



Search for electroweak production of charginos and neutralinos in WH events in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV

The CMS Collaboration*

Abstract

Results are reported from a search for physics beyond the standard model in proton-proton collision events with a charged lepton (electron or muon), two jets identified as originating from a bottom quark decay, and significant imbalance in the transverse momentum. The search was performed using a data sample corresponding to 35.9 fb^{-1} , collected by the CMS experiment in 2016 at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. Events with this signature can arise, for example, from the electroweak production of gauginos, which are predicted in models based on supersymmetry. The event yields observed in data are consistent with the estimated standard model backgrounds. Limits are obtained on the cross sections for chargino-neutralino ($\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm \tilde{\chi}_2^0$) production in a simplified model of supersymmetry with the decays $\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm \rightarrow W^\pm \tilde{\chi}_1^0$ and $\tilde{\chi}_2^0 \rightarrow H \tilde{\chi}_1^0$. Values of $m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm}$ between 220 and 490 GeV are excluded at 95% confidence level by this search when the $\tilde{\chi}_1^0$ is massless, and values of $m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0}$ are excluded up to 110 GeV for $m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm} \approx 450$ GeV.

Published in the Journal of High Energy Physics as doi:10.1007/JHEP11(2017)029.

1 Introduction

Supersymmetry (SUSY) [1–8] is a theoretically attractive extension of the standard model (SM) that is based on a symmetry between bosons and fermions. SUSY predicts the existence of a superpartner for every SM particle, with the same gauge quantum numbers but differing by one half unit of spin. In R-parity conserving SUSY models, supersymmetric particles are created in pairs, and the lightest supersymmetric particle (LSP) is stable [9–11]. As a result, SUSY also provides a potential connection to cosmology as the LSP, if neutral and stable, may be a viable dark matter candidate.

Previous searches based on 13 TeV proton-proton collision data at the CERN LHC focused on strong production of colored SUSY particles [12–28]. Pair production of these particles would have the largest cross section for SUSY processes and therefore provides the strongest discovery potential with small datasets. However, the absence of signals in these searches suggests that strongly produced SUSY particles may be too massive to be found with the present data. In contrast, neutralinos ($\tilde{\chi}^0$) and charginos ($\tilde{\chi}^\pm$), mixtures of the superpartners of the SM electroweak gauge bosons and the Higgs bosons, can have masses within the accessible range. Because of the absence of color charge, the production cross sections are lower, and these particles may have thus far eluded detection. This provides strong motivation for dedicated searches for electroweak SUSY particle production.

Depending on the mass spectrum, the charginos and neutralinos can have significant decay branching fractions to vector bosons V (W or Z) and the Higgs boson (H). Here, “ H ” refers to the 125 GeV Higgs boson [29], interpreted as the lightest CP-even state of an extended Higgs sector. The H boson is expected to have SM-like properties if all of the other Higgs bosons are much heavier [30]. The observation of a Higgs boson in a SUSY-like process would provide evidence that SUSY particles couple to the Higgs field, a necessary condition for SUSY to stabilize the Higgs boson mass. Pair production of neutralinos and/or charginos can thus lead to the HH , VH , and VV decay modes, with a large fraction of the possible final states containing at least one isolated lepton. Such events can be easily selected with simple triggers and do not suffer from large quantum chromodynamics multijet background.

In this paper we focus on a simplified model [31–35] of supersymmetric chargino-neutralino ($\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm \tilde{\chi}_2^0$) production with the decays $\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm \rightarrow W^\pm \tilde{\chi}_1^0$ and $\tilde{\chi}_2^0 \rightarrow H \tilde{\chi}_1^0$, as shown in Fig. 1. Both the $\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$ and $\tilde{\chi}_2^0$ are assumed to be wino-like and have the same mass. The lightest neutralino $\tilde{\chi}_1^0$, produced in the decays of $\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$ or the $\tilde{\chi}_2^0$, is considered to be the stable LSP, which escapes detection. When the W boson decays leptonically, this process typically results in a signature with one lepton, two jets that originate from the decay $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$, and large missing transverse momentum from the neutrino in the W boson decay and the LSPs.

Results of searches for electroweak pair production of SUSY particles were previously reported by the ATLAS and CMS Collaborations using data sets of 8 TeV proton-proton (pp) collisions [36–38] in a variety of event topologies and final states. No excesses above the SM expectations were observed, and the results of those searches were used to place lower limits on the mass of pair-produced charginos and neutralinos. Assuming mass-degenerate $\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$ and $\tilde{\chi}_2^0$, and sleptons (the SUSY partners of the SM leptons) with lower masses, the searches probed masses up to approximately 700 GeV. For the WH decays assumed here, the strongest mass limit was around 270 GeV. With the increase of the LHC collision energy from 8 to 13 TeV, and a significantly larger data set, searches based on 13 TeV data have the potential to quickly surpass the sensitivity of the previous analyses.

This paper presents the result of a search using a data set corresponding to an integrated lu-




Figure 1: Diagram corresponding to the SUSY simplified model targeted by this analysis, i.e., chargino-neutralino production, with the chargino decaying to a W boson and an LSP, while the heavier neutralino decays to a Higgs boson and an LSP.

minosity of 35.9 fb^{-1} of pp collisions collected at a center-of-mass energy of 13 TeV with the CMS detector in 2016. The results are interpreted in the simplified SUSY model with chargino-neutralino production depicted in Fig. 1.

2 The CMS detector

The central feature of the CMS apparatus is a superconducting solenoid, 13 m in length and 6 m in diameter, which provides an axial magnetic field of 3.8 T. Within the field volume are several particle detection systems. Charged-particle trajectories are measured with silicon pixel and strip trackers, covering $0 \leq \phi < 2\pi$ in azimuth and $|\eta| < 2.5$ in pseudorapidity, where $\eta \equiv -\ln[\tan(\theta/2)]$ and θ is the polar angle of the trajectory of the particle with respect to the counterclockwise beam direction. The transverse momentum, the component of the momentum p in the plane orthogonal to the beam, is defined in terms of the polar angle as $p_T = p \sin \theta$. A lead-tungstate crystal electromagnetic calorimeter and a brass and scintillator hadron calorimeter surround the tracking volume, providing energy measurements of electrons, photons, and hadronic jets in the range $|\eta| < 3.0$. Muons are identified and measured within $|\eta| < 2.4$ by gas-ionization detectors embedded in the steel flux-return yoke of the solenoid. Forward calorimeters on each side of the interaction point encompass $3.0 < |\eta| < 5.0$. The detector is nearly hermetic, allowing momentum imbalance measurements in the plane transverse to the beam direction. A two-tier trigger system selects pp collision events of interest for use in physics analyses. A detailed description of the CMS detector, together with a definition of the coordinate system used and the relevant kinematic variables, can be found in Ref. [39].

3 Event samples, reconstruction, and selection

3.1 Object definition and preselection

Event reconstruction is based on the particle-flow (PF) algorithm [40, 41], which combines information from the tracker, calorimeter, and muon systems to reconstruct and identify PF candidates, i.e., charged and neutral hadrons, photons, muons, and electrons. To select collision events, we require at least one reconstructed vertex. The reconstructed vertex with the largest value of summed physics-object p_T^2 is taken to be the primary pp interaction vertex. The physics objects are the objects returned by a jet finding algorithm [42, 43] applied to all charged tracks associated with the vertex, plus the corresponding associated missing transverse momentum. The missing transverse momentum vector, \vec{p}_T^{miss} , is defined as the negative vector sum of the momenta of all reconstructed PF candidates projected onto the plane perpendicular to the pro-

ton beams. Its magnitude is referred to as E_T^{miss} . Events with possible contributions from beam halo processes or anomalous noise in the calorimeter can have large values of E_T^{miss} and are rejected using dedicated filters [44].

Data events are selected using triggers that require the presence of an isolated electron or muon with p_T thresholds of 27 GeV or 24 GeV, respectively. Muon events may also be accepted using a trigger that does not require isolation but instead requires $p_T > 50$ GeV. The trigger efficiency, measured using a data sample of $Z/\gamma^* \rightarrow \ell\ell$ events, varies in the range 70–95% (85–92%) depending on the η and p_T of the electron (muon).

Selected events are required to have exactly one lepton (electron or muon), with electrons (muons) satisfying $p_T > 30(25)$ GeV and $|\eta| < 1.44(2.1)$. Electron candidates are reconstructed starting from a cluster of energy deposits in the electromagnetic calorimeter. The cluster is then matched to a reconstructed track. The electron selection is based on the shower shape, track-cluster matching, and consistency between the cluster energy and the track momentum [45]. Muon candidates are reconstructed by performing a global fit that requires consistent hit patterns in the tracker and the muon system [46]. For both lepton flavors, the impact parameter with respect to the primary vertex is required to be less than 0.5 mm in the transverse plane and 1 mm along the beam direction.

Leptons are required to be isolated from other activity in the event. A measure of lepton isolation is the scalar p_T sum (p_T^{sum}) of all PF candidates not associated with the lepton within a cone of radius $\Delta R \equiv \sqrt{(\Delta\eta)^2 + (\Delta\phi)^2} = 0.3$, where $\Delta\eta$ and $\Delta\phi$ are the distances between the lepton and the PF candidates at the primary vertex in η - ϕ space [47]. Only charged PF candidates compatible with the primary vertex are included in the sum. The average contribution of particles from additional pp interactions in the same or nearby bunch crossings (pileup) is subtracted from p_T^{sum} . We require that p_T^{sum} be less than 5 GeV. Typical lepton identification and isolation efficiencies, measured in samples of $Z/\gamma^* \rightarrow \ell\ell$ events, are approximately 80–85% (85–90%) for electrons (muons), depending on p_T and η .

Particle-flow candidates are clustered to form jets using the anti- k_T clustering algorithm [42] with a distance parameter of 0.4, as implemented in the FASTJET package [43]. Only charged PF candidates compatible with the primary vertex are used in the clustering. The pileup contribution to the jet energy is estimated on an event-by-event basis using the jet area method described in [48] and is subtracted from the overall jet p_T . Corrections are applied to the energy measurements of jets to account for non-uniform detector response and are propagated consistently as a correction to \vec{p}_T^{miss} [49, 50]. The selected lepton can also be reconstructed as a jet, so any jets within $\Delta R = 0.4$ of the lepton are removed from the list of considered jets.

Selected events are required to contain exactly two jets with $p_T > 30$ GeV and $|\eta| < 2.4$. Both of these jets must be consistent with containing the decay products of a heavy-flavor (HF) hadron, as identified using the combined secondary vertex (CSVv2) tagging algorithm [51]. Such jets are referred to as b jets. The CSVv2 algorithm has three main operating points: loose, medium, and tight. We require both jets to be tagged according to the loose operating point, and at least one of them to be tagged with the medium operating point. The efficiency of this algorithm for jets arising from b quarks with p_T between 30 and 400 GeV is in the range 60–65% (70–75%) for the medium (loose) working point. The misidentification rate for jets arising from light quarks or gluons is approximately 1% (10%) for the medium (loose) working point.

The largest background in this search arises from $t\bar{t}$ and tW events with decays into two-lepton final states in which one of the leptons is not reconstructed or identified. In order to reduce these backgrounds, we search for a second electron or muon with $p_T > 5$ GeV and looser iden-

tification and isolation requirements, and reject events where such a lepton is found. Second leptons are required to satisfy $p_T^{\text{sum}}/p_T < 0.1$, where p_T^{sum} is calculated here with a cone radius of $\Delta R = 0.2$ for $p_T^{\text{lep}} \leq 50$ GeV, and $\Delta R = \max(0.05, 10 \text{ GeV}/p_T^{\text{lep}})$ at higher values of lepton transverse momentum. We also reject events with reconstructed hadronically decaying tau leptons with $p_T > 20$ GeV [52], or isolated tracks with $p_T > 10$ GeV and opposite electric charge relative to the selected lepton. For this purpose, a track is considered isolated if $p_T^{\text{sum}}/p_T < 0.1$ and $p_T^{\text{sum}} < 6$ GeV, where p_T^{sum} here is constructed with charged PF candidates compatible with the primary vertex, the cone radius is $\Delta R = 0.3$, and p_T is the transverse momentum of the track.

The final two requirements that complete the preselection are $E_T^{\text{miss}} \geq 125$ GeV and $M_T > 50$ GeV, where M_T is the transverse mass of the lepton- E_T^{miss} system, defined as

$$M_T = \sqrt{2p_T^{\ell} E_T^{\text{miss}} [1 - \cos(\Delta\phi)]}, \quad (1)$$

where p_T^{ℓ} is the transverse momentum of the lepton and $\Delta\phi$ is the angle between the transverse momentum of the lepton and \vec{p}_T^{miss} .

3.2 Signal region definition

The signal regions are defined by additional requirements on the kinematic properties of preselected events. The invariant mass of the two b jets is required to be in the range $90 \leq M_{b\bar{b}} \leq 150$ GeV, consistent with the Higgs boson mass within the resolution. The $M_{b\bar{b}}$ distribution for signal and background processes is shown in Fig. 2 (top left), displaying a clear peak for signal events near the Higgs boson mass.

To suppress single-lepton backgrounds originating from semileptonic $t\bar{t}$, $W + \text{jets}$, and single top quark processes, the preselection requirement on M_T is tightened to >150 GeV. This is because the M_T distribution in these processes with a single leptonically decaying W boson has a kinematic endpoint $M_T < m_W$, where m_W is the W boson mass. The endpoint can be exceeded by off mass-shell W bosons or because of detector resolution effects. The M_T requirement significantly reduces single-lepton backgrounds, as shown in Fig. 2 (bottom left).

In order to further suppress both semileptonic and dileptonic $t\bar{t}$ backgrounds, we utilize the contranverse mass variable, M_{CT} [53, 54]:

$$M_{CT} = \sqrt{2p_T^{b1} p_T^{b2} [1 + \cos(\Delta\phi_{bb})]}, \quad (2)$$

where p_T^{b1} and p_T^{b2} are the transverse momenta of the two jets, and $\Delta\phi_{bb}$ is the azimuthal angle between the pair. As shown in Refs. [53, 54], this variable has a kinematic endpoint at $(m^2(\delta) - m^2(\alpha))/m(\delta)$, where δ is the pair-produced heavy particle and α is the invisible particle produced in the decay of δ . In the case of $t\bar{t}$ events, when both jets from b quarks are correctly identified, the kinematic endpoint corresponds to the top quark mass, while signal events tend to have higher values of M_{CT} . This is shown in Fig. 2 (bottom right). We require $M_{CT} > 170$ GeV.

After all other selections, we define two exclusive bins in E_T^{miss} to enhance sensitivity to signal models with different mass spectra: $125 \leq E_T^{\text{miss}} < 200$ GeV and $E_T^{\text{miss}} \geq 200$ GeV. The E_T^{miss} distribution is shown in Fig. 2 (top right).

3.3 Signal and background simulation

Samples of $t\bar{t}$, $W + \text{jets}$, and $Z + \text{jets}$ events, as well as $t\bar{t}$ production in association with a vector boson, are generated using the MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO 2.2.2 [55] generator at lead-




Figure 2: Distributions in $M_{b\bar{b}}$ (top left), E_T^{miss} (top right), M_T (bottom left), and M_{CT} (bottom right) for signal and background events in simulation after the preselection. The E_T^{miss} , M_T , and M_{CT} distributions are shown after the $90 < M_{b\bar{b}} < 150$ GeV requirement. Expected signal distributions are also overlaid as open histograms for various mass points, with the signal cross section scaled up by a factor of 50 for display purposes. The legend entries for signal give the masses ($m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm}, m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0}$) in GeV and the factor by which the signal cross section has been scaled.

ing order (LO) with the MLM matching scheme [56], while tW and single top quark t -channel events are generated at next-to-leading-order (NLO) using POWHEG V2 [57–59]. A top quark mass of $m_t = 172.5$ GeV, and the NNPDF3.0 LO or NLO [60] parton distribution functions (PDFs) are used in the event generation. Single top quark s -channel production is simulated using MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO 2.2.2 at NLO precision with the FxFx matching scheme [61]. Samples of diboson (WW, WZ, and ZZ) events are generated with either POWHEG or MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO at NLO precision. Normalization of the simulated background samples is performed using the most accurate cross section calculations available [55, 62–72], which generally correspond to NLO or next-to-NLO precision.

The chargino-neutralino signal samples are also generated with MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO at LO precision. For these samples we improve on the modeling of initial-state radiation (ISR), which affects the total transverse momentum (p_T^{ISR}) of the system of SUSY particles, by reweighting

the p_T^{ISR} distribution in these events. This reweighting procedure is based on studies of the p_T of Z bosons [73]. The reweighting factors range between 1.18 at $p_T^{\text{ISR}} = 125 \text{ GeV}$ and 0.78 for $p_T^{\text{ISR}} > 600 \text{ GeV}$. We take the deviation from 1.0 as the systematic uncertainty in the reweighting procedure.

Parton showering and fragmentation in all of these samples are performed using PYTHIA V8.212 [74] with the CUETP8M1 tune [75]. For both signal and background events, additional simultaneous proton-proton interactions (pileup) are generated with PYTHIA and superimposed on the hard collisions. The response of the CMS detector for SM background samples is simulated using GEANT4-based model [76], while that for new physics signals is performed using the CMS fast simulation package [77]. All simulated events are processed with the same chain of reconstruction programs as that used for collision data.

Small differences between the b tagging efficiencies measured in data and simulation are corrected using data-to-simulation scale factors. Corrections are also applied to account for differences between lepton selection efficiencies (trigger, reconstruction, identification, and isolation) in data and simulation.

4 Backgrounds

The backgrounds for this search are classified into six categories. The first and most important category, referred to as dilepton top quark events, consists mainly of events from top quark pair production with both quarks decaying leptonically, but also including contributions from the associated production of a single top quark with a W boson, both of which decay leptonically. The second to fifth categories include processes with a single leptonically decaying W boson. Events with a single W are divided into two categories: those with b jets ($W + \text{HF}$, for “heavy flavor”) and those without ($W + \text{LF}$, for “light flavor”). A separate category comprises WZ events in which the Z boson decays to $b\bar{b}$ ($WZ \rightarrow \ell\nu b\bar{b}$). Events with one leptonically decaying top quark, either from $t\bar{t}$ or from single top quark t - or s -channel production, are included in the fifth category (“single-lepton top quark”). Finally, other SM processes contribute a small amount to the expected yield in the signal region and are grouped together in the “rare” category. This includes events from $Z + \text{jets}$, WW , WZ (except the decays described above), ZZ , triboson, $t\bar{t}W$, $t\bar{t}Z$, and $WH \rightarrow \ell\nu b\bar{b}$ processes.

All background processes are modeled using MC simulation. Three data control regions (CRs) are defined by inverting the signal region selection requirements, as summarized in Table 1. The CRs are defined at both preselection and signal region selection levels. The CRs at the preselection level are defined with looser cuts in order to check the modeling of key discriminant variables. The CRs after the signal region level selections are used to validate the modeling of the main backgrounds and to assign systematic uncertainties in the background predictions. The regions $\text{CRM}b\bar{b}$ and $\text{CR}0b$ are split into two bins in E_T^{miss} to mirror the signal region selection. The expected signal contribution in any of the CRs is always less than 1% of the total SM yields, and typically much smaller.

The dilepton top quark background can be isolated in the $\text{CR}2\ell$ control region by selecting dilepton events. In addition to a lepton passing the analysis selections, events must contain one of the following: a second electron or muon, an isolated track candidate, or a tau lepton candidate. The latter categories are included to accept hadronically decaying tau leptons. If all the kinematic selections used for the signal regions are applied, the number of events in $\text{CR}2\ell$ is too low to validate the modeling of the dilepton top quark background. Therefore, this CR is used primarily to validate the modeling of $M_{b\bar{b}}$.

Table 1: Event selections in signal and control regions. The region CR2 ℓ is only used at the preselection level.

Selection	Signal regions	CR2 ℓ	CR0b	CRMb \bar{b}
N(leptons)	=1	=1 or 2	=1	=1
Isolated track veto	✓	inverted if 1 ℓ	✓	✓
Tau candidate veto	✓	inverted if 1 ℓ	✓	✓
Number of b tags	=2	=2	=0	=2
Preselection level				
$M_{b\bar{b}}$ [GeV]	—	—	$\in[90,150]$	$\notin[90,150]$
E_T^{miss} [GeV]	≥ 125	≥ 125	≥ 125	≥ 125
M_T [GeV]	> 50	> 150	> 50	> 150
M_{CT} [GeV]	—	—	> 170	—
Signal region selection level				
$M_{b\bar{b}}$ [GeV]	$\in[90,150]$	—	$\in[90,150]$	$\notin[90,150]$
E_T^{miss} [GeV]	$[125, 200), \geq 200$	not used	$[125, 200), \geq 200$	$[125, 200), \geq 200$
M_T [GeV]	> 150	—	> 150	> 150
M_{CT} [GeV]	> 170	—	> 170	> 170

Since the signal produces a resonant peak in the $M_{b\bar{b}}$ distribution, the requirement on $M_{b\bar{b}}$ is inverted to define the background-dominated control region CRMb \bar{b} , which includes a mixture of all backgrounds in proportions similar to those in the signal region. Consequently, this control region is dominated by the dilepton top quark background and is used to validate the modeling of these processes in the kinematic tails of the E_T^{miss} , M_T , and M_{CT} distributions.

The CR0b region is designed to study the $W + \text{LF}$ background. It is used to validate the modeling of the kinematic tails in E_T^{miss} , M_T , and M_{CT} for $W + \text{jets}$ processes. In this region, the dijet mass M_{jj} computed from the two selected jets is used in place of $M_{b\bar{b}}$.

The background estimation and the associated uncertainties are described in the following sections.

4.1 Dilepton top quark backgrounds

The dilepton top quark process contributes to the event sample in the signal region when the second lepton is not reconstructed or identified. Due to the presence of two neutrinos, these events tend to have higher E_T^{miss} than the single-lepton backgrounds, and their M_T distribution is not bounded by the W boson mass. However, as mentioned above, the M_{CT} requirement significantly suppresses dilepton top quark events. The modeling of this background is validated in two steps. First, the modeling of the $M_{b\bar{b}}$ distribution is validated in CR2 ℓ ; second, the modeling in the kinematic tails of the E_T^{miss} , M_T , and M_{CT} distributions is validated in CRMb \bar{b} . Distributions of $M_{b\bar{b}}$ in CR2 ℓ and CRMb \bar{b} , after the preselection level cuts defined in Table 1, are displayed in Fig. 3 (left) and Fig. 3 (right), respectively.

In CR2 ℓ , we observe agreement between data and MC, validating the modeling of the $M_{b\bar{b}}$ distribution. We then use CRMb \bar{b} at the signal region selection level to derive a scale factor for the dilepton top quark background separately in each of the analysis E_T^{miss} bins. All other background components are subtracted from the observed data yields, and the result is compared to the dilepton top quark MC prediction. Agreement is observed in the higher E_T^{miss} bin within statistical uncertainties. For the lower E_T^{miss} bin, we find fewer events in data than predicted, and we derive a scale factor of 0.72 for the dilepton top quark background in this bin. From the statistical precision of the data, we assign a systematic uncertainty of 30% in the prediction for both bins. This accounts for any effects that could impact the modeling of this background in simulation, including generator assumptions on factorization and renormalization scales, and




Figure 3: (left) Distribution in $M_{b\bar{b}}$ in CR2 ℓ after the preselection level cuts defined in Table 1, comparing data to MC simulation. (right) Distribution in $M_{b\bar{b}}$ in CRMb \bar{b} after preselection level cuts defined in Table 1. The signal region range of $90 \leq M_{b\bar{b}} \leq 150$ GeV has been removed from the plot.

PDFs, as well as experimental uncertainties in the jet energy scale, the lepton identification and isolation, trigger, and b tagging efficiencies.

4.2 W boson backgrounds

The M_T requirement (>150 GeV) effectively suppresses the contribution from $W + \text{jets}$ events. However, as discussed above, events from $W + \text{jets}$ can still enter the M_T tail due to off-shell W production or E_T^{miss} resolution effects. The control region CR0b consists mostly of $W + \text{LF}$ events and is therefore used to validate the modeling of $W + \text{jets}$ in the tails of all kinematic variables such as M_T .

Figure 4 shows the M_T distributions of data and simulated events in CR0b after the preselection requirements. The data and simulation agree within uncertainties. The observed yields in data are then compared with MC predictions after applying all the kinematic requirements at signal region selection level defined in Table 1. We find agreement within statistical uncertainties. Based on the statistical precision of the data, we assign a 10% systematic uncertainty in the $W + \text{jets}$ prediction. This procedure directly tests the $W + \text{jets}$ background prediction in the kinematic phase space of the signal region, including experimental uncertainties in the jet energy scale, in the efficiencies for trigger, lepton identification and isolation. It also accounts for most generator assumptions. Additional uncertainties for effects not tested by this procedure are discussed below.

For the $W + \text{LF}$ background, the uncertainty due to the b tagging requirements is evaluated by varying the b tagging efficiencies within their measured uncertainties. The uncertainty in the yield in the signal regions is 1%.

For the $W + \text{HF}$ background the effects contributing to the kinematic tails are similar to those in $W + \text{LF}$. In this case the tail of the M_T distribution receives contributions from off-shell W boson production and E_T^{miss} resolution effects, but also from neutrinos in semileptonic decays within the b jets. Since this last effect is accounted for in the event generation, we do not apply




Figure 4: Distribution in M_T in CR0b after the preselection level cuts defined in Table 1.

any additional correction or uncertainty for kinematic tail modeling beyond the one derived above in CR0b.

The most uncertain aspect of the prediction for the $W + \text{HF}$ background is the estimate of its cross section relative to the $W + \text{LF}$ process. We assign a 50% uncertainty to the normalization of this background [78]. This uncertainty is validated by comparing data to simulation in a CR with $60 < M_T < 120 \text{ GeV}$ and with one or two jets, where the dominant contribution to the event sample is from $W + \text{jets}$. We find that the 50% uncertainty conservatively covers differences between data and simulation as a function of the number of b jets. Finally, the uncertainty in this prediction due to the uncertainty in the b tagging efficiency is also evaluated and found to be 5%.

The effects discussed above also contribute to the tail of the M_T distribution in $WZ \rightarrow \ell\nu b\bar{b}$ events. As a result, the tail modeling systematic uncertainty for this background is taken to be the same as those evaluated in CR0b. An additional uncertainty of 12% is applied to the normalization of the $WZ \rightarrow \ell\nu b\bar{b}$ background, based on the CMS cross section measurement of inclusive WZ production at 13 TeV [79]. A unique aspect of the $WZ \rightarrow \ell\nu b\bar{b}$ background is that $M_{b\bar{b}}$ peaks at the Z boson mass, at the lower edge of the $M_{b\bar{b}}$ selection used in this analysis. Uncertainties in the jet energy scale can therefore strongly impact the prediction of this background. By varying the jet energy scale within its uncertainty, we derive an uncertainty of 27% in the $WZ \rightarrow \ell\nu b\bar{b}$ background prediction. While this uncertainty is large, the absolute magnitude of this background remains very small in the signal region. Finally, the uncertainty in the background prediction for this process due to the uncertainty in the b tagging efficiency is 2%.

4.3 Other backgrounds

The single-lepton top quark backgrounds are highly suppressed by several of the selections applied in this analysis. Since these contain exactly one leptonically decaying W boson, the M_T requirement is an effective discriminant against them. Requiring exactly two jets also suppresses the $t\bar{t} \rightarrow \ell + \text{jets}$ background, which typically has four jets in the final state. As a result, this background comprises a small fraction of the expected SM prediction in the signal region.

Isolating the single-lepton top quark background in a region kinematically similar to the signal region is difficult since dilepton top quark events tend to dominate when requiring large M_T . The main source of uncertainty in the prediction of this background is the modeling of the E_T^{miss} resolution, which was found to be well modeled in the study of CR0b.

Additional studies of E_T^{miss} resolution are performed using $\gamma + \text{jets}$ events following the method used in Ref. [78]. The resolution in data is found to be up to 20% worse than in simulation, leading to higher single-lepton top quark yields than expected from simulation. However, the impact of this effect on the total background prediction is negligible. Due to the difficulties in defining a dedicated control region for this process, we assign a conservative uncertainty of 100% to the single lepton top quark background prediction.

The ‘‘rare’’ backgrounds contribute less than 15% of the expected yield in the signal region. We apply an uncertainty of 50% on the event yields from these processes.

5 Results

Figure 5 shows the distributions of $M_{b\bar{b}}$ in data compared with the SM background prediction after all signal region requirements except the $M_{b\bar{b}}$ selection. No significant deviations from the predictions are observed. Table 2 shows the expected SM background yields in the signal region compared to the observation, as well as predicted yields for several signal models with the masses $(m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm}, m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0})$ indicated in GeV. The correlation coefficient for the background prediction between the two bins is 0.61. The correlation is incorporated in the likelihood model described below for the interpretation of the results, and it can be used to reinterpret these results in other signal models [80].




Figure 5: Distributions in $M_{b\bar{b}}$ after all signal region kinematic requirements for the two exclusive E_T^{miss} bins (left: $125 \leq E_T^{\text{miss}} < 200$ GeV, right: $E_T^{\text{miss}} \geq 200$ GeV). The signal region is $90 \leq M_{b\bar{b}} \leq 150$ GeV. The hatched band shows the total uncertainty in the background prediction, including statistical and systematic components. The expected signal distribution for a reference SUSY model is overlaid as an open histogram, and the legend (on the last line) gives the masses as $(m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm}, m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0})$ in GeV.

Table 2: Expected and observed event yields in the signal regions. The uncertainties shown include both statistical and systematic sources. The correlation coefficient for the background prediction between the two bins is 0.61. Predicted yields are shown also for several signal models with the masses ($m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm}, m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0}$) indicated in GeV and with statistical-only uncertainties.

	$125 \leq E_T^{\text{miss}} < 200 \text{ GeV}$	$E_T^{\text{miss}} \geq 200 \text{ GeV}$
Dilepton top quark	4.6 ± 1.5	4.9 ± 1.7
W + LF	0.2 ± 0.1	0.5 ± 0.4
W + HF	1.0 ± 0.9	1.3 ± 1.0
WZ $\rightarrow \ell\nu b\bar{b}$	0.1 ± 0.1	0.4 ± 0.2
Single-lepton top quark	1.6 ± 1.6	0.3 ± 0.4
Rare	$0.0_{-0.0}^{+0.2}$	1.2 ± 0.7
Total SM background	7.5 ± 2.5	8.7 ± 2.2
Data	11	7
$\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm \tilde{\chi}_1^0$ (225,75)	2.4 ± 0.4	2.3 ± 0.4
$\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm \tilde{\chi}_1^0$ (250,1)	7.6 ± 1.0	10.0 ± 1.2
$\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm \tilde{\chi}_1^0$ (500,1)	0.9 ± 0.1	6.3 ± 0.2
$\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm \tilde{\chi}_1^0$ (500,125)	1.0 ± 0.1	5.5 ± 0.2
$\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm \tilde{\chi}_1^0$ (350,100)	2.7 ± 0.3	8.0 ± 0.5

6 Interpretation

The results of this analysis are interpreted in the context of the simplified SUSY model depicted in Fig. 1, $\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm \tilde{\chi}_2^0 \rightarrow W^\pm H \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0$. The $\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$ and $\tilde{\chi}_2^0$ are assumed to have the same mass, and the branching fractions for the decays listed above are taken to be 100%. The W and Higgs bosons are taken to decay according to their SM branching fractions. Cross section limits as a function of the SUSY particle masses are set using a modified frequentist approach, employing the CL_s criterion and an asymptotic formulation [81–84]. Both signal regions are considered simultaneously in setting limits. The “expected” limit is that under the background-only hypothesis, while the “observed” limit reflects the data yields in the signal regions. The production cross sections are computed at NLO plus next-to-leading-log (NLL) precision in a limit of mass-degenerate wino $\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$ and $\tilde{\chi}_2^0$, light bino $\tilde{\chi}_1^0$, and with all the other sparticles assumed to be heavy and decoupled [85, 86]. The uncertainty in the cross section calculation includes variations of factorization and renormalization scales, and of the PDFs.

The systematic uncertainties in the signal yield are summarized in Table 3. The signal models with the largest acceptance uncertainties are those with $\Delta m = m_{\tilde{\chi}_2^0} - m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0} \simeq m_H$. For these models, the kinematic properties of the events are most similar to those from SM backgrounds, and as a result, the acceptance is smaller than for models with larger Δm . For these models with compressed mass spectra, the largest uncertainties in the signal yields arise from the jet energy scale (up to 40%), E_T^{miss} resolution in fast simulation (up to 50%), and limited size of MC samples (up to 60%). These uncertainties reach their maximal values only for models where the acceptance of this analysis is very small and the sensitivity is similarly small. For models with large Δm , where this analysis has the best sensitivity, these uncertainties typically amount to only a few percent. Other experimental and theoretical uncertainties are also considered and lead to small changes in the expected yields. These include effects from the renormalization and factorization scales assumed in the generator on the signal acceptance, the b tagging efficiency, the lepton reconstruction, identification, and isolation efficiency, the trigger efficiency, and the modeling of pileup. Finally, the uncertainty in the integrated luminosity is 2.5% [87].

Table 3: Sources of systematic uncertainty in the estimated signal yield, along with their typical values. The ranges represent variation across the signal masses probed.

Source	Typical range of values [%]
Integrated luminosity	2.5
Size of MC samples	2–60
Pileup	1–5
Renormalization and factorization scales	1–3
ISR modeling	1–5
b tagging efficiency	2–8
Lepton efficiency	2–5
Trigger efficiency	1–5
Jet energy scale	1–40
Fastsim E_T^{miss} resolution	1–50

Figure 6 shows the expected and observed 95% confidence level (CL) exclusion limits for $\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm \tilde{\chi}_2^0 \rightarrow W^\pm H \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0$ as a function of $m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm}$ assuming $m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0} = 1$ GeV (left) and then in the two-dimensional plane of $m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm}$ and $m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0}$ (right). This search excludes $m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm}$ values between 220 and 490 GeV when $m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0} = 1$ GeV, and $m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0}$ values up to 110 GeV when $m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm}$ is around 450 GeV.

7 Summary

A search is performed for beyond the standard model physics in events with a leptonically decaying W boson, a Higgs boson decaying to a $b\bar{b}$ pair, and large transverse momentum imbalance. The search uses proton-proton collision data recorded by the CMS experiment in 2016 at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 35.9 fb^{-1} . The event yields observed in data are consistent with the estimated standard model backgrounds. The results are used to set cross section limits on chargino-neutralino production in a simplified supersymmetric model with degenerate masses for $\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$ and $\tilde{\chi}_2^0$ and with the decays $\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm \rightarrow W^\pm \tilde{\chi}_1^0$ and $\tilde{\chi}_2^0 \rightarrow H \tilde{\chi}_1^0$. Values of $m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm}$ between 220 and 490 GeV are excluded at 95% confidence level by this search when the $\tilde{\chi}_1^0$ is massless, and values of $m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0}$ are excluded up to 110 GeV for $m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm} \approx 450$ GeV. These results significantly extend the previous best limits, by up to 270 GeV in $m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm}$ and up to 90 GeV in $m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0}$.

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); INFN (Italy); MSIP and NRF (Republic of Korea); LAS (Lithuania); MOE and UM




Figure 6: (left) Cross section exclusion limits at the 95% CL are shown for $\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm \tilde{\chi}_2^0 \rightarrow W^\pm H \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0$ as a function of $m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm}$, assuming $m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0} = 1$ GeV. The solid black line and points represent the observed exclusion. The dashed black line represents the expected exclusion, while the green and yellow bands indicate the ± 1 and ± 2 standard deviation (s.d.) uncertainties in the expected limit. The magenta line shows the theoretical cross section with its uncertainty. (right) Exclusion limits at the 95% CL in the plane of $m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm}$ and $m_{\tilde{\chi}_2^0}$. The area below the thick black (dashed red) curve represents the observed (expected) exclusion region. The thin dashed red line indicates the $+1$ s.d._{exp.} experimental uncertainty. The -1 s.d._{exp.} line does not appear as no mass points would be excluded in that case. The thin black lines show the effect of the theoretical uncertainties (± 1 s.d._{theory}) on the signal cross section.

(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, RFBR and RAEP (Russia); MESTD (Serbia); SEIDI, CPAN, PCTI and FEDER (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 Horizon 2020 Grant, contract No. 675440 (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 2014/13/B/ST2/02543, 2014/15/B/ST2/03998, and 2015/19/B/ST2/02861, Sonata-bis 2012/07/E/ST2/01406; the National Priorities Research Program by Qatar National Research Fund; the Programa Clarín-COFUND del Principado de Asturias; the Thalís and Aristeia programs cofinanced by EU-ESF and the Greek NSRF; the Rachadapisek Sompot Fund for Postdoctoral Fellowship, Chulalongkorn University and the Chulalongkorn Academic into Its 2nd Century Project Advancement Project (Thailand); and the Welch Foundation, contract C-1845.

References

- [1] P. Ramond, “Dual theory for free fermions”, *Phys. Rev. D* **3** (1971) 2415, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.3.2415.
- [2] Y. A. Gol’fand and E. P. Likhtman, “Extension of the algebra of Poincaré group generators and violation of P invariance”, *JETP Lett.* **13** (1971) 323.
- [3] A. Neveu and J. H. Schwarz, “Factorizable dual model of pions”, *Nucl. Phys. B* **31** (1971) 86, doi:10.1016/0550-3213(71)90448-2.
- [4] D. V. Volkov and V. P. Akulov, “Possible universal neutrino interaction”, *JETP Lett.* **16** (1972) 438.
- [5] J. Wess and B. Zumino, “A Lagrangian model invariant under supergauge transformations”, *Phys. Lett. B* **49** (1974) 52, doi:10.1016/0370-2693(74)90578-4.
- [6] J. Wess and B. Zumino, “Supergauge transformations in four dimensions”, *Nucl. Phys. B* **70** (1974) 39, doi:10.1016/0550-3213(74)90355-1.
- [7] P. Fayet, “Supergauge invariant extension of the Higgs mechanism and a model for the electron and its neutrino”, *Nucl. Phys. B* **90** (1975) 104, doi:10.1016/0550-3213(75)90636-7.
- [8] H. P. Nilles, “Supersymmetry, supergravity and particle physics”, *Phys. Rep.* **110** (1984) 1, doi:10.1016/0370-1573(84)90008-5.
- [9] G. R. Farrar and P. Fayet, “Phenomenology of the production, decay, and detection of new hadronic states associated with supersymmetry”, *Phys. Lett. B* **76** (1978) 575, doi:10.1016/0370-2693(78)90858-4.
- [10] C. Boehm, A. Djouadi, and M. Drees, “Light scalar top quarks and supersymmetric dark matter”, *Phys. Rev. D* **62** (2000) 035012, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.62.035012, arXiv:hep-ph/9911496.
- [11] C. Balázs, M. Carena, and C. E. M. Wagnerr, “Dark matter, light top squarks, and electroweak baryogenesis”, *Phys. Rev. D* **70** (2004) 015007, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.70.015007, arXiv:hep-ph/403224.
- [12] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for new phenomena in final states with large jet multiplicities and missing transverse momentum with ATLAS using $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV proton-proton collisions”, *Phys. Lett. B* **757** (2016) 334, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2016.04.005, arXiv:1602.06194.
- [13] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for new phenomena in final states with an energetic jet and large missing transverse momentum in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV using the ATLAS detector”, *Phys. Rev. D* **94** (2016) 032005, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.94.032005, arXiv:1604.07773.
- [14] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for squarks and gluinos in final states with jets and missing transverse momentum at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76** (2016) 392, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-4184-8, arXiv:1605.03814.

- [15] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for pair production of gluinos decaying via stop and sbottom in events with b jets and large missing transverse momentum in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector”, *Phys. Rev. D* **94** (2016) 032003, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.94.032003, arXiv:1605.09318.
- [16] CMS Collaboration, “Search for new physics with the M_{T2} variable in all-jets final states produced in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV”, *JHEP* **10** (2016) 006, doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2016)006, arXiv:1603.04053.
- [17] CMS Collaboration, “Search for supersymmetry in multijet events with missing transverse momentum in proton-proton collisions at 13 TeV”, (2017). arXiv:1704.07781. Submitted to *Phys. Rev. D*.
- [18] CMS Collaboration, “Inclusive search for supersymmetry using razor variables in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV”, *Phys. Rev. D* **95** (2017) 012003, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.95.012003, arXiv:1609.07658.
- [19] CMS Collaboration, “A search for new phenomena in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV in final states with missing transverse momentum and at least one jet using the α_T variable”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77** (2017) 294, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-4787-8, arXiv:1611.00338.
- [20] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for supersymmetry at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV in final states with jets and two same-sign leptons or three leptons with the ATLAS detector”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76** (2016) 259, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-4095-8, arXiv:1602.09058.
- [21] CMS Collaboration, “Search for physics beyond the standard model in events with two leptons of same sign, missing transverse momentum, and jets in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV”, (2017). arXiv:1704.07323. Submitted to *Eur. Phys. J. C*.
- [22] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for top squarks in final states with one isolated lepton, jets, and missing transverse momentum in $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV pp collisions with the ATLAS detector”, *Phys. Rev. D* **94** (2016) 052009, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.94.052009, arXiv:1606.03903.
- [23] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for new phenomena in final states with large jet multiplicities and missing transverse momentum with ATLAS using $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV proton-proton collisions”, *Phys. Lett. B* **757** (2016) 334, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2016.04.005, arXiv:1602.06194.
- [24] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for gluinos in events with an isolated lepton, jets and missing transverse momentum at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76** (2016) 565, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-4397-x, arXiv:1605.04285.
- [25] CMS Collaboration, “Search for supersymmetry in the all-hadronic final state using top quark tagging in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV”, (2017). arXiv:1701.01954. Submitted to *Phys. Rev. D*.
- [26] CMS Collaboration, “Search for supersymmetry in events with one lepton and multiple jets in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV”, *Phys. Rev. D* **95** (2017) 012011, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.95.012011, arXiv:1609.09386.
- [27] CMS Collaboration, “Search for supersymmetry with multiple charged leptons in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV”, (2017). arXiv:1701.06940. Submitted to *Eur. J. Phys. C*.

- [28] CMS Collaboration, “Search for supersymmetry in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV in the single-lepton final state using the sum of masses of large-radius jets”, *JHEP* **08** (2016) 122, doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2016)122, arXiv:1605.04608.
- [29] ATLAS, CMS Collaboration, “Measurements of the Higgs boson production and decay rates and constraints on its couplings from a combined ATLAS and CMS analysis of the LHC pp collision data at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ and 8 TeV”, *JHEP* **08** (2016) 045, doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2016)045, arXiv:1606.02266.
- [30] S. P. Martin, “A supersymmetry primer”, in *Perspectives on Supersymmetry II*, G. L. Kane, ed., p. 1. World Scientific, 2010. arXiv:hep-ph/9709356. Adv. Ser. Direct. High Energy Phys., vol. 21. doi:10.1142/9789814307505_0001.
- [31] N. Arkani-Hamed et al., “MARMOSSET: The Path from LHC Data to the New Standard Model via On-Shell Effective Theories”, (2007). arXiv:hep-ph/0703088.
- [32] J. Alwall, P. Schuster, and N. Toro, “Simplified models for a first characterization of new physics at the LHC”, *Phys. Rev. D* **79** (2009) 075020, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.79.075020, arXiv:0810.3921.
- [33] J. Alwall, M.-P. Le, M. Lisanti, and J. G. Wacker, “Model-independent jets plus missing energy searches”, *Phys. Rev. D* **79** (2009) 015005, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.79.015005, arXiv:0809.3264.
- [34] D. Alves et al., “Simplified models for LHC new physics searches”, *J. Phys. G* **39** (2012) 105005, doi:10.1088/0954-3899/39/10/105005, arXiv:1105.2838.
- [35] CMS Collaboration, “Interpretation of searches for supersymmetry with simplified models”, *Phys. Rev. D* **88** (2013) 052017, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.88.052017, arXiv:1301.2175.
- [36] CMS Collaboration, “Searches for electroweak neutralino and chargino production in channels with Higgs, Z, and W bosons in pp collisions at 8 TeV”, *Phys. Rev. D* **90** (2014) 092007, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.90.092007, arXiv:1409.3168.
- [37] CMS Collaboration, “Searches for electroweak production of charginos, neutralinos, and sleptons decaying to leptons and W, Z, and Higgs bosons in pp collisions at 8 TeV”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74** (2014) 3036, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-014-3036-7, arXiv:1405.7570.
- [38] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for the electroweak production of supersymmetric particles in $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV pp collisions with the ATLAS detector”, *Phys. Rev. D* **93** (2016) 052002, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.052002, arXiv:1509.07152.
- [39] CMS Collaboration, “The CMS experiment at the CERN LHC”, *JINST* **3** (2008) S08004, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08004.
- [40] 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.
- [41] 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.

- [42] M. Cacciari, G. P. Salam, and G. Soyez, “The anti- k_t jet clustering algorithm”, *JHEP* **04** (2008) 063, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2008/04/063, arXiv:0802.1189.
- [43] M. Cacciari, G. P. Salam, and G. Soyez, “FastJet user manual”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **72** (2012) 1896, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-012-1896-2, arXiv:1111.6097.
- [44] CMS Collaboration, “Missing transverse energy performance of the CMS detector”, *JINST* **6** (2011) P09001, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/6/09/P09001, arXiv:1106.5048.
- [45] CMS Collaboration, “Performance of electron reconstruction and selection with the CMS detector in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV”, *JINST* **10** (2015) P06005, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/10/06/P06005, arXiv:1502.02701.
- [46] CMS Collaboration, “Performance of CMS muon reconstruction in pp collision events at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV”, *JINST* **7** (2012) P10002, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/7/10/P10002, arXiv:1206.4071.
- [47] CMS Collaboration, “Description and performance of track and primary-vertex reconstruction with the CMS tracker”, *JINST* **9** (2014) P10009, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/9/10/P10009, arXiv:1405.6569.
- [48] M. Cacciari and G. P. Salam, “Pileup subtraction using jet areas”, *Phys. Lett. B* **659** (2008) 119, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2007.09.077, arXiv:0707.1378.
- [49] CMS Collaboration, “Determination of jet energy calibration and transverse momentum resolution in CMS”, *JINST* **6** (2011) P11002, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/6/11/P11002, arXiv:1107.4277.
- [50] CMS Collaboration, “Jet energy scale and resolution in the CMS experiment in pp collisions at 8 TeV”, *JINST* **12** (2017) P02014, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/12/02/P02014, arXiv:1607.03663.
- [51] CMS Collaboration, “Identification of b-quark jets with the CMS experiment”, *JINST* **8** (2013) P04013, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/8/04/P04013, arXiv:1211.4462.
- [52] CMS Collaboration, “Reconstruction and identification of τ lepton decays to hadrons and ν_τ at CMS”, *JINST* **11** (2016) P01019, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/11/01/P01019, arXiv:1510.07488.
- [53] D. R. Tovey, “On measuring the masses of pair-produced semi-invisibly decaying particles at hadron colliders”, *JHEP* **04** (2008) 034, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2008/04/034, arXiv:0802.2879.
- [54] G. Polesello and D. R. Tovey, “Supersymmetric particle mass measurement with the boost-corrected contranverse mass”, *JHEP* **03** (2010) 030, doi:10.1007/JHEP03(2010)030, arXiv:0910.0174.
- [55] 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.
- [56] J. Alwall et al., “Comparative study of various algorithms for the merging of parton showers and matrix elements in hadronic collisions”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **53** (2008) 473, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-007-0490-5, arXiv:0706.2569.

- [57] P. Nason, “A new method for combining NLO QCD with shower Monte Carlo algorithms”, *JHEP* **11** (2004) 040, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2004/11/040, arXiv:hep-ph/0409146.
- [58] S. Frixione, P. Nason, and C. Oleari, “Matching NLO QCD computations with parton shower simulations: the POWHEG method”, *JHEP* **11** (2007) 070, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2007/11/070, arXiv:0709.2092.
- [59] S. Alioli, P. Nason, C. Oleari, and E. Re, “A general framework for implementing NLO calculations in shower Monte Carlo programs: the POWHEG BOX”, *JHEP* **06** (2010) 043, doi:10.1007/JHEP06(2010)043, arXiv:1002.2581.
- [60] NNPDF Collaboration, “Parton distributions for the LHC Run II”, *JHEP* **04** (2015) 040, doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2015)040, arXiv:1410.8849.
- [61] R. Frederix and S. Frixione, “Merging meets matching in MC@NLO”, *JHEP* **12** (2012) 061, doi:10.1007/JHEP12(2012)061, arXiv:1209.6215.
- [62] S. Alioli, P. Nason, C. Oleari, and E. Re, “NLO single-top production matched with shower in POWHEG: s - and t -channel contributions”, *JHEP* **09** (2009) 111, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2009/09/111, arXiv:0907.4076. [Erratum: doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2010)011].
- [63] E. Re, “Single-top Wt -channel production matched with parton showers using the POWHEG method”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **71** (2011) 1547, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-011-1547-z, arXiv:1009.2450.
- [64] T. Melia, P. Nason, R. Rontsch, and G. Zanderighi, “ W^+W^- , WZ and ZZ production in the POWHEG BOX”, *JHEP* **11** (2011) 078, doi:10.1007/JHEP11(2011)078, arXiv:1107.5051.
- [65] M. Beneke, P. Falgari, S. Klein, and C. Schwinn, “Hadronic top-quark pair production with NNLL threshold resummation”, *Nucl. Phys. B* **855** (2012) 695, doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2011.10.021, arXiv:1109.1536.
- [66] M. Cacciari et al., “Top-pair production at hadron colliders with next-to-next-to-leading logarithmic soft-gluon resummation”, *Phys. Lett. B* **710** (2012) 612, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2012.03.013, arXiv:1111.5869.
- [67] P. Bärnreuther, M. Czakon, and A. Mitov, “Percent-level-precision physics at the Tevatron: Next-to-next-to-leading order QCD corrections to $q\bar{q} \rightarrow t\bar{t} + X$ ”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109** (2012) 132001, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.132001, arXiv:1204.5201.
- [68] M. Czakon and A. Mitov, “NNLO corrections to top-pair production at hadron colliders: the all-fermionic scattering channels”, *JHEP* **12** (2012) 054, doi:10.1007/JHEP12(2012)054, arXiv:1207.0236.
- [69] M. Czakon and A. Mitov, “NNLO corrections to top pair production at hadron colliders: the quark-gluon reaction”, *JHEP* **01** (2013) 080, doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2013)080, arXiv:1210.6832.
- [70] M. Czakon, P. Fiedler, and A. Mitov, “Total top-quark pair-production cross section at hadron colliders through $O(\alpha_s^4)$ ”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110** (2013) 252004, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.110.252004, arXiv:1303.6254.

- [71] R. Gavin, Y. Li, F. Petriello, and S. Quackenbush, “W Physics at the LHC with FEWZ 2.1”, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **184** (2013) 208, doi:10.1016/j.cpc.2012.09.005, arXiv:1201.5896.
- [72] R. Gavin, Y. Li, F. Petriello, and S. Quackenbush, “FEWZ 2.0: A code for hadronic Z production at next-to-next-to-leading order”, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **182** (2011) 2388, doi:10.1016/j.cpc.2011.06.008, arXiv:1011.3540.
- [73] CMS Collaboration, “Search for top-squark pair production in the single-lepton final state in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **73** (2013) 2677, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-013-2677-2, arXiv:1308.1586.
- [74] T. Sjöstrand, S. Mrenna, and P. Z. Skands, “A brief introduction to PYTHIA 8.1”, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **178** (2008) 852, doi:10.1016/j.cpc.2008.01.036, arXiv:0710.3820.
- [75] 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.
- [76] GEANT4 Collaboration, “GEANT4 — a simulation toolkit”, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **506** (2003) 250, doi:10.1016/S0168-9002(03)01368-8.
- [77] S. Abdullin et al., “The fast simulation of the CMS detector at LHC”, *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **331** (2011) 032049, doi:10.1088/1742-6596/331/3/032049.
- [78] CMS Collaboration, “Searches for pair production of third-generation squarks in $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV pp collisions”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77** (2017) 327, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-4853-2, arXiv:1612.03877.
- [79] CMS Collaboration, “Measurement of the WZ production cross section in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV”, *Phys. Lett. B* **766** (2017) 268, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2017.01.011, arXiv:1607.06943.
- [80] CMS Collaboration, “Simplified likelihood for the re-interpretation of public CMS results”, Technical Report CMS-NOTE-2017-001, 2017.
- [81] 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.
- [82] 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.
- [83] 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].
- [84] ATLAS and CMS Collaborations, “Procedure for the LHC Higgs boson search combination in summer 2011”, Technical Report ATL-PHYS-PUB-2011-011, CMS-NOTE-2011-005, 2011.

-
- [85] B. Fuks, M. Klasen, D. R. Lamprea, and M. Rothering, “Gaugino production in proton-proton collisions at a center-of-mass energy of 8 TeV”, *JHEP* **10** (2012) 081, doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2012)081, arXiv:1207.2159.
- [86] B. Fuks, M. Klasen, D. R. Lamprea, and M. Rothering, “Precision predictions for electroweak superpartner production at hadron colliders with RESUMMINO”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **73** (2013) 2480, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-013-2480-0, arXiv:1304.0790.
- [87] CMS Collaboration, “CMS luminosity measurements for the 2016 data taking period”, CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-LUM-17-001, 2017.

A The CMS Collaboration

Yerevan Physics Institute, Yerevan, Armenia

A.M. Sirunyan, A. Tumasyan

Institut für Hochenergiephysik, Wien, Austria

W. Adam, F. Ambrogio, E. Asilar, T. Bergauer, J. Brandstetter, E. Brondolin, M. Dragicevic, J. Erö, M. Flechl, M. Friedl, R. Frühwirth¹, V.M. Ghete, J. Grossmann, J. Hrubec, M. Jeitler¹, A. König, N. Krammer, I. Krätschmer, D. Liko, T. Madlener, I. Mikulec, E. Pree, D. Rabady, N. Rad, H. Rohringer, J. Schieck¹, R. Schöfbeck, M. Spanring, D. Spitzbart, J. Strauss, W. Waltenberger, J. Wittmann, C.-E. Wulz¹, M. Zarucki

Institute for Nuclear Problems, Minsk, Belarus

V. Chekhovsky, V. Mossolov, J. Suarez Gonzalez

Universiteit Antwerpen, Antwerpen, Belgium

E.A. De Wolf, D. Di Croce, X. Janssen, J. Lauwers, H. Van Haevermaet, P. Van Mechelen, N. Van Remortel

Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussel, Belgium

S. Abu Zeid, F. Blekman, J. D'Hondt, I. De Bruyn, J. De Clercq, K. Deroover, G. Flouris, D. Lontkovskyi, S. Lowette, S. Moortgat, L. Moreels, A. Olbrechts, Q. Python, K. Skovpen, 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, 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, M. Gul, I. Khvastunov, D. Poyraz, C. Roskas, S. Salva, M. Tytgat, W. Verbeke, N. Zaganidis

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

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

Université de Mons, Mons, Belgium

N. Bely

Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Fisicas, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

W.L. Aldá Júnior, F.L. Alves, G.A. Alves, L. Brito, M. Correa Martins Junior, 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. Chinellato³, A. Custódio, E.M. Da Costa, G.G. Da Silveira⁴, D. De Jesus Damiao, S. Fonseca De Souza, L.M. Huertas Guativa, H. Malbouisson, M. Melo De Almeida, C. Mora Herrera, L. Mundim, H. Nogima, A. Santoro, A. Sznajder, E.J. Tonelli Manganote³, F. Torres Da Silva De Araujo, A. Vilela Pereira

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

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

Institute for Nuclear Research and Nuclear Energy of Bulgaria Academy of Sciences

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

University of Sofia, Sofia, Bulgaria

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

Beihang University, Beijing, China

W. Fang⁵, X. Gao⁵

Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing, China

M. Ahmad, J.G. Bian, G.M. Chen, H.S. Chen, M. Chen, Y. Chen, C.H. Jiang, D. Leggat, H. Liao, Z. Liu, F. Romeo, S.M. Shaheen, A. Spiezia, J. Tao, C. Wang, Z. Wang, E. Yazgan, 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, C.F. González Hernández, J.D. Ruiz Alvarez

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

B. Courbon, 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, B. Mesic, A. Starodumov⁶, T. Susa

University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus

M.W. Ather, A. Attikis, G. Mavromanolakis, J. Mousa, C. Nicolaou, F. Ptochos, P.A. Razis, H. Rykaczewski

Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

M. Finger⁷, M. Finger Jr.⁷

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. Ellithi Kamel⁸, S. Khalil⁹, A. Mohamed⁹

National Institute of Chemical Physics and Biophysics, Tallinn, Estonia

R.K. Dewanjee, M. Kadastik, 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, E. Tuominen, J. Tuominiemi, E. Tuovinen

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, J.L. Faure, F. Ferri, S. Ganjour, S. Ghosh, A. Givernaud, P. Gras, G. Hamel de Monchenault, P. Jarry, I. Kucher, E. Locci, M. Machet, J. Malcles, G. Negro, J. Rander, A. Rosowsky, M.Ö. Sahin, M. Titov

Laboratoire Leprince-Ringuet, Ecole polytechnique, CNRS/IN2P3, Université Paris-Saclay, Palaiseau, France

A. Abdulsalam, I. Antropov, S. Baffioni, F. Beaudette, P. Busson, L. Cadamuro, C. Charlot, R. Granier de Cassagnac, M. Jo, S. Lisniak, A. Lobanov, J. Martin Blanco, M. Nguyen, C. Ochando, G. Ortona, P. Paganini, P. Pigard, S. Regnard, R. Salerno, J.B. Sauvan, Y. Sirois, A.G. Stahl Leiton, T. Strebler, Y. Yilmaz, A. Zabi, A. Zghiche

Université de Strasbourg, CNRS, IPHC UMR 7178, F-67000 Strasbourg, France

J.-L. Agram¹⁰, J. Andrea, D. Bloch, J.-M. Brom, M. Buttignol, E.C. Chabert, N. Chanon, C. Collard, E. Conte¹⁰, X. Coubez, J.-C. Fontaine¹⁰, D. Gelé, U. Goerlach, M. Jansová, A.-C. Le Bihan, N. Tonon, 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, R. Chierici, D. Contardo, P. Depasse, H. El Mamouni, J. Fay, L. Finco, S. Gascon, M. Gouzevitch, G. Grenier, B. Ille, F. Lagarde, I.B. Laktineh, M. Lethuillier, L. Mirabito, A.L. Pequegnot, S. Perries, A. Popov¹¹, V. Sordini, M. Vander Donckt, S. Viret

Georgian Technical University, Tbilisi, Georgia

T. Toriashvili¹²

Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia

Z. Tsamalaidze⁷

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

C. Autermann, S. Beranek, L. Feld, M.K. Kiesel, K. Klein, M. Lipinski, M. Preuten, C. Schomakers, J. Schulz, T. Verlage

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

A. Albert, 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, D. Teyssier, S. Thüer

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

G. Flügge, B. Kargoll, T. Kress, A. Künsken, J. Lingemann, T. Müller, A. Nehr Korn, A. Nowack, C. Pistone, O. Pooth, A. Stahl¹³

Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Hamburg, Germany

M. Aldaya Martin, T. Arndt, C. Asawatangtrakuldee, K. Beernaert, O. Behnke, U. Behrens, A. Bermúdez Martínez, A.A. Bin Anuar, K. Borras¹⁴, V. Botta, A. Campbell, P. Connor, C. Contreras-Campana, F. Costanza, C. Diez Pardos, G. Eckerlin, D. Eckstein, T. Eichhorn,

E. Eren, E. Gallo¹⁵, J. Garay Garcia, A. Geiser, A. Gizhko, J.M. Grados Luyando, A. Grohsjean, P. Gunnellini, A. Harb, J. Hauk, M. Hempel¹⁶, H. Jung, A. Kalogeropoulos, M. Kasemann, J. Keaveney, C. Kleinwort, I. Korol, D. Krücker, W. Lange, A. Lelek, T. Lenz, J. Leonard, K. Lipka, W. Lohmann¹⁶, 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. Savitskyi, P. Saxena, R. Shevchenko, S. Spannagel, N. Stefaniuk, G.P. Van Onsem, R. Walsh, Y. Wen, K. Wichmann, C. Wissing, O. Zenaiev

University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany

S. Bein, V. Blobel, M. Centis Vignali, A.R. Draeger, T. Dreyer, E. Garutti, D. Gonzalez, J. Haller, A. Hinzmann, M. Hoffmann, A. Karavdina, R. Klanner, R. Kogler, N. Kovalchuk, S. Kurz, T. Lapsien, I. Marchesini, D. Marconi, M. Meyer, M. Niedziela, D. Nowatschin, F. Pantaleo¹³, T. Peiffer, A. Perieanu, C. Scharf, P. Schleper, A. Schmidt, S. Schumann, J. Schwandt, J. Sonneveld, H. Stadie, G. Steinbrück, F.M. Stober, M. Stöver, H. Tholen, D. Troendle, E. Usai, L. Vanelderen, A. Vanhoefer, B. Vormwald

Institut für Experimentelle Kernphysik, Karlsruhe, Germany

M. Akbiyik, C. Barth, S. Baur, E. Butz, R. Caspart, T. Chwalek, F. Colombo, W. De Boer, A. Dierlamm, B. Freund, R. Friese, M. Giffels, A. Gilbert, D. Haitz, F. Hartmann¹³, S.M. Heindl, U. Husemann, F. Kassel¹³, S. Kudella, H. Mildner, M.U. Mozer, Th. Müller, M. Plagge, G. Quast, K. Rabbertz, M. Schröder, I. Shvetsov, G. Sieber, H.J. Simonis, R. Ulrich, 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

University of Ioánnina, Ioánnina, Greece

I. Evangelou, C. Foudas, P. Kokkas, S. Mallios, N. Manthos, I. Papadopoulos, E. Paradas, J. Strologas, F.A. Triantis

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

M. Csanad, N. Filipovic, G. Pasztor

Wigner Research Centre for Physics, Budapest, Hungary

G. Bencze, C. Hajdu, D. Horvath¹⁷, Á. Hunyadi, F. Sikler, V. Veszpremi, G. Vesztergombi¹⁸, A.J. Zsigmond

Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary

N. Beni, S. Czellar, J. Karancsi¹⁹, A. Makovec, J. Molnar, Z. Szillasi

Institute of Physics, University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary

M. Bartók¹⁸, P. Raics, Z.L. Trocsanyi, B. Ujvari

Indian Institute of Science (IISc), Bangalore, India

S. Choudhury, J.R. Komaragiri

National Institute of Science Education and Research, Bhubaneswar, India

S. Bahinipati²⁰, S. Bhowmik, P. Mal, K. Mandal, A. Nayak²¹, D.K. Sahoo²⁰, N. Sahoo, S.K. Swain

Panjab University, Chandigarh, India

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

University of Delhi, Delhi, India

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

Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, HBNI, Kolkata, India

R. Bhardwaj, R. Bhattacharya, S. Bhattacharya, 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. Mohanty¹³, P.K. Netrakanti, L.M. Pant, P. Shukla, A. Topkar

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-A, Mumbai, India

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

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-B, Mumbai, India

S. Banerjee, S. Bhattacharya, S. Chatterjee, P. Das, M. Guchait, Sa. Jain, S. Kumar, M. Maity²², G. Majumder, K. Mazumdar, T. Sarkar²², N. Wickramage²³

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

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

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

S. Chenarani²⁴, E. Eskandari Tadavani, S.M. Etesami²⁴, M. Khakzad, M. Mohammadi Najafabadi, M. Naseri, S. Paktinat Mehdiabadi²⁵, F. Rezaei Hosseinabadi, B. Safarzadeh²⁶, 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}, F. Errico^{a,b}, L. Fiore^a, G. Iaselli^{a,c}, S. Lezki^{a,b}, 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}, A. Sharma^a, L. Silvestris^{a,13}, R. Venditti^a, P. Verwilligen^a

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

G. Abbiendi^a, C. Battilana^{a,b}, D. Bonacorsi^{a,b}, S. Braibant-Giacomelli^{a,b}, R. Campanini^{a,b}, P. Capiluppi^{a,b}, A. Castro^{a,b}, F.R. Cavallo^a, S.S. Chhibra^a, 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. Navarra^{a,b}, A. Perrotta^a, A.M. Rossi^{a,b}, T. Rovelli^{a,b}, G.P. Siroli^{a,b}, N. Tosi^a

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, K. Chatterjee^{a,b}, 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, L. Russo^{a,27}, G. Sguazzoni^a, D. Strom^a, L. Viliani^{a,b,13}

INFN Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, Frascati, Italy

L. Benussi, S. Bianco, F. Fabbri, D. Piccolo, F. Primavera¹³

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

V. Calvelli^{a,b}, F. Ferro^a, E. Robutti^a, S. Tosi^{a,b}

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

L. Brianza^{a,b}, F. Brivio^{a,b}, V. Ciriolo^{a,b}, M.E. Dinardo^{a,b}, S. Fiorendi^{a,b}, S. Gennai^a, A. Ghezzi^{a,b}, P. Govoni^{a,b}, M. Malberti^{a,b}, S. Malvezzi^a, R.A. Manzoni^{a,b}, D. Menasce^a, L. Moroni^a, M. Paganoni^{a,b}, K. Pauwels^{a,b}, D. Pedrini^a, S. Pigazzini^{a,b,28}, 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}, S. Di Guida^{a,d,13}, M. Esposito^{a,b}, F. Fabozzi^{a,c}, F. Fienga^{a,b}, A.O.M. Iorio^{a,b}, W.A. Khan^a, G. Lanza^a, L. Lista^a, S. Meola^{a,d,13}, P. Paolucci^{a,13}, C. Sciacca^{a,b}, F. Thyssen^a

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

P. Azzi^{a,13}, 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, 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}, N. Pozzobon^{a,b}, P. Ronchese^{a,b}, R. Rossin^{a,b}, F. Simonetto^{a,b}, E. Torassa^a, M. Zanetti^{a,b}, P. Zotto^{a,b}, G. Zumerle^{a,b}

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

A. Braghieri^a, F. Fallavollita^{a,b}, A. Magnani^{a,b}, P. Montagna^{a,b}, S.P. Ratti^{a,b}, V. Re^a, M. Ressegotti, 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}, M. Biasini^{a,b}, G.M. Bilei^a, C. Cecchi^{a,b}, D. Ciangottini^{a,b}, L. Fanò^{a,b}, P. Lariccia^{a,b}, R. Leonardi^{a,b}, E. Manoni^a, G. Mantovani^{a,b}, V. Mariani^{a,b}, M. Menichelli^a, A. Rossi^{a,b}, A. Santocchia^{a,b}, D. Spiga^a

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

K. Androsov^a, P. Azzurri^{a,13}, G. Bagliesi^a, J. Bernardini^a, T. Boccali^a, L. Borrello, R. Castaldi^a, M.A. Ciocci^{a,b}, R. Dell'Orso^a, G. Fedi^a, L. Giannini^{a,c}, A. Giassi^a, M.T. Grippo^{a,27}, F. Ligabue^{a,c}, T. Lomtadze^a, E. Manca^{a,c}, G. Mandorli^{a,c}, L. Martini^{a,b}, A. Messineo^{a,b}, F. Palla^a, A. Rizzi^{a,b}, A. Savoy-Navarro^{a,29}, P. Spagnolo^a, R. Tenchini^a, G. Tonelli^{a,b}, A. Venturi^a, P.G. Verdini^a

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

L. Barone^{a,b}, F. Cavallari^a, M. Cipriani^{a,b}, D. Del Re^{a,b,13}, 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,b}, 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}, 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

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, J. Lee, S. Lee, S.W. Lee, C.S. Moon, 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, D.H. Moon, G. Oh

Hanyang University, Seoul, Korea

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

Korea University, Seoul, Korea

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

Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea

J. Almond, J. Kim, J.S. Kim, H. Lee, K. Lee, K. Nam, 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

Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon, Korea

Y. Choi, 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, M.A.B. Md Ali³⁰, F. Mohamad Idris³¹, 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 Cruz³², R. Lopez-Fernandez, 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

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, 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. Byszuk³³, K. Doroba, A. Kalinowski, M. Konecki, J. Krolikowski, M. Misiura, M. Olszewski, A. Pyskir, 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, M. Gallinaro, J. Hollar, N. Leonardo, L. Lloret Iglesias, M.V. Nemallapudi, J. Seixas, O. Toldaiev, D. Vadrucchio, J. Varela

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^{34,35}, V. Palichik, V. Perelygin, S. Shmatov, S. Shulha, N. Skatchkov, V. Smirnov, N. Voytishin, A. Zarubin

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

Y. Ivanov, V. Kim³⁶, E. Kuznetsova³⁷, P. Levchenko, V. Murzin, V. Oreshkin, I. Smirnov, V. Sulimov, L. Uvarov, S. Vavilov, 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. Gavrilov, N. Lychkovskaya, V. Popov, I. Pozdnyakov, G. Safronov, A. Spiridonov, A. Steppenov, M. Toms, E. Vlasov, A. Zhokin

Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Moscow, Russia

T. Aushev, A. Bylinkin³⁵

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

M. Chadeeva³⁸, P. Parygin, D. Philippov, S. Polikarpov, E. Popova, V. Rusinov

P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia

V. Andreev, M. Azarkin³⁵, I. Dremin³⁵, M. Kirakosyan³⁵, A. Terkulov

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

A. Baskakov, A. Belyaev, E. Boos, M. Dubinin³⁹, L. Dudko, A. Ershov, A. Gribushin, V. Klyukhin, O. Kodolova, I. Lokhtin, I. Miagkov, S. Obraztsov, S. Petrushanko, V. Savrin, A. Snigirev

Novosibirsk State University (NSU), Novosibirsk, RussiaV. Blinov⁴⁰, Y.Skovpen⁴⁰, D. Shtol⁴⁰**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, SerbiaP. Adzic⁴¹, 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, M. Cerrada, 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, A. Pérez-Calero Yzquierdo, J. Puerta Pelayo, A. Quintario Olmeda, I. Redondo, L. Romero, M.S. Soares, A. Álvarez Fernández

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain

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

Universidad de Oviedo, Oviedo, Spain

J. Cuevas, C. Erice, J. Fernandez Menendez, I. Gonzalez Caballero, J.R. González Fernández, E. Palencia Cortezon, S. Sanchez Cruz, I. Suárez Andrés, P. Vischia, J.M. Vizán García

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

I.J. Cabrillo, A. Calderon, B. Chazin Quero, E. Curras, M. Fernandez, J. Garcia-Ferrero, G. Gomez, A. Lopez Virto, J. Marco, C. Martinez Rivero, P. Martinez Ruiz del Arbol, 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, SwitzerlandD. Abbaneo, E. Auffray, P. Baillon, A.H. Ball, D. Barney, M. Bianco, P. Bloch, A. Bocci, C. Botta, T. Camporesi, R. Castello, M. Cepeda, G. Cerminara, E. Chapon, Y. Chen, D. d'Enterria, A. Dabrowski, V. Daponte, A. David, M. De Gruttola, A. De Roeck, E. Di Marco⁴², M. Dobson, B. Dorney, T. du Pree, M. Dünser, N. Dupont, A. Elliott-Peisert, P. Everaerts, G. Franzoni, J. Fulcher, W. Funk, D. Gigi, K. Gill, F. Glege, D. Gulhan, S. Gundacker, M. Guthoff, P. Harris, J. Hegeman, V. Innocente, P. Janot, O. Karacheban¹⁶, J. Kieseler, H. Kirschenmann, V. Knünz, A. Kornmayer¹³, M.J. Kortelainen, 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. Milenovic⁴³, F. Moortgat, 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. Rolandi⁴⁴, M. Rovere, H. Sakulin, C. Schäfer, C. Schwick, M. Seidel, M. Selvaggi, A. Sharma, P. Silva, P. Sphicas⁴⁵, J. Steggemann, M. Stoye, M. Tosi, D. Treille, A. Triossi, A. Tsiros, V. Veckalns⁴⁶, G.I. Veres¹⁸, M. Verweij, N. Wardle, W.D. Zeuner**Paul Scherrer Institut, Villigen, Switzerland**W. Bertl[†], L. Caminada⁴⁷, K. Deiters, W. Erdmann, R. Horisberger, Q. Ingram, H.C. Kaestli, D. Kotlinski, U. Langenegger, T. Rohe, S.A. Wiederkehr**Institute for Particle Physics, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland**

F. Bachmair, L. Bäni, P. Berger, L. Bianchini, B. Casal, G. Dissertori, M. Dittmar, M. Donegà,

C. Grab, C. Heidegger, D. Hits, J. Hoss, G. Kasieczka, T. Klijsma, W. Lustermann, B. Mangano, M. Marionneau, 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. Schönenberger, L. Shchutska, V.R. Tavolaro, K. Theofilatos, M.L. Vesterbacka Olsson, R. Wallny, A. Zagodzinska³³, D.H. Zhu

Universität Zürich, Zurich, Switzerland

T.K. Aarrestad, C. Amsler⁴⁸, M.F. Canelli, A. De Cosa, S. Donato, C. Galloni, T. Hreus, B. Kilminster, J. Ngadiuba, D. Pinna, G. Rauco, P. Robmann, D. Salerno, C. Seitz, A. Zucchetta

National Central University, Chung-Li, Taiwan

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

National Taiwan University (NTU), Taipei, Taiwan

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

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

B. Asavapibhop, K. Kovitanggoon, G. Singh, N. Srimanobhas

ukurova University, Physics Department, Science and Art Faculty, Adana, Turkey

A. Adiguzel⁴⁹, F. Boran, S. Cerci⁵⁰, S. Damarseckin, Z.S. Demiroglu, C. Dozen, I. Dumanoglu, S. Girgis, G. Gokbulut, Y. Guler, I. Hos⁵¹, E.E. Kangal⁵², O. Kara, A. Kayis Topaksu, U. Kiminsu, M. Oglakci, G. Onengut⁵³, K. Ozdemir⁵⁴, D. Sunar Cerci⁵⁰, B. Tali⁵⁰, S. Turkcapar, I.S. Zorbakir, C. Zorbilmez

Middle East Technical University, Physics Department, Ankara, Turkey

B. Bilin, G. Karapinar⁵⁵, K. Ocalan⁵⁶, M. Yalvac, M. Zeyrek

Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey

E. Gülmez, M. Kaya⁵⁷, O. Kaya⁵⁸, S. Tekten, E.A. Yetkin⁵⁹

Istanbul Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey

M.N. Agaras, S. Atay, A. Cakir, K. Cankocak

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, O. Davignon, H. Flacher, J. Goldstein, M. Grimes, G.P. Heath, H.F. Heath, J. Jacob, L. Kreczko, C. Lucas, D.M. Newbold⁶⁰, 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. Belyaev⁶¹, 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

R. Bainbridge, S. Breeze, O. Buchmuller, A. Bundock, S. Casasso, M. Citron, D. Colling, L. Corpe, P. Dauncey, G. Davies, A. De Wit, M. Della Negra, R. Di Maria, A. Elwood, Y. Haddad, G. Hall, G. Iles, T. James, R. Lane, C. Laner, L. Lyons, A.-M. Magnan, S. Malik, L. Mastrolorenzo,

T. Matsushita, J. Nash, A. Nikitenko⁶, V. Palladino, M. Pesaresi, D.M. Raymond, A. Richards, A. Rose, E. Scott, C. Seez, A. Shtipliyski, S. Summers, A. Tapper, K. Uchida, M. Vazquez Acosta⁶², T. Virdee¹³, D. Winterbottom, J. Wright, S.C. Zenz

Brunel University, Uxbridge, United Kingdom

J.E. Cole, P.R. Hobson, A. Khan, P. Kyberd, 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, C. Smith

Catholic University of America, Washington DC, USA

R. Bartek, A. Dominguez

The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, USA

A. Buccilli, 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, D. Cutts, A. Garabedian, J. Hakala, U. Heintz, J.M. Hogan, K.H.M. Kwok, E. Laird, G. Landsberg, Z. Mao, M. Narain, S. Piperov, S. Sagir, R. Syarif, D. Yu

University of California, Davis, Davis, USA

R. Band, C. Brainerd, D. Burns, M. Calderon De La Barca Sanchez, 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, M. Shi, J. Smith, M. Squires, D. Stolp, K. Tos, M. Tripathi, Z. Wang

University of California, Los Angeles, USA

M. Bachtis, C. Bravo, R. Cousins, A. Dasgupta, A. Florent, J. Hauser, M. Ignatenko, N. Mccoll, D. Saltzberg, C. Schnaible, V. Valuev

University of California, Riverside, Riverside, USA

E. Bouvier, 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, L. Wang, H. Wei, S. Wimpenny, B. R. Yates

University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, USA

J.G. Branson, S. Cittolin, M. Derdzinski, B. Hashemi, A. Holzner, D. Klein, G. Kole, V. Krutelyov, J. Letts, I. Macneill, M. Masciovecchio, D. Olivito, S. Padhi, M. Pieri, M. Sani, V. Sharma, S. Simon, M. Tadel, A. Vartak, S. Wasserbaech⁶³, 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, J. Bendavid, A. Bornheim, J.M. Lawhorn, H.B. Newman, T. Nguyen, C. Pena, M. Spiropulu, J.R. Vlimant, S. Xie, Z. Zhang, R.Y. Zhu

Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, USA

M.B. Andrews, T. Ferguson, T. Mudholkar, 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, S. Leontsinis, T. Mulholland, K. Stenson, S.R. Wagner

Cornell University, Ithaca, USA

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

Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, USA

S. Abdullin, M. Albrow, G. Apollinari, A. Apresyan, A. Apyan, S. Banerjee, L.A.T. Bauerdick, A. Beretvas, J. Berryhill, P.C. Bhat, G. Bolla, K. Burkett, J.N. Butler, A. Canepa, G.B. Cerati, H.W.K. Cheung, F. Chlebana, M. Cremonesi, J. Duarte, V.D. Elvira, J. Freeman, Z. Gecse, E. Gottschalk, L. Gray, D. Green, S. Grünendahl, O. Gutsche, R.M. Harris, S. Hasegawa, J. Hirschauer, Z. Hu, B. Jayatilaka, S. Jindariani, M. Johnson, U. Joshi, B. Klima, B. Kreis, S. Lammel, D. Lincoln, R. Lipton, M. Liu, 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, V. O'Dell, K. Pedro, O. Prokofyev, G. Rakness, L. Ristori, B. Schneider, E. Sexton-Kennedy, A. Soha, W.J. Spalding, L. Spiegel, S. Stoynev, J. Strait, 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

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, K. Kotov, P. Ma, K. Matchev, H. Mei, G. Mitselmakher, D. Rank, D. Sperka, N. Terentyev, L. Thomas, J. Wang, S. Wang, J. Yelton

Florida International University, Miami, USA

Y.R. Joshi, S. Linn, P. Markowitz, J.L. Rodriguez

Florida State University, Tallahassee, USA

A. Ackert, T. Adams, A. Askew, S. Hagopian, V. Hagopian, K.F. Johnson, T. Kolberg, G. Martinez, T. Perry, H. Prosper, A. Saha, 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, R. Cavanaugh, X. Chen, O. Evdokimov, C.E. Gerber, D.A. Hangal, D.J. Hofman, K. Jung, J. Kamin, I.D. Sandoval Gonzalez, M.B. Tonjes, H. Trauger, N. Varelas, H. Wang, Z. Wu, J. Zhang

The University of Iowa, Iowa City, USA

B. Bilki⁶⁴, W. Clarida, K. Dilsiz⁶⁵, S. Durgut, R.P. Gandrajula, M. Haytmyradov, V. Khristenko, J.-P. Merlo, H. Mermerkaya⁶⁶, A. Mestvirishvili, A. Moeller, J. Nachtman, H. Ogul⁶⁷, Y. Onel, F. Ozok⁶⁸, A. Penzo, C. Snyder, E. Tiras, J. Wetzel, K. Yi

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA

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

The University of Kansas, Lawrence, USA

A. Al-bataineh, P. Baringer, A. Bean, S. Boren, J. Bowen, J. Castle, S. Khalil, A. Kropivnitskaya,

D. Majumder, W. Mcbrayer, M. Murray, C. Royon, S. Sanders, E. Schmitz, 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, N.J. Hadley, S. Jabeen, G.Y. Jeng, R.G. Kellogg, J. Kunkle, A.C. Mignerey, F. Ricci-Tam, Y.H. Shin, A. Skuja, S.C. Tonwar

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, USA

D. Abercrombie, B. Allen, V. Azzolini, R. Barbieri, A. Baty, R. Bi, S. Brandt, W. Busza, I.A. Cali, M. D'Alfonso, Z. Demiragli, G. Gomez Ceballos, M. Goncharov, D. Hsu, Y. Iiyama, G.M. Innocenti, M. Klute, D. Kovalskyi, 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. Tatar, D. Velicanu, J. Wang, T.W. Wang, B. Wyslouch

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, USA

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

University of Mississippi, Oxford, USA

J.G. Acosta, S. Oliveros

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, USA

E. Avdeeva, K. Bloom, D.R. Claes, C. Fangmeier, R. Gonzalez Suarez, R. Kamalieddin, I. Kravchenko, J. Monroy, J.E. Siado, G.R. Snow, B. Stieger

State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, USA

M. Alyari, J. Dolen, A. Godshalk, C. Harrington, I. Iashvili, D. Nguyen, 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, D. Wood

Northwestern University, Evanston, USA

S. Bhattacharya, O. Charaf, K.A. Hahn, 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. Loukas, N. Marinelli, F. Meng, C. Mueller, Y. Musienko³⁴, 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, B. Bylsma, L.S. Durkin, S. Flowers, B. Francis, A. Hart, C. Hill, W. Ji, B. Liu, W. Luo, D. Puigh, B.L. Winer, H.W. Wulsin

Princeton University, Princeton, USA

A. Benaglia, S. Cooperstein, O. Driga, P. Elmer, J. Hardenbrook, P. Hebda, S. Higginbotham,

D. Lange, J. Luo, D. Marlow, K. Mei, I. Ojalvo, J. Olsen, C. Palmer, P. Piroué, D. Stickland, C. Tully

University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez, USA

S. Malik, S. Norberg

Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA

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

Purdue University Northwest, Hammond, USA

T. Cheng, 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, J. Roberts, J. Rorie, Z. Tu, J. Zabel

University of Rochester, Rochester, USA

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

The Rockefeller University, New York, USA

R. Ciesielski, K. Goulianos, C. Mesropian

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

A. Agapitos, J.P. Chou, Y. Gershtein, T.A. Gómez Espinosa, E. Halkiadakis, M. Heindl, E. Hughes, S. Kaplan, R. Kunnawalkam Elayavalli, S. Kyriacou, A. Lath, R. Montalvo, K. Nash, M. Osherson, 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. Bouhali⁶⁹, A. Castaneda Hernandez⁶⁹, A. Celik, M. Dalchenko, M. De Mattia, A. Delgado, S. Dildick, R. Eusebi, J. Gilmore, T. Huang, T. Kamon⁷⁰, R. Mueller, Y. Pakhotin, R. Patel, A. Perloff, L. Perniè, D. Rathjens, A. Safonov, A. Tatarinov, K.A. Ulmer

Texas Tech University, Lubbock, USA

N. Akchurin, J. Damgov, F. De Guio, P.R. Duderø, J. Faulkner, E. Garpinar, 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, R. Hirosky, A. Ledovskoy, H. Li, C. Neu, T. Sinthuprasith, X. Sun, Y. Wang, E. Wolfe, F. Xia

Wayne State University, Detroit, USA

R. Harr, P.E. Karchin, J. Sturdy, S. Zaleski

University of Wisconsin - Madison, Madison, WI, USA

M. Brodski, J. Buchanan, C. Caillol, S. Dasu, L. Dodd, S. Duric, B. Gomber, M. Grothe,

M. Herndon, A. Hervé, U. Hussain, P. Klabbers, A. Lanaro, A. Levine, K. Long, R. Loveless, 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 Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, Brazil
- 4: Also at Universidade Federal de Pelotas, Pelotas, Brazil
- 5: Also at Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium
- 6: Also at Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia
- 7: Also at Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia
- 8: Now at Cairo University, Cairo, Egypt
- 9: Also at Zewail City of Science and Technology, Zewail, Egypt
- 10: Also at Université de Haute Alsace, Mulhouse, France
- 11: Also at Skobeltsyn Institute of Nuclear Physics, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia
- 12: Also at Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia
- 13: Also at CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland
- 14: Also at RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut A, Aachen, Germany
- 15: Also at University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany
- 16: Also at Brandenburg University of Technology, Cottbus, Germany
- 17: Also at Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary
- 18: Also at MTA-ELTE Lendület CMS Particle and Nuclear Physics Group, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary
- 19: Also at Institute of Physics, University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary
- 20: Also at Indian Institute of Technology Bhubaneswar, Bhubaneswar, India
- 21: Also at Institute of Physics, Bhubaneswar, India
- 22: Also at University of Visva-Bharati, Santiniketan, India
- 23: Also at University of Ruhuna, Matara, Sri Lanka
- 24: Also at Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, Iran
- 25: Also at Yazd University, Yazd, Iran
- 26: Also at Plasma Physics Research Center, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
- 27: Also at Università degli Studi di Siena, Siena, Italy
- 28: Also at INFN Sezione di Milano-Bicocca; Università di Milano-Bicocca, Milano, Italy
- 29: Also at Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA
- 30: Also at International Islamic University of Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
- 31: Also at Malaysian Nuclear Agency, MOSTI, Kajang, Malaysia
- 32: Also at Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología, Mexico city, Mexico
- 33: Also at Warsaw University of Technology, Institute of Electronic Systems, Warsaw, Poland
- 34: Also at Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia
- 35: Now at National Research Nuclear University 'Moscow Engineering Physics Institute' (MEPhI), Moscow, Russia
- 36: Also at St. Petersburg State Polytechnical University, St. Petersburg, Russia
- 37: Also at University of Florida, Gainesville, USA
- 38: Also at P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia
- 39: Also at California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA
- 40: Also at Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, Novosibirsk, Russia
- 41: Also at Faculty of Physics, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia

-
- 42: Also at INFN Sezione di Roma; Sapienza Università di Roma, Rome, Italy
- 43: Also at University of Belgrade, Faculty of Physics and Vinca Institute of Nuclear Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia
- 44: Also at Scuola Normale e Sezione dell'INFN, Pisa, Italy
- 45: Also at National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece
- 46: Also at Riga Technical University, Riga, Latvia
- 47: Also at Universität Zürich, Zurich, Switzerland
- 48: Also at Stefan Meyer Institute for Subatomic Physics (SMI), Vienna, Austria
- 49: Also at Istanbul University, Faculty of Science, Istanbul, Turkey
- 50: Also at Adiyaman University, Adiyaman, Turkey
- 51: Also at Istanbul Aydin University, Istanbul, Turkey
- 52: Also at Mersin University, Mersin, Turkey
- 53: Also at Cag University, Mersin, Turkey
- 54: Also at Piri Reis University, Istanbul, Turkey
- 55: Also at Izmir Institute of Technology, Izmir, Turkey
- 56: Also at Necmettin Erbakan University, Konya, Turkey
- 57: Also at Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey
- 58: Also at Kafkas University, Kars, Turkey
- 59: Also at Istanbul Bilgi University, Istanbul, Turkey
- 60: Also at Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom
- 61: Also at School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southampton, Southampton, United Kingdom
- 62: Also at Instituto de Astrofísica de Canarias, La Laguna, Spain
- 63: Also at Utah Valley University, Orem, USA
- 64: Also at Beykent University, Istanbul, Turkey
- 65: Also at Bingol University, Bingol, Turkey
- 66: Also at Erzincan University, Erzincan, Turkey
- 67: Also at Sinop University, Sinop, Turkey
- 68: Also at Mimar Sinan University, Istanbul, Istanbul, Turkey
- 69: Also at Texas A&M University at Qatar, Doha, Qatar
- 70: Also at Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea