

MIT Open Access Articles

Search for an exotic decay of the Higgs boson to a pair of light pseudoscalars in the final state with two b quarks and two τ leptons in proton–proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV

The MIT Faculty has made this article openly available. **Please share** how this access benefits you. Your story matters.

Citation: Sirunyan, A. M., et al. “Search for an Exotic Decay of the Higgs Boson to a Pair of Light Pseudoscalars in the Final State with Two b Quarks and Two τ Leptons in Proton–Proton Collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV.” *Physics Letters B*, vol. 785, Oct. 2018, pp. 462–88. © 2018 The Authors

As Published: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2018.08.057>


Publisher: Elsevier

Persistent URL: <http://hdl.handle.net/1721.1/118966>

Version: Final published version: final published article, as it appeared in a journal, conference proceedings, or other formally published context

Terms of use: Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License





Search for an exotic decay of the Higgs boson to a pair of light pseudoscalars in the final state with two b quarks and two τ leptons in proton–proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV



The CMS Collaboration*

CERN, Switzerland

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 25 May 2018
 Received in revised form 16 July 2018
 Accepted 7 August 2018
 Available online 31 August 2018
 Editor: M. Doser

Keywords:

CMS
 Physics
 Higgs boson
 Exotic decays
 NMSSM
 2HDM + S

ABSTRACT

A search for an exotic decay of the Higgs boson to a pair of light pseudoscalar bosons is performed for the first time in the final state with two b quarks and two τ leptons. The search is motivated in the context of models of physics beyond the standard model (SM), such as two Higgs doublet models extended with a complex scalar singlet (2HDM + S), which include the next-to-minimal supersymmetric SM (NMSSM). The results are based on a data set of proton–proton collisions corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 35.9fb^{-1} , accumulated by the CMS experiment at the LHC in 2016 at a center-of-mass energy of 13 TeV. Masses of the pseudoscalar boson between 15 and 60 GeV are probed, and no excess of events above the SM expectation is observed. Upper limits between 3 and 12% are set on the branching fraction $\mathcal{B}(h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow 2\tau 2b)$ assuming the SM production of the Higgs boson. Upper limits are also set on the branching fraction of the Higgs boson to two light pseudoscalar bosons in different 2HDM + S scenarios. Assuming the SM production cross section for the Higgs boson, the upper limit on this quantity is as low as 20% for a mass of the pseudoscalar of 40 GeV in the NMSSM.

© 2018 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). Funded by SCOAP³.

1. Introduction

Within the standard model (SM), the Brout–Englert–Higgs mechanism [1–6] is responsible for electroweak symmetry breaking and predicts the existence of a scalar particle—the Higgs boson. A particle compatible with the Higgs boson was discovered by the ATLAS and CMS collaborations at the CERN LHC [7–9]. Measurements of the couplings and properties of this particle leave room for exotic decays to beyond-the-SM particles, with a limit of 34% on this branching fraction at 95% confidence level (CL), using data collected at center-of-mass energies of 7 and 8 TeV [10].

The possible existence of exotic decays of the Higgs boson is well motivated [11–16]. The decay width of the Higgs boson in the SM is so narrow that a small coupling to a light state could lead to branching fractions of the Higgs boson to that light state of the order of several percent. Additionally, the scalar sector can theoretically serve as a portal that allows matter from a hidden sector to interact with SM particles [17]. In general, exotic decays of the Higgs boson are allowed in many models that are consistent with all LHC measurements published so far.

An interesting class of such processes consists of decays to a pair of light pseudoscalar particles, which then decay to pairs of SM particles. This type of process is allowed in various models, including two Higgs doublet models augmented by a scalar singlet (2HDM + S). Seven scalar and pseudoscalar particles are predicted in 2HDM + S. One of them, h, is a scalar that can be compatible with the discovered particle with a mass of 125 GeV, and another, the pseudoscalar a, can be light enough so that $h \rightarrow aa$ decays are allowed.

Four types of 2HDM, and by extension 2HDM + S, forbid flavor-changing neutral currents at tree level [18]. In type I, all SM particles couple to the first doublet. In type II, up-type quarks couple to the first doublet, whereas leptons and down-type quarks couple to the second doublet. The next-to-minimal supersymmetric SM (NMSSM) is a particular case of 2HDM + S of type II that brings a solution to the μ problem [19]. In type III, quarks couple to the first doublet, and leptons to the second one. Finally, in type IV, leptons and up-type quarks couple to the first doublet, while down-type quarks couple to the second doublet [15]. The branching fractions of the light pseudoscalars to pairs of SM particles depend on the type of 2HDM + S, on the pseudoscalar mass m_a , and on $\tan\beta$, defined as the ratio of the vacuum expectation values of the second and first doublets. The value of the branch-

* E-mail address: cms-publication-committee-chair@cern.ch.




Fig. 1. Predicted $\mathcal{B}(aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau)$ for $m_a = 40\text{ GeV}$ in the different models of 2HDM + S, as a function of $\tan\beta$. The picture is essentially the same for all m_a hypotheses considered in this Letter. The branching fractions are computed following the formulas of Ref. [15].

ing fraction $\mathcal{B}(aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau)$ is slightly above 10% in the NMSSM—or more generally in 2HDM + S type II—for $\tan\beta > 1$, and can reach up to about 50% in 2HDM + S type III with $\tan\beta \sim 2$, as shown in Fig. 1.

Several searches for exotic decays of the Higgs boson to a pair of light short-lived pseudoscalar bosons have been performed by the CMS Collaboration with data collected at a center-of-mass energy of 8 TeV in different final states: $2\mu 2b$ for $25.0 < m_a < 62.5\text{ GeV}$ [20], $2\mu 2\tau$ for $15.0 < m_a < 62.5\text{ GeV}$ [20], 4τ for $4 < m_a < 8\text{ GeV}$ [21] and $5 < m_a < 15\text{ GeV}$ [20], and 4μ for $0.25 < m_a < 3.50\text{ GeV}$ [22]. The CMS Collaboration also studied the $2\mu 2\tau$ final state for $15.0 < m_a < 62.5\text{ GeV}$ at a center-of-mass energy of 13 TeV [23]. The ATLAS Collaboration reported results for the following final states at a center-of-mass energy of 8 TeV: 4μ , $4e$, and $2e2\mu$ for $15 < m_a < 60\text{ GeV}$ [24]; 4γ for $10 < m_a < 62\text{ GeV}$ [25]; and $2\mu 2\tau$ for $3.7 < m_a < 50.0\text{ GeV}$ [26]. At a center-of-mass energy of 13 TeV, the ATLAS Collaboration published results for the $4b$ decay channel for $20 < m_a < 60\text{ GeV}$ [27], and 4μ , $4e$, and $2e2\mu$ for $1 < m_a < 60\text{ GeV}$ [28]. The $2b2\tau$ final state has never been probed so far. This final state benefits from large branching fractions in most models because of the large masses of τ leptons and b quarks with respect to other leptons and quarks. The presence of light leptons originating from the τ decays allows events to be triggered in the dominant gluon fusion production mode.

This Letter reports on the first search with the CMS experiment for exotic decays of the Higgs boson to a pair of light pseudoscalar bosons, in the final state with two τ leptons and two b quarks. The search focuses on the mass range between 15 and 60 GeV. For low m_a values, between the $b\bar{b}$ threshold and 15 GeV, the decay products of each of the pseudoscalar bosons become collimated, which would necessitate the use of special reconstruction techniques.

The search is based on proton–proton (pp) collision data collected at a center-of-mass energy of 13 TeV and corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 35.9 fb^{-1} . Throughout this Letter, the term τ_h denotes τ leptons decaying hadronically. The $\tau\tau$ final states studied in this search are $e\mu$, $e\tau_h$, and $\mu\tau_h$. Despite its large branching fraction, the $\tau_h\tau_h$ final state is not considered because the signal acceptance is negligible with the transverse momentum (p_T) thresholds available for the $\tau_h\tau_h$ triggers. The ee and $\mu\mu$ final states for the $\tau\tau$ pair are not considered either, because they have a low branching fraction and suffer from a large contribution of Drell–Yan background events.

2. The CMS detector

The central feature of the CMS apparatus is a superconducting solenoid of 6 m internal diameter, providing a magnetic field of 3.8 T. Within the solenoid volume, there are a silicon pixel and strip tracker, a lead tungstate crystal electromagnetic calorimeter (ECAL), and a brass and scintillator hadron calorimeter, each composed of a barrel and two endcap sections. Forward calorimeters extend the pseudorapidity coverage provided by the barrel and endcap detectors. Muons are detected in gas-ionization chambers embedded in the steel flux-return yoke outside the solenoid. Events of interest are selected using a two-tiered trigger system [29]. A more 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. [30].

3. Simulated samples and event reconstruction

The signal and some of the background processes are modeled with samples of simulated events. The MADGRAPH5_AMC@NLO [31] 2.3.2 generator is used for the $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow 2\tau 2b$ signal process, in gluon fusion (ggh), vector boson fusion (VBF), or associated vector boson (Wh, Zh) processes. These samples are simulated at leading order (LO) in perturbative quantum chromodynamics (QCD) with the MLM jet matching and merging [32]. The Z + jets and W + jets processes are also generated with the MADGRAPH5_AMC@NLO generator at LO with the MLM jet matching and merging. The Z + jets simulation contains non-resonant Drell–Yan production, with a minimum dilepton mass threshold of 10 GeV. The FxFx merging scheme [33] is used to generate diboson background with the MADGRAPH5_AMC@NLO generator at next-to-LO (NLO). The $t\bar{t}$ and single top quark processes are generated at NLO with the POWHEG 2.0 and 1.0 generator [34–39]. Backgrounds from SM Higgs boson production are generated at NLO with the POWHEG 2.0 generator [40], and the MINLO HVJ [41] extension of POWHEG 2.0 is used for the Wh and Zh simulated samples. The generators are interfaced with PYTHIA 8.212 [42] to model the parton showering and fragmentation, as well as the decay of the τ leptons. The CUETP8M1 tune [43] is chosen for the PYTHIA parameters that affect the description of the underlying event. The set of parton distribution functions (PDFs) is NLO NNPDF3.0 for NLO samples, and LO NNPDF3.0 for LO samples [44]. The full next-to-NLO (NNLO) plus next-to-next-to-leading logarithmic (NNLL) order calculation [45–50], performed with the TOP++ 2.0 program [51], is used to compute a $t\bar{t}$ production cross section equal to 832_{-29}^{+20} (scale) ± 35 (PDF + α_S) pb setting the top quark mass to 172.5 GeV. This cross section is used to normalize the $t\bar{t}$ background simulated with POWHEG.

All simulated samples include additional proton–proton interactions per bunch crossing, referred to as “pileup”, obtained by generating concurrent minimum bias collision events using PYTHIA. The simulated events are reweighted in such a way to have the same pileup distribution as data. Generated events are processed through a simulation of the CMS detector based on GEANT4 [52].

The reconstruction of events relies on the particle-flow (PF) algorithm [53], which combines information from the CMS sub-detectors to identify and reconstruct the particles emerging from pp collisions: charged and neutral hadrons, photons, muons, and electrons. Combinations of these PF objects are used to reconstruct higher-level objects such as jets, τ_h candidates, and missing transverse momentum.

Electrons are reconstructed by matching ECAL clusters to tracks in the tracker. They are then identified with a multivariate analysis (MVA) discriminant that makes use of variables related to the

energy deposits in the ECAL, the quality of the track, and the compatibility between the properties of the ECAL clusters and the track that have been matched [54]. The MVA working point chosen in this search has an efficiency of about 80%. The reconstruction of muon candidates is performed combining the information of the tracker and the muon systems. Muons are then identified on the basis of the track reconstruction quality and on the number of measurements in the tracker and the muon systems [55]. The relative isolation of electrons and muons is defined as:

$$I^\ell \equiv \frac{\sum_{\text{charged}} p_T + \max\left(0, \sum_{\text{neutral}} p_T - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\text{charged, PU}} p_T\right)}{p_T^\ell}. \quad (1)$$

In this formula, $\sum_{\text{charged}} p_T$ is the scalar sum of the transverse momenta of the charged particles, excluding the lepton itself, associated with the primary vertex and in a cone around the lepton direction, with size $\Delta R = \sqrt{(\Delta\eta)^2 + (\Delta\phi)^2} = 0.3$ for electrons, or 0.4 for muons. The sum $\sum_{\text{neutral}} p_T$ represents a similar quantity for neutral particles. The last term corresponds to the p_T of neutral particles from pileup vertices, which, as estimated from simulation, is equal to approximately half of that of charged hadrons associated with pileup vertices, denoted by $\sum_{\text{charged, PU}} p_T$. The p_T of the lepton is denoted p_T^ℓ . The azimuthal angle, ϕ , is measured in radians.

Jets are reconstructed from PF objects with the anti- k_T clustering algorithm implemented in the FASTJET library [56,57], using a distance parameter of 0.4. Corrections to the jet energy are applied as a function of the p_T and η of the jet [58]. The jets in this search are required to be separated from the selected electrons, muons, or τ_h , by $\Delta R \geq 0.5$. Jets that originate from b quarks, called b jets, are identified with the combined secondary vertex (CSVv2) algorithm [59]. The CSVv2 algorithm builds a discriminant from variables related to secondary vertices associated with the jet if any, and from track-based lifetime information. The working point chosen in this search provides an efficiency for b quark jets of approximately 70%, and a misidentification rate for light-flavor and c quark jets of approximately 1 and 10%, respectively.

Hadronically decaying τ leptons are reconstructed with the hadrons-plus-strips (HPS) algorithm [60,61] as a combination of tracks and energy deposits in strips of the ECAL. The tracks are the signature of the charged hadrons, and the strips that of the neutral pions, which decay to a pair of photons with potential electron-positron conversion. The reconstructed τ_h decay modes are one track, one track plus at least one strip, and three tracks. The rate for jets to be misidentified as τ_h is reduced by applying an MVA discriminator that uses isolation as well as lifetime variables. Its working point has been chosen to have an efficiency of approximately 45% for a misidentification rate of light-flavor jets of the order of 0.1%. Additionally, discriminators that reduce the rates with which electrons and muons are misidentified as τ_h are applied. Loose working points with an efficiency above 90% are chosen because the $Z \rightarrow ee/\mu\mu$ background does not contribute much in the region where the signal is expected.

To account for the contribution of undetected particles, such as the neutrinos, the missing transverse momentum, \vec{p}_T^{miss} , is defined as the negative vectorial sum of the transverse momenta of all PF objects reconstructed in the event. The magnitude of this vector is denoted p_T^{miss} . 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 constructed by a jet finding algorithm [56,62] applied to all charged tracks associated with the vertex, and the corresponding associated missing transverse momentum.

Table 1

Baseline selection criteria for objects required in various final states. The numbers given for the p_T thresholds of the electron and muon in the $e\mu$ final state correspond to the leading and subleading particles. The p_T threshold for the τ_h candidates is the result of an optimization of the expected exclusion limits of the signal.

	$e\mu$	$e\tau_h$	$\mu\tau_h$
$p_T(e)$	>24/13 GeV	>26 GeV	–
$p_T(\mu)$	>24/13 GeV	–	>20 GeV
$p_T(\tau_h)$	–	>25 GeV	>25 GeV
$p_T(b)$	>20 GeV	>20 GeV	>20 GeV
$ \eta(e) $	<2.4	<2.1	–
$ \eta(\mu) $	<2.4	–	<2.1
$ \eta(\tau_h) $	–	<2.3	<2.3
$ \eta(b) $	<2.4	<2.4	<2.4
Isolation (e)	<0.10	<0.10	–
Isolation (μ)	<0.15	–	<0.15
Ident. (τ_h)	–	MVA	MVA

4. Event selection

Events are selected in three different $\tau\tau$ final states: $e\mu$, $e\tau_h$, and $\mu\tau_h$. They are additionally required to contain at least one b-tagged jet. The dominant backgrounds with these objects in the final state are $t\bar{t}$ and $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$ production. Another large background consists of events with jets misidentified as τ_h , such as $W + \text{jets}$ events, the background from SM events composed uniquely of jets produced through the strong interaction, referred to as QCD multi-jet events, or semileptonic $t\bar{t}$ events.

All events are required to have at least one b-tagged jet with $p_T > 20 \text{ GeV}$ and $|\eta| < 2.4$. About 90% of simulated signal events passing this condition have only one such jet, as a result of the typically soft b jet p_T spectrum and of the limited efficiency of the b tagging algorithm. Events in the $e\mu$ final state are selected with a trigger that relies on the presence of both an electron and a muon, where the leading lepton has $p_T > 23 \text{ GeV}$ and the sub-leading one $p_T > 12 \text{ GeV}$ if it is an electron or 8 GeV if it is a muon. In the $e\tau_h$ final state, the trigger is based on the presence of an isolated electron with $p_T > 25 \text{ GeV}$, whereas in the $\mu\tau_h$ final state events are selected with a combination of triggers that require either an isolated muon with $p_T > 22 \text{ GeV}$, or a muon with $p_T > 19 \text{ GeV}$ and a τ_h candidate with $p_T > 21 \text{ GeV}$. During the 2016 data taking period, none of the available triggers that required the presence of both an electron and a τ_h candidate could increase the signal acceptance significantly with respect to the trigger based on the presence of an electron only. Tighter selection criteria are applied at the reconstruction level. The electrons, muons, and τ_h candidates are required to be well identified and isolated [54,55,61], to have opposite charge, and to be separated by at least $\Delta R = 0.4$ if there is a τ_h , or 0.3 otherwise. Table 1 details the p_T , η , isolation, and identification criteria for the various objects, in the different final states.

To increase the sensitivity of the analysis, events in each final state are separated into four categories with different signal-to-background ratios. The categories are defined on the basis of the invariant mass of the visible decay products of the τ leptons and the b-tagged jet with the highest p_T , denoted by $m_{b\tau}^{\text{vis}}$. This variable is typically low for signal events because the three objects originate from a 125 GeV Higgs boson, but it is on average much larger for background events, where the three objects do not originate from a decay of a resonance, as shown in Fig. 2 for the $\mu\tau_h$ final state. The thresholds that define the categories depend on the $\tau\tau$ final state: they are lower in the $e\mu$ final state because there are more neutrinos not included in the mass calculation, and they are higher in the $e\tau_h$ final state to keep enough events despite the lower signal acceptance related to the electron p_T thresholds.




Fig. 2. Visible invariant mass of the leptons and the leading b jet, $m_{b\tau\tau}^{\text{vis}}$, after the baseline selection, in the $\mu\tau_h$ final state, for the signal with different mass hypotheses (top). Distribution of $m_{b\tau\tau}^{\text{vis}}$ in the $\mu\tau_h$ final state (bottom). The “jet $\rightarrow \tau_h$ ” contribution includes all events with a jet misidentified as a τ_h candidate, whereas the rest of background contributions only include events where the reconstructed τ_h corresponds to a τ_h , a muon, or an electron, at the generator level. The “Other” contribution includes events from single top quark, diboson, and SM Higgs boson processes. The signal histogram corresponds to 10 times the SM production cross section for ggh, VBF, and Vh processes, and assumes $\mathcal{B}(h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow 2\tau b) = 100\%$. (For interpretation of the colors in the figures, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

Signal events with $m_a \gtrsim 25$ GeV contribute mostly to the first two categories, whereas those with $m_a \lesssim 25$ GeV are concentrated in the second and third categories. This can be explained by the fact that the missing b jet in the mass calculation would be closer to the reconstructed b jet for a signal with lower m_a because of the boost of the pseudoscalar bosons, leading to a larger reconstructed mass. The last category has large background yields; it is useful to constrain the various backgrounds and provides some additional sensitivity for low- m_a signal samples. The results of the search are extracted from a fit of the visible $\tau\tau$ mass ($m_{\tau\tau}^{\text{vis}}$) distributions in each of the categories, because this is a resonant distribution for signal events.

Selection criteria are applied to optimize the expected limits on the product of the signal cross section and branching fraction. The same thresholds would be obtained with an optimization based on the discovery potential. One such criterion is based on the transverse mass of \vec{p}_T^{miss} and each of the leptons. The transverse mass m_T between a lepton ℓ and \vec{p}_T^{miss} is defined as

$$m_T(\ell, \vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}}) \equiv \sqrt{2p_T^\ell p_T^{\text{miss}} [1 - \cos(\Delta\phi)]}, \quad (2)$$

where p_T^ℓ is the transverse momentum of the lepton ℓ , and $\Delta\phi$ is the azimuthal angle between the lepton momentum and \vec{p}_T^{miss} . Selecting events with low m_T strongly reduces the backgrounds from $W + \text{jets}$ and $t\bar{t}$ events, which are characterized by a larger \vec{p}_T^{miss} . In addition, for $W + \text{jets}$ events in which the selected lepton comes from the W boson decay, m_T has a Jacobian peak near the W boson mass. The distributions of $m_T(\mu, \vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}})$ and $m_T(\tau_h, \vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}})$ in the $\mu\tau_h$ final state before the $m_{b\tau\tau}^{\text{vis}}$ -based categorization are shown in Fig. 3 (top and center).

Another selection criterion is based on the variable D_ζ , which is defined as

$$D_\zeta \equiv p_\zeta - 0.85 p_\zeta^{\text{vis}}, \quad (3)$$

where p_ζ is the component of \vec{p}_T^{miss} along the bisector of the transverse momenta of the two τ candidates and p_ζ^{vis} is the sum of the components of the lepton p_T along the same direction [63]. As shown in Fig. 3 (bottom), the $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$ background typically has D_ζ values close to zero because \vec{p}_T^{miss} is approximately collinear to the $\tau\tau$ system, whereas the $t\bar{t}$ background is concentrated at lower D_ζ values because of typically large \vec{p}_T^{miss} not aligned with the $\tau\tau$ system. The signal lies in an intermediate region because \vec{p}_T^{miss} is approximately aligned with the $\tau\tau$ system, but p_T^{miss} is usually small. The precise criteria for each final state and category are indicated in Table 2.

5. Background estimation

The $Z \rightarrow \ell\ell$ background is estimated from simulation. The distributions of the p_T of the dilepton system and the visible invariant mass between the leptons and the leading b jet are reweighted with corrections derived using data from a region enriched in $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu + \geq 1$ b events. The simulation is separated between $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$, where the reconstructed τ candidates correspond to τ leptons at generator level, and $Z \rightarrow ee/\mu\mu$ decays, where at least one electron or muon is misidentified as a τ_h candidate.

Backgrounds with a jet misidentified as a τ_h candidate are estimated from data. They consist mostly of $W + \text{jets}$ and QCD multijet events, as well as the fraction of $t\bar{t}$, diboson, and single top quark production where the reconstructed τ_h candidate comes from a jet. The probabilities for jets to be misidentified as τ_h candidates, denoted f , are estimated from $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu + \text{jets}$ events in data. They are parameterized with Landau distributions as a function of the p_T of the τ_h candidate, separately for every reconstructed τ_h decay mode. Events that pass all the selection criteria, except that the τ_h candidate fails the isolation condition, are reweighted with a weight $f/(1-f)$ to estimate the contribution of events with jets in the signal region. The contribution of events with genuine electrons, muons, or τ_h candidates in the control region is estimated from simulation and subtracted from data.

In the $e\mu$ final state, the small $W + \text{jets}$ background is estimated from simulation [64]. Such events typically have a genuine lepton coming from the W boson decay and a jet misidentified as the other lepton. The QCD multijet background, which also contains jets misidentified as leptons, is estimated from data. Its normalization corresponds to the difference between the data and the sum of all the other backgrounds in a so-called same-sign region where the τ candidates have the same sign. A smooth distribution is obtained by additionally relaxing the isolation conditions of both leptons. A correction that is extracted from data is applied to extrapolate the normalization obtained in the same-sign region to the signal region.




Fig. 3. Distributions of $m_T(\mu, \vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}})$ (top), $m_T(\tau_h, \vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}})$ (center), and D_ζ (bottom) in the $\mu\tau_h$ final state before the $m_{b\tau\tau}^{\text{vis}}$ -based categorization. The “jet $\rightarrow \tau_h$ ” contribution includes all events with a jet misidentified as a τ_h candidate, whereas the rest of background contributions only include events where the reconstructed τ_h corresponds to a τ_h , a muon, or an electron, at the generator level. The “Other” contribution includes events from single top quark, diboson, and SM Higgs boson production processes. The signal histogram corresponds to 10 times the SM production cross section for ggh, VBF, and Vh processes, and assumes $\mathcal{B}(h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow 2\tau 2b) = 100\%$.

Table 2

Optimized selection and categorization in the various final states. The selection criterion $D_\zeta > -30$ GeV in the $e\mu$ final state reduces the large $t\bar{t}$ background. In the other final states the $t\bar{t}$ background is less important, and only events with $D_\zeta > 0$ GeV are discarded in one of the categories of the $\mu\tau_h$ final state to reduce the $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$ background. This selection criterion does not improve the sensitivity in the $e\tau_h$ final state because of the lower expected signal and background yields, and is therefore not applied.

Variable	Category 1	Category 2	Category 3	Category 4
$e\mu$				
$m_{b\tau\tau}^{\text{vis}}$	<65 GeV	$\in[65, 80]$ GeV	$\in[80, 95]$ GeV	>95 GeV
$m_T(e, \vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}})$	<40 GeV	<40 GeV	<40 GeV	<40 GeV
$m_T(\mu, \vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}})$	<40 GeV	<40 GeV	<40 GeV	<40 GeV
D_ζ	> -30 GeV	> -30 GeV	> -30 GeV	> -30 GeV
$e\tau_h$				
$m_{b\tau\tau}^{\text{vis}}$	<80 GeV	$\in[80, 100]$ GeV	$\in[100, 120]$ GeV	>120 GeV
$m_T(e, \vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}})$	<40 GeV	<50 GeV	<50 GeV	<40 GeV
$m_T(\tau_h, \vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}})$	<60 GeV	<60 GeV	<60 GeV	<60 GeV
$\mu\tau_h$				
$m_{b\tau\tau}^{\text{vis}}$	<75 GeV	$\in[75, 95]$ GeV	$\in[95, 115]$ GeV	>115 GeV
$m_T(\mu, \vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}})$	<40 GeV	<50 GeV	<50 GeV	<40 GeV
$m_T(\tau_h, \vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}})$	<60 GeV	<60 GeV	<60 GeV	<60 GeV
D_ζ	—	<0 GeV	—	—

Other processes, including diboson, $t\bar{t}$, and single top quark production without jet misidentified as a τ_h candidate, as well as SM Higgs boson processes in various production and decay modes, are estimated from simulation. The $t\bar{t}$ production is a major background, especially in the $e\mu$ final state. The $t\bar{t}$ simulation models the variables used in this analysis well, as it has been verified in a control region in the $e\mu$ final state where no selection criterion is applied on $m_T(e, \vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}})$ or $m_T(\mu, \vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}})$, and where the D_ζ selection criterion is inverted.

In the $e\tau_h$ and $\mu\tau_h$ final states, where all backgrounds with a jet misidentified as a τ_h candidate are estimated from data, simulated events with a reconstructed τ_h that is not matched to an electron, a muon, or a τ_h at the generator level are discarded to avoid double counting. Approximately 30% of simulated $t\bar{t}$ events after the selection have a reconstructed τ_h that is not matched to an electron, a muon, or a τ_h at the generator level.

6. Fit method and systematic uncertainties

The search for an excess of signal events over the expected background involves a global binned maximum likelihood fit based on the $m_{b\tau\tau}^{\text{vis}}$ distributions in the different channels and categories. The statistical uncertainty largely dominates over systematic uncertainties in this search. The systematic uncertainties are represented by nuisance parameters that are varied in the fit according to their probability density functions. A log-normal probability density function is assumed for the nuisance parameters that affect the event yields of the various background and signal contributions, whereas systematic uncertainties that affect the distributions are represented by nuisance parameters whose variation results in a continuous perturbation of the spectrum [65] and which are assumed to have a Gaussian probability density function.

To take into account the limited size of simulated samples and of data in the control regions used to estimate some of the background processes, statistical uncertainties in individual bins of the $m_{b\tau\tau}^{\text{vis}}$ distributions are considered as Poissonian nuisance parameters. The uncertainty can be as large as 40% for some bins in the low- $m_{b\tau\tau}^{\text{vis}}$ categories. The combined effect of all these uncertainties is the dominant systematic uncertainty in this search.

The uncertainties in the jet energy scale [58] affect the overall yields of processes estimated from simulation, as well as their




Fig. 4. Distributions of $m_{\tau\tau}^{\text{vis}}$ in the four categories of the $e\mu$ channel. The “Other” contribution includes events from single top quark, diboson, SM Higgs boson, and $W + \text{jets}$ productions. The signal histogram corresponds to the SM production cross section for ggh , VBF, and Vh processes, and assumes $\mathcal{B}(h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow 2\tau 2b) = 10\%$. The normalizations of the predicted background distributions correspond to the result of the global fit.

relative contribution to the different categories because the categorization is based on the value of $m_{b\tau\tau}^{\text{vis}}$ for each event. They are functions of the jet p_T and η . The \vec{p}_T^{miss} is recomputed for each variation of the jet energy scale. The uncertainty in \vec{p}_T^{miss} related to the measurement of the energy that is not clustered in jets [66] is evaluated event-by-event, and is also considered as a shape uncertainty.

Corrections for the efficiency of the identification of electrons, muons, and τ_h candidates are derived from data using tag-and-probe methods [67], and are applied to simulated events as a function of the lepton p_T and η . Uncertainties related to these corrections amount to 2% for electrons, 2% for muons, and 5% for τ_h candidates. Additionally, events with an electron or muon misidentified as a τ_h candidate have a yield uncertainty of 5%. Trigger scale factors are also estimated with tag-and-probe methods and their corresponding uncertainties in the yields of simulated processes are 1%.

The energy scale of τ_h candidates is corrected for each reconstructed decay mode, and the uncertainty of 1.2% for each single decay mode is considered as a shape uncertainty. Uncertainties in the energy scales of electrons and muons are also included as shape uncertainties.

Corrections to the efficiency for identifying a b quark jet as a b jet, as well as for mistagging a jet originating from a different fla-

vor, are applied to simulated events on the basis of the generated flavor of the jets. The uncertainties in the scale factors depend on the p_T of the jet and are therefore considered as shape uncertainties. They amount to 1.5% for a jet originating from a b quark, 5% from a c quark, and 10% from a light-flavor parton [59].

The uncertainty in the yield of the backgrounds with jets misidentified as τ_h candidates accounts for possibly different misidentification rates in $Z + \text{jets}$ events (where the misidentification rates are measured), and in $W + \text{jets}$ and QCD multijet events (which dominate the constitution of the reducible background in the signal region), and for differences between data and predicted backgrounds observed in a region enriched in reducible background events by inverting the charge requirement on the τ candidates and removing the m_T and D_ζ selection criteria. This uncertainty amounts to 20%, and is constrained to about 7% after the maximum likelihood fit because of the large number of events contributing to the last $m_{b\tau\tau}^{\text{vis}}$ category. Uncertainties in the parameterization of the misidentification probability of jets as a function of p_T result in shape uncertainties for the backgrounds with jets misidentified as τ_h candidates.

The uncertainty in the yield of the QCD multijet background in the $e\mu$ final state is 20%; the value comes from the uncertainty in the extrapolation factor from the same-sign region to the opposite-sign region. The uncertainty in the $W + \text{jets}$ background in this channel also amounts to 20%, and accounts for a potential mismod-




Fig. 5. Distributions of $m_{\tau\tau}^{\text{vis}}$ in the four categories of the $e\tau_h$ channel. The “jet $\rightarrow \tau_h$ ” contribution includes all events with a jet misidentified as a τ_h candidate, whereas the rest of background contributions only include events where the reconstructed τ_h corresponds to a τ_h , a muon, or an electron, at the generator level. The “Other” contribution includes events from single top quark, diboson, and SM Higgs boson processes. The signal histogram corresponds to the SM production cross section for ggh , VBF, and VH processes, and assumes $\mathcal{B}(h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow 2\tau 2b) = 10\%$. The normalizations of the predicted background distributions correspond to the result of the global fit.

eling in simulation of the misidentification rate of jets as electrons or muons.

The theoretical yield uncertainty of the $t\bar{t}$ background is related to the PDF uncertainty and to the uncertainty associated to the strong coupling constant α_s in the full NNLO plus NNLL order calculation of the cross section; it amounts to about 4%. The yield uncertainties for other backgrounds estimated from simulation are taken from recent CMS measurements: 6% for diboson processes [68], 13% for single top quark processes [69], and 7% for Z +jets events with at least one b -tagged jet in the final state [70]. The uncertainty in the correction of the dilepton p_T distribution for Drell–Yan events is equal to 10% of the size of the correction itself. The uncertainty in the correction of the $m_{b\tau\tau}^{\text{vis}}$ distribution is equal to the correction itself, and considered as a shape uncertainty. Uncertainties in the production cross sections and branching fractions for SM Higgs boson processes are taken from Ref. [71]. The uncertainty in the integrated luminosity amounts to 2.5% [72].

7. Results

The $m_{\tau\tau}^{\text{vis}}$ distributions in the different channels and categories are shown in Figs. 4–6. The binning corresponds to the bins used in the likelihood fit.

No excess is observed relatively to the SM background prediction. Upper limits at 95% CL are set on $(\sigma(h)/\sigma_{\text{SM}})\mathcal{B}(h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow 2\tau 2b)$ using the modified frequentist construction CL_s in the asymptotic approximation [73–77], for pseudoscalar masses between 15 and 60 GeV. In this expression, σ_{SM} denotes the SM production cross section of the Higgs boson, whereas $\sigma(h)$ is the h production cross section. The limits per channel and for the combination of the three channels are shown in Fig. 7. The most sensitive final state is $\mu\tau_h$. The sensitivity of the $e\tau_h$ and $e\mu$ channels is approximately equivalent; the first channel suffers from higher trigger thresholds and lower object identification efficiency than $\mu\tau_h$, and the second one suffers from a lower branching fraction than $\mu\tau_h$. At low m_a , the $e\mu$ final state has a higher signal acceptance than the other final states, especially $e\tau_h$. The limits are more stringent in the intermediate mass range. The low- m_a signals have a lower acceptance because of the overlap of the leptons related to the boost of the pseudoscalar bosons, and of the typically softer lepton and b jet p_T spectra. The high m_a signals lie in a region where more backgrounds contribute, leading also to lower sensitivity than in the intermediate mass region. The categories are complementary over the probed mass range, with the low- $m_{b\tau\tau}^{\text{vis}}$ signal regions more sensitive for heavy resonances, and the high- $m_{b\tau\tau}^{\text{vis}}$ signal regions for light resonances.




Fig. 6. Distributions of $m_{\tau\tau}^{vis}$ in the four categories of the $\mu\tau_h$ channel. The “jet $\rightarrow \tau_h$ ” contribution includes all events with a jet misidentified as a τ_h candidate, whereas the rest of background contributions only include events where the reconstructed τ_h corresponds to a τ_h , a muon, or an electron, at the generator level. The “Other” contribution includes events from single top quark, diboson, and SM Higgs boson processes. The signal histogram corresponds to the SM production cross section for ggh, VBF, and Vh processes, and assumes $\mathcal{B}(h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow 2\tau 2b) = 10\%$. The normalizations of the predicted background distributions correspond to the result of the global fit.

The combined limit at intermediate mass is as low as 3% on $\mathcal{B}(h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow 2\tau 2b)$, assuming the SM production cross section and mechanisms for the Higgs boson, and is up to 12% for the lowest mass point $m_a = 15\text{ GeV}$. Computing the branching fractions of the light pseudoscalar to SM particles [15,78], this translates to limits on $(\sigma(h)/\sigma_{SM})\mathcal{B}(h \rightarrow aa)$ of about 20% in 2HDM + S type II—including the NMSSM—with $\tan\beta > 1$ for $m_a = 40\text{ GeV}$. This improves by more than one order of magnitude previous limits on $\mathcal{B}(h \rightarrow aa)$ obtained in the $2\mu 2\tau$ final state by CMS for $15 < m_a < 25\text{ GeV}$ [20,23], and by up to a factor five those obtained in the $2\mu 2b$ final state by CMS for $25 < m_a < 60\text{ GeV}$ [20]. In the scenario with the highest branching fraction, 2HDM + S type III with $\tan\beta = 2$, the expected limit is as low as 6% at intermediate m_a . Fig. 8 shows the observed limits at 95% CL on $(\sigma(h)/\sigma_{SM})\mathcal{B}(h \rightarrow aa)$ as a function of m_a and $\tan\beta$ for type III and type IV 2HDM + S, for which there is a strong dependence with $\tan\beta$. Fig. 9 shows the observed limits at 95% CL on $(\sigma(h)/\sigma_{SM})\mathcal{B}(h \rightarrow aa)$ for a few scenarios of 2HDM + S, assuming the branching fractions of the light pseudoscalar to SM particles computed using Refs. [15,78]. The limit shown for type II 2HDM + S is approximately valid for any value of $\tan\beta > 1$, and that for type I 2HDM + S does not depend on $\tan\beta$. In the m_a range considered in the analysis, the branching fraction $\mathcal{B}(aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau)$ ranges between 0.10 and 0.11 in type I 2HDM + S, between 0.11 and 0.13 for $\tan\beta = 2$ in type II 2HDM + S,

between 0.44 and 0.46 for $\tan\beta = 2$ in type III 2HDM + S, and between 0.16 and 0.21 for $\tan\beta = 0.5$ in type IV 2HDM + S.

8. Summary

The first search for exotic decays of the Higgs boson to pairs of light bosons with two b quark jets and two τ leptons in the final state has been performed with 35.9 fb^{-1} of data collected at 13 TeV center-of-mass energy in 2016. This decay channel has a large branching fraction in many models where the couplings to fermions are proportional to the fermion mass, and can be triggered with high efficiency in the dominant gluon fusion production mode because of the presence of light leptons from leptonic τ decays. No excess of events is found on top of the expected standard model background for masses of the light boson, m_a , between 15 and 60 GeV. Upper limits between 3 and 12% are set on the branching fraction $\mathcal{B}(h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow 2\tau 2b)$ assuming the SM production of the Higgs boson. This translates to upper limits on $\mathcal{B}(h \rightarrow aa)$ as low as 20% for $m_a = 40\text{ GeV}$ in the NMSSM. These results improve by more than one order of magnitude the sensitivity to exotic Higgs boson decays to pairs of light pseudoscalars in the NMSSM from previous CMS results in other final states for $15 < m_a < 25\text{ GeV}$, and by a factor up to five for $25 < m_a < 60\text{ GeV}$ [20,23].




Fig. 7. Expected and observed 95% CL limits on $(\sigma(h)/\sigma_{\text{SM}})B(h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow 2\tau 2b)$ in %. The $e\mu$ results are shown in the top left panel, $e\tau_h$ in the top right, $\mu\tau_h$ in the bottom left, and the combination in the bottom right. The inner (green) band and the outer (yellow) band indicate the regions containing 68 and 95%, respectively, of the distribution of limits expected under the background-only hypothesis.

Acknowledgements

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: BMWF 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); NKFI (Hungary); DAE and DST (India); IPM (Iran); SFI (Ireland); INFN (Italy); MSIP and NRF (Republic of Korea); LAS (Lithuania); MOE and UM (Malaysia); BUAP, CINVESTAV, CONACYT, LNS, SEP, and UASLP-FAI (Mexico); MBIE (New Zealand); PAEC (Pakistan); MSHE and NSC (Poland); FCT (Portugal); JINR (Dubna); MON, ROSATOM, RAS and RFBR (Russia); MESTD (Serbia); SEIDI, 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 Alfred 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 F.R.S.-FNRS and FWO (Belgium) under the “Excellence of Science – EOS” – be.h project No. 30820817; the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (MEYS) of the Czech Republic; the Lendület (“Momentum”) Programme and the János Bolyai Research Scholarship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, the New National Excellence Program ÚNKP, the NKFI research grants 123842, 123959, 124845, 124850 and 125105 (Hungary); 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 Centre (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 Estatal de Fomento de la Investigación Científica y Técnica de




Fig. 8. Observed 95% CL limits on $(\sigma(h)/\sigma_{SM})\mathcal{B}(h \rightarrow aa)$ in 2HDM + S of type III (top), and type IV (bottom). The contours corresponding to a 95% CL exclusion of $(\sigma(h)/\sigma_{SM})\mathcal{B}(h \rightarrow aa) = 1.00$ and 0.34 are drawn with dashed lines. The number 34% corresponds to the limit on the branching fraction of the Higgs boson to beyond-the-SM particles at the 95% CL obtained with data collected at center-of-mass energies of 7 and 8 TeV by the ATLAS and CMS experiments [10].




Fig. 9. Observed 95% CL limits on $(\sigma(h)/\sigma_{SM})\mathcal{B}(h \rightarrow aa)$ for various 2HDM + S types. The limit in type I 2HDM + S does not depend on $\tan \beta$.

Excelencia María de Maeztu, grant MDM-2015-0509 and the Programa Severo Ochoa 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); the Welch Foundation, contract C-1845; and the Weston Havens Foundation (USA).

References

- [1] F. Englert, R. Brout, Broken symmetry and the mass of gauge vector mesons, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 13 (1964) 321, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.13.321>.
- [2] P.W. Higgs, Broken symmetries, massless particles and gauge fields, *Phys. Lett.* 12 (1964) 132, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-9163\(64\)91136-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-9163(64)91136-9).
- [3] P.W. Higgs, Broken symmetries and the masses of gauge bosons, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 13 (1964) 508, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.13.508>.
- [4] G.S. Guralnik, C.R. Hagen, T.W.B. Kibble, Global conservation laws and massless particles, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 13 (1964) 585, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.13.585>.
- [5] P.W. Higgs, Spontaneous symmetry breakdown without massless bosons, *Phys. Rev.* 145 (1966) 1156, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRev.145.1156>.
- [6] T.W.B. Kibble, Symmetry breaking in non-Abelian gauge theories, *Phys. Rev.* 155 (1967) 1554, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRev.155.1554>.
- [7] ATLAS Collaboration, Observation of a new particle in the search for the standard model Higgs boson with the ATLAS detector at the LHC, *Phys. Lett. B* 716 (2012) 1, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2012.08.020>, arXiv:1207.7214.
- [8] CMS Collaboration, Observation of a new boson at a mass of 125 GeV with the CMS experiment at the LHC, *Phys. Lett. B* 716 (2012) 30, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2012.08.021>, arXiv:1207.7235.
- [9] CMS Collaboration, Observation of a new boson with mass near 125 GeV in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ and 8 TeV, *J. High Energy Phys.* 06 (2013) 081, [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP06\(2013\)081](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP06(2013)081), arXiv:1303.4571.
- [10] ATLAS and CMS Collaborations, 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, *J. High Energy Phys.* 08 (2016) 045, [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP08\(2016\)045](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP08(2016)045), arXiv:1606.02266.
- [11] B.A. Dobrescu, G.L. Landsberg, K.T. Matchev, Higgs boson decays to CP odd scalars at the Fermilab Tevatron and beyond, *Phys. Rev. D* 63 (2001) 075003, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.63.075003>, arXiv:hep-ph/0005308.
- [12] R. Dermisek, J.F. Gunion, Escaping the large fine tuning and little hierarchy problems in the next to minimal supersymmetric model and $h \rightarrow aa$ decays, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 95 (2005) 041801, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.95.041801>, arXiv:hep-ph/0502105.
- [13] R. Dermisek, J.F. Gunion, The NMSSM close to the R-symmetry limit and naturalness in $h \rightarrow aa$ decays for $m_a < 2m_b$, *Phys. Rev. D* 75 (2007) 075019, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.75.075019>, arXiv:hep-ph/0611142.
- [14] S. Chang, R. Dermisek, J.F. Gunion, N. Weiner, Nonstandard Higgs boson decays, *Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* 58 (2008) 75, <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.nucl.58.110707.171200>, arXiv:0801.4554.
- [15] D. Curtin, R. Essig, S. Gori, P. Jaiswal, A. Katz, T. Liu, Z. Liu, D. McKeen, J. Shelton, M. Strassler, Z. Surujon, B. Tweedie, Y.-M. Zhong, Exotic decays of the 125 GeV Higgs boson, *Phys. Rev. D* 90 (2014) 075004, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.90.075004>, arXiv:1312.4992.
- [16] J.A. Evans, S. Gori, J. Shelton, Looking for the WIMP next door, *J. High Energy Phys.* 02 (2018) 100, [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP02\(2018\)100](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP02(2018)100), arXiv:1712.03974.
- [17] C. Englert, T. Plehn, D. Zerwas, P.M. Zerwas, Exploring the Higgs portal, *Phys. Lett. B* 703 (2011) 298, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2011.08.002>, arXiv:1106.3097.
- [18] G.C. Branco, P.M. Ferreira, L. Lavoura, M.N. Rebelo, M. Sher, J.P. Silva, Theory and phenomenology of two-Higgs-doublet models, *Phys. Rep.* 516 (2012) 1, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physrep.2012.02.002>, arXiv:1106.0034.
- [19] S. Ramos-Sanchez, The mu-problem, the NMSSM and string theory, *Fortschr. Phys.* 58 (2010) 748, <https://doi.org/10.1002/prop.201000058>, arXiv:1003.1307.
- [20] CMS Collaboration, Search for light bosons in decays of the 125 GeV Higgs boson in proton–proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV, *J. High Energy Phys.* 10 (2017) 076, [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP10\(2017\)076](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP10(2017)076), arXiv:1701.02032.
- [21] CMS Collaboration, Search for a very light NMSSM Higgs boson produced in decays of the 125 GeV scalar boson and decaying into τ leptons in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV, *J. High Energy Phys.* 01 (2016) 079, [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP01\(2016\)079](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP01(2016)079), arXiv:1510.06534.
- [22] CMS Collaboration, A search for pair production of new light bosons decaying into muons, *Phys. Lett. B* 752 (2016) 146, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2015.10.067>, arXiv:1506.00424.
- [23] CMS Collaboration, Search for an exotic decay of the Higgs boson to a pair of light pseudoscalars in the final state of two muons and two τ leptons in

- proton–proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, arXiv:1805.04865, J. High Energy Phys. (2018), submitted.
- [24] ATLAS Collaboration, Search for new light gauge bosons in Higgs boson decays to four-lepton final states in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV with the ATLAS detector at the LHC, Phys. Rev. D 92 (2015) 092001, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.92.092001>, arXiv:1505.07645.
- [25] ATLAS Collaboration, Search for new phenomena in events with at least three photons collected in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV with the ATLAS detector, Eur. Phys. J. C 76 (2016) 210, <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-4034-8>, arXiv:1509.05051.
- [26] ATLAS Collaboration, Search for Higgs bosons decaying to aa in the $\mu\mu\tau\tau$ final state in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV with the ATLAS experiment, Phys. Rev. D 92 (2015) 052002, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.92.052002>, arXiv:1505.01609.
- [27] ATLAS Collaboration, Search for the Higgs boson produced in association with a W boson and decaying to four b-quarks via two spin-zero particles in pp collisions at 13 TeV with the ATLAS detector, Eur. Phys. J. C 76 (2016) 605, <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-4418-9>, arXiv:1606.08391.
- [28] ATLAS Collaboration, Search for Higgs boson decays to beyond-the-Standard-Model light bosons in four-lepton events with the ATLAS detector at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, J. High Energy Phys. 06 (2018) 166, [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP06\(2018\)166](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP06(2018)166), arXiv:1802.03388.
- [29] CMS Collaboration, The CMS trigger system, J. Instrum. 12 (2017) P01020, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/12/01/P01020>, arXiv:1609.02366.
- [30] CMS Collaboration, The CMS experiment at the CERN LHC, J. Instrum. 3 (2008) S08004, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08004>.
- [31] J. Alwall, R. Frederix, S. Frixione, V. Hirschi, F. Maltoni, O. Mattelaer, H.S. Shao, T. Stelzer, P. Torrielli, M. Zaro, The automated computation of tree-level and next-to-leading order differential cross sections, and their matching to parton shower simulations, J. High Energy Phys. 07 (2014) 079, [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07\(2014\)079](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07(2014)079), arXiv:1405.0301.
- [32] J. Alwall, S. Höche, F. Krauss, N. Lavesson, L. Lönnblad, F. Maltoni, M.L. Mangano, M. Moretti, C.G. Papadopoulos, F. Piccinini, S. Schumann, M. Treccani, J. Winter, M. Worek, Comparative study of various algorithms for the merging of parton showers and matrix elements in hadronic collisions, Eur. Phys. J. C 53 (2008) 473, <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-007-0490-5>, arXiv:0706.2569.
- [33] R. Frederix, S. Frixione, Merging meets matching in MC@NLO, J. High Energy Phys. 12 (2012) 061, [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP12\(2012\)061](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP12(2012)061), arXiv:1209.6215.
- [34] P. Nason, A new method for combining NLO QCD with shower Monte Carlo algorithms, J. High Energy Phys. 11 (2004) 040, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2004/11/040>, arXiv:hep-ph/0409146.
- [35] S. Frixione, P. Nason, C. Oleari, Matching NLO QCD computations with parton shower simulations: the POWHEG method, J. High Energy Phys. 11 (2007) 070, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2007/11/070>, arXiv:0709.2092.
- [36] S. Alioli, P. Nason, C. Oleari, E. Re, A general framework for implementing NLO calculations in shower Monte Carlo programs: the POWHEG BOX, J. High Energy Phys. 06 (2010) 043, [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP06\(2010\)043](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP06(2010)043), arXiv:1002.2581.
- [37] S. Alioli, K. Hamilton, P. Nason, C. Oleari, E. Re, Jet pair production in POWHEG, J. High Energy Phys. 04 (2011) 081, [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP04\(2011\)081](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP04(2011)081), arXiv:1012.3380.
- [38] S. Alioli, P. Nason, C. Oleari, E. Re, NLO Higgs boson production via gluon fusion matched with shower in POWHEG, J. High Energy Phys. 04 (2009) 002, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2009/04/002>, arXiv:0812.0578.
- [39] S. Frixione, P. Nason, G. Ridolfi, A positive-weight next-to-leading-order Monte Carlo for heavy flavour hadroproduction, J. High Energy Phys. 09 (2007) 126, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2007/09/126>, arXiv:0707.3088.
- [40] E. Bagnaschi, G. Degraffi, P. Slavich, A. Vicini, Higgs production via gluon fusion in the POWHEG approach in the SM and in the MSSM, J. High Energy Phys. 02 (2012) 088, [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP02\(2012\)088](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP02(2012)088), arXiv:1111.2854.
- [41] G. Luisoni, P. Nason, C. Oleari, F. Tramontano, $HW^\pm/HZ + 0$ and 1 jet at NLO with the POWHEG BOX interfaced to GoSam and their merging within MiNLO, J. High Energy Phys. 10 (2013) 083, [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP10\(2013\)083](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP10(2013)083), arXiv:1306.2542.
- [42] T. Sjöstrand, S. Ask, J.R. Christiansen, R. Corke, N. Desai, P. Ilten, S. Mrenna, S. Prestel, C.O. Rasmussen, P.Z. Skands, An introduction to PYTHIA 8.2, Comput. Phys. Commun. 191 (2015) 159, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpc.2015.01.024>, arXiv:1410.3012.
- [43] CMS Collaboration, Event generator tunes obtained from underlying event and multiparton scattering measurements, Eur. Phys. J. C 76 (2016) 155, <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-3988-x>, arXiv:1512.00815.
- [44] R.D. Ball, et al., NNPDF Collaboration, Parton distributions for the LHC Run II, J. High Energy Phys. 04 (2015) 040, [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP04\(2015\)040](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP04(2015)040), arXiv:1410.8849.
- [45] M. Beneke, P. Falgari, S. Klein, C. Schwinn, Hadronic top-quark pair production with NNLL threshold resummation, Nucl. Phys. B 855 (2012) 695, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2011.10.021>, arXiv:1109.1536.
- [46] M. Cacciari, M. Czakon, M. Mangano, A. Mitov, P. Nason, Top-pair production at hadron colliders with next-to-next-to-leading logarithmic soft-gluon resummation, Phys. Lett. B 710 (2012) 612, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2012.03.013>, arXiv:1111.5869.
- [47] P. Baerzreuther, M. Czakon, A. Mitov, Percent level precision physics at the tevatron: first genuine NNLO QCD corrections to $q\bar{q} \rightarrow t\bar{t} + X$, Phys. Rev. Lett. 109 (2012) 132001, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.132001>, arXiv:1204.5201.
- [48] M. Czakon, A. Mitov, NNLO corrections to top pair production at hadron colliders: the quark–gluon reaction, J. High Energy Phys. 01 (2013) 080, [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP01\(2013\)080](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP01(2013)080), arXiv:1210.6832.
- [49] M. Czakon, A. Mitov, NNLO corrections to top-pair production at hadron colliders: the all-fermionic scattering channels, J. High Energy Phys. 12 (2012) 054, [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP12\(2012\)054](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP12(2012)054), arXiv:1207.0236.
- [50] M. Czakon, P. Fiedler, A. Mitov, Total top-quark pair-production cross section at hadron colliders through $O(\alpha_s^4)$, Phys. Rev. Lett. 110 (2013) 252004, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.110.252004>, arXiv:1303.6254.
- [51] M. Czakon, A. Mitov, Top++: a program for the calculation of the top-pair cross-section at hadron colliders, Comput. Phys. Commun. 185 (2014) 2930, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpc.2014.06.021>, arXiv:1112.5675.
- [52] S. Agostinelli, et al., GEANT4 Collaboration, GEANT4—a simulation toolkit, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A, Accel. Spectrom. Detect. Assoc. Equip. 506 (2003) 250, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9002\(03\)01368-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9002(03)01368-8).
- [53] CMS Collaboration, Particle-flow reconstruction and global event description with the CMS detector, J. Instrum. 12 (2017) P10003, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/12/10/P10003>, arXiv:1706.04965.
- [54] CMS Collaboration, Performance of electron reconstruction and selection with the CMS detector in proton–proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV, J. Instrum. 10 (2015) P06005, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/10/06/P06005>, arXiv:1502.02701.
- [55] CMS Collaboration, Performance of CMS muon reconstruction in pp collision events at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV, J. Instrum. 7 (2012) P10002, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/7/10/P10002>, arXiv:1206.4071.
- [56] M. Cacciari, G.P. Salam, G. Soyez, FastJet user manual, Eur. Phys. J. C 72 (2012) 1896, <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-012-1896-2>, arXiv:1111.6097.
- [57] M. Cacciari, G.P. Salam, Dispelling the N^3 myth for the k_T jet-finder, Phys. Lett. B 641 (2006) 57, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2006.08.037>, arXiv:hep-ph/0512210.
- [58] CMS Collaboration, Determination of jet energy calibration and transverse momentum resolution in CMS, J. Instrum. 6 (2011) 11002, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/6/11/P11002>, arXiv:1107.4277.
- [59] CMS Collaboration, Identification of heavy-flavour jets with the CMS detector in pp collisions at 13 TeV, J. Instrum. (2017), <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/13/05/P05011>, arXiv:1712.07158.
- [60] CMS Collaboration, Reconstruction and identification of τ lepton decays to hadrons and ν_τ at CMS, J. Instrum. 11 (2016) P01019, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/11/01/P01019>, arXiv:1510.07488.
- [61] CMS Collaboration, Performance of Reconstruction and Identification of Tau Leptons in Their Decays to Hadrons and Tau Neutrino in LHC Run-2, CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-TAU-16-002, 2016, <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2196972>.
- [62] M. Cacciari, G.P. Salam, G. Soyez, The anti- k_T jet clustering algorithm, J. High Energy Phys. 04 (2008) 063, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2008/04/063>, arXiv:0802.1189.
- [63] CMS Collaboration, Search for neutral MSSM Higgs bosons decaying to a pair of tau leptons in pp collisions, J. High Energy Phys. 10 (2014) 160, [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP10\(2014\)160](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP10(2014)160), arXiv:1408.3316.
- [64] CMS Collaboration, Observation of the Higgs boson decay to a pair of τ leptons with the CMS detector, Phys. Lett. B 779 (2018) 283, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2018.02.004>, arXiv:1708.00373.
- [65] J.S. Conway, Incorporating nuisance parameters in likelihoods for multisource spectra, in: Proceedings of PHYSTAT 2011 Workshop on Statistical Issues Related to Discovery Claims in Search Experiments and Unfolding, CERN-2011-006, 2011, p. 115, <http://cdsweb.cern.ch/record/1306523>.
- [66] CMS Collaboration, Performance of the CMS missing transverse momentum reconstruction in pp data at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV, J. Instrum. 10 (2015) P02006, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/10/02/P02006>, arXiv:1411.0511.
- [67] CMS Collaboration, Measurement of the inclusive W and Z production cross sections in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV, J. High Energy Phys. 10 (2011) 132, [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP10\(2011\)132](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP10(2011)132), arXiv:1107.4789.
- [68] CMS Collaboration, Measurements of the pp $\rightarrow ZZ$ production cross section and the Z $\rightarrow 4\ell$ branching fraction, and constraints on anomalous triple gauge couplings at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, Eur. Phys. J. C 78 (2018) 165, <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-018-5567-9>, arXiv:1709.08601.
- [69] CMS Collaboration, Cross section measurement of t-channel single top quark production in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, Phys. Lett. B 772 (2017) 752, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2017.07.047>, arXiv:1610.00678.
- [70] CMS Collaboration, Measurements of the associated production of a Z boson and b jets in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV, Eur. Phys. J. C 77 (2017) 751, <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-5140-y>, arXiv:1611.06507.

- [71] D. de Florian, et al., Handbook of LHC Higgs Cross Sections: 4. Deciphering the Nature of the Higgs Sector, CERN Report CERN-2017-002-M, 2016, arXiv:1610.07922.
- [72] CMS Collaboration, CMS Luminosity Measurements for the 2016 Data Taking Period, CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-LUM-17-001, 2017, <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2257069>.
- [73] The ATLAS Collaboration, The CMS Collaboration, The LHC Higgs Combination Group, Procedure for the LHC Higgs Boson Search Combination in Summer 2011, Technical Report CMS-NOTE-2011-005, ATL-PHYS-PUB-2011-11, 2011, <https://cds.cern.ch/record/1379837>.
- [74] S. Chatrchyan, et al., CMS Collaboration, Combined results of searches for the standard model Higgs boson in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV, Phys. Lett. B 710 (2012) 26, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2012.02.064>, arXiv:1202.1488.
- [75] T. Junk, Confidence level computation for combining searches with small statistics, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A, Accel. Spectrom. Detect. Assoc. Equip. 434 (1999) 435, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9002\(99\)00498-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9002(99)00498-2), arXiv:hep-ex/9902006.
- [76] A.L. Read, Presentation of search results: the CL_s technique, in: Durham IPPP Workshop: Advanced Statistical Techniques in Particle Physics, Durham, UK, 2002, J. Phys. G 28 (2002) 2693, <https://doi.org/10.1088/0954-3899/28/10/313>.
- [77] G. Cowan, K. Cranmer, E. Gross, O. Vitells, Asymptotic formulae for likelihood-based tests of new physics, Eur. Phys. J. C 71 (2011) 1554, <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-011-1554-0>, arXiv:1007.1727; Erratum: <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-013-2501-z>.
- [78] A. Djouadi, The anatomy of electro-weak symmetry breaking. I: The Higgs boson in the standard model, Phys. Rep. 457 (2008) 1, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physrep.2007.10.004>, arXiv:hep-ph/0503172.

The CMS Collaboration

A.M. Sirunyan, A. Tumasyan

Yerevan Physics Institute, Yerevan, Armenia

W. Adam, F. Ambroggi, E. Asilar, T. Bergauer, J. Brandstetter, E. Brondolin, M. Dragicevic, J. Erö, A. Escalante Del Valle, M. Flechl, R. Frühwirth¹, V.M. Ghete, J. Hrubec, M. Jeitler¹, N. Krammer, I. Krätschmer, D. Liko, T. Madlener, I. Mikulec, N. Rad, H. Rohringer, J. Schieck¹, R. Schöfbeck, M. Spanring, D. Spitzbart, A. Taurok, W. Waltenberger, J. Wittmann, C.-E. Wulz¹, M. Zarucki

Institut für Hochenergiephysik, Wien, Austria

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

Institute for Nuclear Problems, Minsk, Belarus

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

Universiteit Antwerpen, Antwerpen, Belgium

S. Abu Zeid, F. Blekman, J. D'Hondt, I. De Bruyn, J. De Clercq, K. Deroover, G. Flouris, D. Lontkovskiy, S. Lowette, I. Marchesini, S. Moortgat, L. Moreels, Q. Python, K. Skovpen, S. Tavernier, W. Van Doninck, P. Van Mulders, I. Van Parijs

Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussel, Belgium

D. Beghin, B. Bilin, H. Brun, B. Clerbaux, G. De Lentdecker, H. Delannoy, B. Dorney, G. Fasanella, L. Favart, R. Goldouzian, A. Grebenyuk, A.K. Kalsi, T. Lenzi, J. Luetic, N. Postiau, E. Starling, L. Thomas, C. Vander Velde, P. Vanlaer, D. Vannerom, Q. Wang

Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium

T. Cornelis, D. Dobur, A. Fagot, M. Gul, I. Khvastunov², D. Poyraz, C. Roskas, D. Trocino, M. Tytgat, W. Verbeke, B. Vermassen, M. Vit, N. Zaganidis

Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

H. Bakhshiansohi, O. Bondu, S. Brochet, G. Bruno, C. Caputo, P. David, C. Delaere, M. Delcourt, B. Francois, A. Giammanco, G. Krintiras, V. Lemaitre, A. Magitteri, A. Mertens, M. Musich, K. Piotrkowski, A. Saggio, M. Vidal Marono, S. Wertz, J. Zobec

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

F.L. Alves, G.A. Alves, L. Brito, G. Correia Silva, C. Hensel, A. Moraes, M.E. Pol, P. Rebello Teles

Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Físicas, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

E. Belchior Batista Das Chagas, W. Carvalho, J. Chinellato³, E. Coelho, E.M. Da Costa, G.G. Da Silveira⁴, D. De Jesus Damiao, C. De Oliveira Martins, S. Fonseca De Souza, H. Malbouisson, D. Matos Figueiredo, M. Melo De Almeida, C. Mora Herrera, L. Mundim, H. Nogima, W.L. Prado Da Silva, L.J. Sanchez Rosas, A. Santoro, A. Sznajder, M. Thiel, E.J. Tonelli Manganote³, F. Torres Da Silva De Araujo, A. Vilela Pereira

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

S. Ahuja^a, C.A. Bernardes^a, L. Calligaris^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

^a *Universidade Estadual Paulista, São Paulo, Brazil*

^b *Universidade Federal do ABC, São Paulo, Brazil*

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

Institute for Nuclear Research and Nuclear Energy, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia, Bulgaria

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

University of Sofia, Sofia, Bulgaria

W. Fang⁵, X. Gao⁵, L. Yuan

Beihang University, 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

Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing, China

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

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

Y. Wang

Tsinghua University, Beijing, China

C. Avila, A. Cabrera, C.A. Carrillo Montoya, L.F. Chaparro Sierra, C. Florez, C.F. González Hernández, M.A. Segura Delgado

Universidad de Los Andes, Bogota, Colombia

B. Courbon, N. Godinovic, D. Lelas, I. Puljak, T. Sculac

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

Z. Antunovic, M. Kovac

University of Split, Faculty of Science, Split, Croatia

V. Brigljevic, D. Ferencek, K. Kadija, B. Mesic, A. Starodumov⁶, T. Susa

Institute Rudjer Boskovic, Zagreb, Croatia

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

University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus

M. Finger⁷, M. Finger Jr.⁷

Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

E. Ayala

Escuela Politecnica Nacional, Quito, Ecuador

E. Carrera Jarrin

Universidad San Francisco de Quito, Quito, Ecuador

H. Abdalla⁸, A.A. Abdelalim^{9,10}, A. Mohamed¹⁰

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

S. Bhowmik, A. Carvalho Antunes De Oliveira, R.K. Dewanjee, K. Ehataht, M. Kadastik, M. Raidal, C. Veelken

National Institute of Chemical Physics and Biophysics, Tallinn, Estonia

P. Eerola, H. Kirschenmann, J. Pekkanen, M. Voutilainen

Department of Physics, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

J. Havukainen, J.K. Heikkilä, T. Järvinen, V. Karimäki, R. Kinnunen, T. Lampén, K. Lassila-Perini, S. Laurila, S. Lehti, T. Lindén, P. Luukka, T. Mäenpää, H. Siikonen, E. Tuominen, J. Tuominiemi

Helsinki Institute of Physics, Helsinki, Finland

T. Tuuva

Lappeenranta University of Technology, Lappeenranta, Finland

M. Besancon, F. Couderc, M. Dejardin, D. Denegri, J.L. Faure, F. Ferri, S. Ganjour, A. Givernaud, P. Gras, G. Hamel de Monchenault, P. Jarry, C. Leloup, E. Locci, J. Malcles, G. Negro, J. Rander, A. Rosowsky, M.Ö. Sahin, M. Titov

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

A. Abdulsalam¹¹, C. Amendola, I. Antropov, F. Beaudette, P. Busson, C. Charlot, R. Granier de Cassagnac, I. Kucher, S. Lisniak, A. Lobanov, J. Martin Blanco, M. Nguyen, C. Ochando, G. Ortona, P. Pigard, R. Salerno, J.B. Sauvan, Y. Sirois, A.G. Stahl Leiton, A. Zabi, A. Zghiche

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

J.-L. Agram¹², J. Andrea, D. Bloch, J.-M. Brom, E.C. Chabert, V. Cherepanov, C. Collard, E. Conte¹², J.-C. Fontaine¹², D. Gelé, U. Goerlach, M. Jansová, A.-C. Le Bihan, N. Tonon, P. Van Hove

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

S. Gadrat

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

S. Beauceron, C. Bernet, G. Boudoul, N. Chanon, 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, H. Lattaud, M. Lethuillier, L. Mirabito, A.L. Pequegnot, S. Perries, A. Popov¹³, V. Sordini, M. Vander Donckt, S. Viret, S. Zhang

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

A. Khvedelidze⁷

Georgian Technical University, Tbilisi, Georgia

Z. Tsamalaidze⁷

Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia

C. Autermann, L. Feld, M.K. Kiesel, K. Klein, M. Lipinski, M. Preuten, M.P. Rauch, C. Schomakers, J. Schulz, M. Teroerde, B. Wittmer, V. Zhukov¹³

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

A. Albert, D. Duchardt, M. Endres, M. Erdmann, T. Esch, R. Fischer, S. Ghosh, A. Güth, T. Hebbeker, C. Heidemann, K. Hoepfner, H. Keller, S. Knutzen, L. Mastrolorenzo, M. Merschmeyer, A. Meyer, P. Millet, S. Mukherjee, T. Pook, M. Radziej, H. Reithler, M. Rieger, F. Scheuch, A. Schmidt, D. Teyssier

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

G. Flügge, O. Hlushchenko, B. Kargoll, T. Kress, A. Künsken, T. Müller, A. Nehr Korn, A. Nowack, C. Pistone, O. Pooth, H. Sert, A. Stahl¹⁴

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

M. Aldaya Martin, T. Arndt, C. Asawatangtrakuldee, I. Babounikau, K. Beernaert, O. Behnke, U. Behrens, A. Bermúdez Martínez, D. Bertsche, A.A. Bin Anuar, K. Borras¹⁵, V. Botta, A. Campbell, P. Connor, C. Contreras-Campana, F. Costanza, V. Danilov, A. De Wit, M.M. Defranchis, C. Diez Pardos, D. Domínguez Damiani, G. Eckerlin, T. Eichhorn, A. Elwood, E. Eren, E. Gallo¹⁶, A. Geiser, J.M. Grados Luyando, A. Grohsjean, P. Gunnellini, M. Guthoff, M. Haranko, A. Harb, J. Hauk, H. Jung, M. Kasemann, J. Keaveney, C. Kleinwort, J. Knolle, D. Krücker, W. Lange, A. Lelek, T. Lenz, K. Lipka, W. Lohmann¹⁷, R. Mankel, I.-A. Melzer-Pellmann, A.B. Meyer, M. Meyer, M. Missiroli, G. Mittag, J. Mnich, V. Myronenko, S.K. Pflitsch, D. Pitzl, A. Raspereza, M. Savitskyi, P. Saxena, P. Schütze, C. Schwanenberger, R. Shevchenko, A. Singh, N. Stefaniuk, H. Tholen, O. Turkot, A. Vagnerini, G.P. Van Onsem, R. Walsh, Y. Wen, K. Wichmann, C. Wissing, O. Zenaiev

Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Hamburg, Germany

R. Aggleton, S. Bein, L. Benato, A. Benecke, V. Blobel, M. Centis Vignali, T. Dreyer, E. Garutti, D. Gonzalez, J. Haller, A. Hinzmann, A. Karavdina, G. Kasieczka, R. Klanner, R. Kogler, N. Kovalchuk, S. Kurz, V. Kutzner, J. Lange, D. Marconi, J. Multhaupt, M. Niedziela, D. Nowatschin, A. Perieanu, A. Reimers, O. Rieger, C. Scharf, P. Schleper, S. Schumann, J. Schwandt, J. Sonneveld, H. Stadie, G. Steinbrück, F.M. Stober, M. Stöver, D. Troendle, A. Vanhoefer, B. Vormwald

University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany

M. Akbiyik, C. Barth, M. Baselga, S. Baur, E. Butz, R. Caspart, T. Chwalek, F. Colombo, W. De Boer, A. Dierlamm, N. Faltermann, B. Freund, M. Giffels, M.A. Harrendorf, F. Hartmann¹⁴, S.M. Heindl, U. Husemann, F. Kassel¹⁴, I. Katkov¹³, S. Kudella, H. Mildner, S. Mitra, 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

Karlsruher Institut fuer Technology, Germany

G. Anagnostou, G. Daskalakis, T. Geralis, A. Kyriakis, D. Loukas, G. Paspalaki, I. Topsis-Giotis

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

G. Karathanasis, S. Kesisoglou, P. Kontaxakis, A. Panagiotou, N. Saoulidou, E. Tziaferi, K. Vellidis

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece

K. Kousouris, I. Papakrivopoulos, G. Tsipolitis

National Technical University of Athens, Athens, Greece

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

University of Ioánnina, Ioánnina, Greece

M. Bartók¹⁸, M. Csanad, N. Filipovic, P. Major, M.I. Nagy, G. Pasztor, O. Surányi, G.I. Veres

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

G. Bencze, C. Hajdu, D. Horvath¹⁹, Á. Hunyadi, F. Sikler, T.Á. Vámi, V. Veszpremi, G. Vesztergombi[†]

Wigner Research Centre for Physics, Budapest, Hungary

N. Beni, S. Czellar, J. Karancsi²⁰, A. Makovec, J. Molnar, Z. Szillasi

Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary

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

Institute of Physics, University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary

S. Choudhury, J.R. Komaragiri, P.C. Tiwari

Indian Institute of Science (IISc), Bangalore, India

S. Bahinipati²¹, C. Kar, P. Mal, K. Mandal, A. Nayak²², D.K. Sahoo²¹, S.K. Swain

National Institute of Science Education and Research, HBNI, Bhubaneswar, India

S. Bansal, S.B. Beri, V. Bhatnagar, S. Chauhan, R. Chawla, N. Dhingra, R. Gupta, A. Kaur, A. Kaur, M. Kaur, S. Kaur, R. Kumar, P. Kumari, M. Lohan, A. Mehta, K. Sandeep, S. Sharma, J.B. Singh, G. Walia

Panjab University, Chandigarh, India

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

University of Delhi, Delhi, India

R. Bhardwaj²³, M. Bharti, R. Bhattacharya, S. Bhattacharya, U. Bhawandeep²³, D. Bhowmik, S. Dey, S. Dutt²³, S. Dutta, S. Ghosh, K. Mondal, S. Nandan, A. Purohit, P.K. Rout, A. Roy, S. Roy Chowdhury, S. Sarkar, M. Sharan, B. Singh, S. Thakur²³

Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, HBNI, Kolkata, India

P.K. Behera

Indian Institute of Technology Madras, Madras, India

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

Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, Mumbai, India

T. Aziz, M.A. Bhat, S. Dugad, G.B. Mohanty, N. Sur, B. Sutar, Ravindra Kumar Verma

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-A, Mumbai, India

S. Banerjee, S. Bhattacharya, S. Chatterjee, P. Das, M. Guchait, Sa. Jain, S. Karmakar, S. Kumar, M. Maity²⁴, G. Majumder, K. Mazumdar, N. Sahoo, T. Sarkar²⁴

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-B, Mumbai, India

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

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

S. Chenarani²⁵, E. Eskandari Tadavani, S.M. Etesami²⁵, M. Khakzad, M. Mohammadi Najafabadi, M. Naseri, F. Rezaei Hosseinabadi, B. Safarzadeh²⁶, M. Zeinali

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

M. Felcini, M. Grunewald

University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland

M. Abbrescia^{a,b}, C. Calabria^{a,b}, A. Colaleo^a, D. Creanza^{a,c}, L. Cristella^{a,b}, N. De Filippis^{a,c},
M. De Palma^{a,b}, A. Di Florio^{a,b}, F. Errico^{a,b}, L. Fiore^a, A. Gelmi^{a,b}, 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, A. Ranieri^a,
G. Selvaggi^{a,b}, A. Sharma^a, L. Silvestris^{a,14}, R. Venditti^a, P. Verwilligen^a, G. Zito^a

^a INFN Sezione di Bari, Bari, Italy

^b Università di Bari, Bari, Italy

^c Politecnico di Bari, Bari, Italy

G. Abbiendi^a, C. Battilana^{a,b}, D. Bonacorsi^{a,b}, L. Borgonovi^{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,b}, C. Ciocca^a, G. Codispoti^{a,b},
M. Cuffiani^{a,b}, G.M. Dallavalle^a, F. Fabbri^a, A. Fanfani^{a,b}, P. Giacomelli^a, C. Grandi^a, L. Guiducci^{a,b},
F. Iemmi^{a,b}, S. Marcellini^a, G. Masetti^a, A. Montanari^a, F.L. Navarria^{a,b}, A. Perrotta^a, F. Primavera^{a,b,14},
A.M. Rossi^{a,b}, T. Rovelli^{a,b}, G.P. Siroli^{a,b}, N. Tosi^a

^a INFN Sezione di Bologna, Bologna, Italy

^b Università di Bologna, Bologna, Italy

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

^a INFN Sezione di Catania, Catania, Italy

^b Università di Catania, Catania, Italy

G. Barbagli^a, K. Chatterjee^{a,b}, V. Ciulli^{a,b}, C. Civinini^a, R. D'Alessandro^{a,b}, E. Focardi^{a,b}, G. Latino,
P. Lenzi^{a,b}, M. Meschini^a, S. Paoletti^a, L. Russo^{a,27}, G. Sguazzoni^a, D. Strom^a, L. Viliani^a

^a INFN Sezione di Firenze, Firenze, Italy

^b Università di Firenze, Firenze, Italy

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

INFN Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, Frascati, Italy

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

^a INFN Sezione di Genova, Genova, Italy

^b Università di Genova, Genova, Italy

A. Benaglia^a, A. Beschi^b, L. Brianza^{a,b}, F. Brivio^{a,b}, V. Ciriolo^{a,b,14}, S. Di Guida^{a,b,14}, 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, A. Massironi^{a,b},
D. Menasce^a, L. Moroni^a, M. Paganoni^{a,b}, D. Pedrini^a, S. Ragazzi^{a,b}, T. Tabarelli de Fatis^{a,b}

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

^b Università di Milano-Bicocca, Milano, Italy

S. Buontempo^a, N. Cavallo^{a,c}, A. Di Crescenzo^{a,b}, F. Fabozzi^{a,c}, F. Fienga^a, G. Galati^a, A.O.M. Iorio^{a,b},
W.A. Khan^a, L. Lista^a, S. Meola^{a,d,14}, P. Paolucci^{a,14}, C. Sciacca^{a,b}, E. Voevodina^{a,b}

^a INFN Sezione di Napoli, Napoli, Italy

^b Università di Napoli 'Federico II', Napoli, Italy

^c Università della Basilicata, Potenza, Italy

^d Università G. Marconi, Roma, Italy

P. Azzi^a, N. Bacchetta^a, D. Bisello^{a,b}, A. Boletti^{a,b}, A. Bragagnolo, R. Carlin^{a,b}, P. Checchia^a,
M. Dall'Osso^{a,b}, P. De Castro Manzano^a, T. Dorigo^a, U. Dosselli^a, F. Gasparini^{a,b}, U. Gasparini^{a,b},
A. Gozzelino^a, S. Lacaprara^a, P. Lujan, M. Margoni^{a,b}, A.T. Meneguzzo^{a,b}, F. Montecassiano^a,
N. Pozzobon^{a,b}, P. Ronchese^{a,b}, R. Rossin^{a,b}, F. Simonetto^{a,b}, A. Tiko, M. Zanetti^{a,b}, G. Zumerle^{a,b}

^a INFN Sezione di Padova, Padova, Italy

^b Università di Padova, Padova, Italy

^c Università di Trento, Trento, Italy

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

^a INFN Sezione di Pavia, Pavia, Italy

^b Università di Pavia, Pavia, 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

^a INFN Sezione di Perugia, Perugia, Italy

^b Università di Perugia, Perugia, Italy

K. Androsov^a, P. Azzurri^a, G. Bagliesi^a, L. Bianchini^a, T. Boccali^a, L. Borrello, R. Castaldi^a, M.A. Ciocci^{a,b},
R. Dell’Orso^a, G. Fedi^a, F. Fiori^{a,c}, L. Giannini^{a,c}, A. Giassi^a, M.T. Grippo^a, F. Ligabue^{a,c}, E. Manca^{a,c},
G. Mandorli^{a,c}, A. Messineo^{a,b}, F. Palla^a, A. Rizzi^{a,b}, P. Spagnolo^a, R. Tenchini^a, G. Tonelli^{a,b},
A. Venturi^a, P.G. Verdini^a

^a INFN Sezione di Pisa, Pisa, Italy

^b Università di Pisa, Pisa, Italy

^c Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Pisa, Italy

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

^a INFN Sezione di Roma, Rome, Italy

^b Sapienza Università di Roma, Rome, 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}, S. Cometti, M. Costa^{a,b}, R. Covarelli^{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}, A. Romero^{a,b}, M. Ruspa^{a,c}, R. Sacchi^{a,b},
K. Shchelina^{a,b}, V. Sola^a, A. Solano^{a,b}, D. Soldi, A. Staiano^a

^a INFN Sezione di Torino, Torino, Italy

^b Università di Torino, Torino, Italy

^c Università del Piemonte Orientale, Novara, Italy

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

^a INFN Sezione di Trieste, Trieste, Italy

^b Università di Trieste, Trieste, Italy

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

Kyungpook National University, Republic of Korea

H. Kim, D.H. Moon, G. Oh

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

J. Goh, T.J. Kim

Hanyang University, Seoul, Republic of Korea

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

Korea University, Seoul, Republic of Korea

H.S. Kim

Sejong University, Seoul, Republic of 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

Seoul National University, Seoul, Republic of Korea

D. Jeon, H. Kim, J.H. Kim, J.S.H. Lee, I.C. Park

University of Seoul, Seoul, Republic of Korea

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

Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon, Republic of Korea

V. Dudenas, A. Juodagalvis, J. Vaitkus

Vilnius University, Vilnius, Lithuania

I. Ahmed, Z.A. Ibrahim, M.A.B. Md Ali²⁸, F. Mohamad Idris²⁹, W.A.T. Wan Abdullah, M.N. Yusli, Z. Zolkapli

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

A. Castaneda Hernandez, J.A. Murillo Quijada

Universidad de Sonora (UNISON), Hermosillo, Mexico

M.C. Duran-Osuna, H. Castilla-Valdez, E. De La Cruz-Burelo, G. Ramirez-Sanchez, I. Heredia-De La Cruz³⁰, R.I. Rabadan-Trejo, R. Lopez-Fernandez, J. Mejia Guisao, R. Reyes-Almanza, A. Sanchez-Hernandez

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

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

Universidad Iberoamericana, Mexico City, Mexico

J. Eysermans, I. Pedraza, H.A. Salazar Ibarquen, C. Uribe Estrada

Benemerita Universidad Autonoma de Puebla, Puebla, Mexico

A. Morelos Pineda

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

D. Krofcheck

University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

S. Bheesette, P.H. Butler

University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand

A. Ahmad, M. Ahmad, M.I. Asghar, Q. Hassan, H.R. Hoorani, A. Saddique, M.A. Shah, M. Shoaib, M. Waqas

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

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

National Centre for Nuclear Research, Swierk, Poland

K. Bunkowski, A. Byszuk³¹, K. Doroba, A. Kalinowski, M. Konecki, J. Krolikowski, M. Misiura, M. Olszewski, A. Pyskir, M. Walczak

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

P. Bargassa, C. Beirão Da Cruz E Silva, A. Di Francesco, P. Faccioli, B. Galinhas, M. Gallinaro, J. Hollar, N. Leonardo, L. Lloret Iglesias, M.V. Nemallapudi, J. Seixas, G. Strong, O. Toldaiev, D. Vadrucio, J. Varela

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

V. Alexakhin, A. Golunov, I. Golutvin, N. Gorbounov, I. Gorbunov, A. Kamenev, V. Karjavin, A. Lanev, A. Malakhov, V. Matveev^{32,33}, P. Moisenz, V. Palichik, V. Perelygin, M. Savina, S. Shmatov, S. Shulha, N. Skatchkov, V. Smirnov, A. Zarubin

Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia

V. Golovtsov, Y. Ivanov, V. Kim³⁴, E. Kuznetsova³⁵, P. Levchenko, V. Murzin, V. Oreshkin, I. Smirnov, D. Sosnov, V. Sulimov, L. Uvarov, S. Vavilov, A. Vorobyev

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

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

Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia

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

Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia

T. Aushev

Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Moscow, Russia

R. Chistov³⁶, M. Danilov³⁶, P. Parygin, D. Philippov, S. Polikarpov³⁶, E. Tarkovskii

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

V. Andreev, M. Azarkin³³, I. Dremin³³, M. Kirakosyan³³, S.V. Rusakov, A. Terkulov

P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia

A. Baskakov, A. Belyaev, E. Boos, V. Bunichev, M. Dubinin³⁷, L. Dudko, A. Ershov, A. Gribushin, V. Klyukhin, O. Kodolova, I. Lokhtin, I. Miagkov, S. Obraztsov, S. Petrushanko, V. Savrin

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

V. Blinov³⁸, T. Dimova³⁸, L. Kardapoltsev³⁸, D. Shtol³⁸, Y. Skovpen³⁸

Novosibirsk State University (NSU), Novosibirsk, Russia

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

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

A. Babaev, S. Baidali

National Research Tomsk Polytechnic University, Tomsk, Russia

P. Adzic³⁹, P. Cirkovic, D. Devetak, M. Dordevic, J. Milosevic

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

J. Alcaraz Maestre, A. Álvarez Fernández, I. Bachiller, M. Barrio Luna, J.A. Brochero Cifuentes, M. Cerrada, N. Colino, B. De La Cruz, A. Delgado Peris, C. Fernandez Bedoya, J.P. Fernández Ramos, J. Flix, M.C. Fouz, O. Gonzalez Lopez, S. Goy Lopez, J.M. Hernandez, M.I. Josa, D. Moran, A. Pérez-Calero Yzquierdo, J. Puerta Pelayo, I. Redondo, L. Romero, M.S. Soares, A. Triossi

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

C. Albajar, J.F. de Trocóniz

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain

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

Universidad de Oviedo, Oviedo, Spain

I.J. Cabrillo, A. Calderon, B. Chazin Quero, J. Duarte Campderros, M. Fernandez, P.J. Fernández Manteca, A. García Alonso, J. Garcia-Ferrero, G. Gomez, A. Lopez Virto, J. Marco, C. Martinez Rivero, P. Martinez Ruiz del Arbol, F. Matorras, J. Piedra Gomez, C. Prieels, T. Rodrigo, A. Ruiz-Jimeno, L. Scodellaro, N. Trevisani, I. Vila, R. Vilar Cortabitarte

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

D. Abbaneo, B. Akgun, E. Auffray, P. Baillon, A.H. Ball, D. Barney, J. Bendavid, M. Bianco, A. Bocci, C. Botta, T. Camporesi, M. Cepeda, G. Cerminara, E. Chapon, Y. Chen, G. Cucciati, D. d'Enterria, A. Dabrowski, V. Daponte, A. David, A. De Roeck, N. Deelen, M. Dobson, T. du Pree, M. Dünser, N. Dupont, A. Elliott-Peisert, P. Everaerts, F. Fallavollita⁴⁰, D. Fasanella, G. Franzoni, J. Fulcher, W. Funk, D. Gigi, A. Gilbert, K. Gill, F. Glege, M. Guilbaud, D. Gulhan, J. Hegeman, V. Innocente, A. Jafari, P. Janot, O. Karacheban¹⁷, J. Kieseler, A. Kornmayer, M. Krammer¹, C. Lange, P. Lecoq, C. Lourenço, L. Malgeri, M. Mannelli, F. Meijers, J.A. Merlin, S. Mersi, E. Meschi, P. Milenov⁴¹, F. Moortgat, M. Mulders, J. Ngadiuba, S. Orfanelli, L. Orsini, F. Pantaleo¹⁴, L. Pape, E. Perez, M. Peruzzi, A. Petrilli, G. Petrucciani, A. Pfeiffer, M. Pierini, F.M. Pitters, D. Rabady, A. Racz, T. Reis, G. Rolandi⁴², M. Rovere, H. Sakulin, C. Schäfer, C. Schwick, M. Seidel, M. Selvaggi, A. Sharma, P. Silva, P. Sphicas⁴³, A. Stakia, J. Steggemann, M. Tosi, D. Treille, A. Tsirou, V. Veckalns⁴⁴, W.D. Zeuner

CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland

L. Caminada⁴⁵, K. Deiters, W. Erdmann, R. Horisberger, Q. Ingram, H.C. Kaestli, D. Kotlinski, U. Langenegger, T. Rohe, S.A. Wiederkehr

Paul Scherrer Institut, Villigen, Switzerland

M. Backhaus, L. Bäni, P. Berger, N. Chernyavskaya, G. Dissertori, M. Dittmar, M. Donegà, C. Dorfer, C. Grab, C. Heidegger, D. Hits, J. Hoss, T. Klijnsma, W. Lustermann, R.A. Manzoni, M. Marionneau, M.T. Meinhard, F. Micheli, P. Musella, F. Nessi-Tedaldi, J. Pata, F. Pauss, G. Perrin, L. Perrozzi, S. Pigazzini, M. Quittnat, D. Ruini, D.A. Sanz Becerra, M. Schönenberger, L. Shchutska, V.R. Tavolaro, K. Theofilatos, M.L. Vesterbacka Olsson, R. Wallny, D.H. Zhu

ETH Zurich – Institute for Particle Physics and Astrophysics (IPA), Zurich, Switzerland

T.K. Aarrestad, C. AMSler⁴⁶, D. Brzhechko, M.F. Canelli, A. De Cosa, R. Del Burgo, S. Donato, C. Galloni, T. Hreus, B. Kilminster, I. Neutelings, D. Pinna, G. Rauco, P. Robmann, D. Salerno, K. Schweiger, C. Seitz, Y. Takahashi, A. Zucchetta

Universität Zürich, Zurich, Switzerland

Y.H. Chang, K.y. Cheng, T.H. Doan, Sh. Jain, R. Khurana, C.M. Kuo, W. Lin, A. Pozdnyakov, S.S. Yu

National Central University, Chung-Li, Taiwan

P. Chang, Y. Chao, K.F. Chen, P.H. Chen, W.-S. Hou, Arun Kumar, Y.y. Li, R.-S. Lu, E. Paganis, A. Psallidas, A. Steen, J.f. Tsai

National Taiwan University (NTU), Taipei, Taiwan

B. Asavapibhop, N. Srimanobhas, N. Suwonjandee

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

A. Bat, F. Boran, S. Cerci⁴⁷, S. Damarseekin, Z.S. Demiroglu, F. Dolek, C. Dozen, I. Dumanoglu, S. Girgis, G. Gokbulut, Y. Guler, E. Gurpinar, I. Hos⁴⁸, C. Isik, E.E. Kangal⁴⁹, O. Kara, A. Kayis Topaksu, U. Kiminsu, M. Oglakci, G. Onengut, K. Ozdemir⁵⁰, S. Ozturk⁵¹, D. Sunar Cerci⁴⁷, B. Tali⁴⁷, U.G. Tok, S. Turkcapar, I.S. Zorbakir, C. Zorbilmez

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

B. Isildak⁵², G. Karapinar⁵³, M. Yalvac, M. Zeyrek

Middle East Technical University, Physics Department, Ankara, Turkey

I.O. Atakisi, E. Gülmez, M. Kaya⁵⁴, O. Kaya⁵⁵, S. Tekten, E.A. Yetkin⁵⁶

Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey

M.N. Agaras, S. Atay, A. Cakir, K. Cankocak, Y. Komurcu, S. Sen⁵⁷

Istanbul Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey

B. Grynyov

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

L. Levchuk

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

F. Ball, L. Beck, J.J. Brooke, D. Burns, E. Clement, D. Cussans, O. Davignon, H. Flacher, J. Goldstein, G.P. Heath, H.F. Heath, L. Kreczko, D.M. Newbold⁵⁸, S. Paramesvaran, B. Penning, T. Sakuma, D. Smith, V.J. Smith, J. Taylor, A. Titterton

University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom

K.W. Bell, A. Belyaev⁵⁹, C. Brew, R.M. Brown, D. Cieri, D.J.A. Cockerill, J.A. Coughlan, K. Harder, S. Harper, J. Linacre, E. Olaiya, D. Petyt, C.H. Shepherd-Themistocleous, A. Thea, I.R. Tomalin, T. Williams, W.J. Womersley

Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom

G. Auzinger, R. Bainbridge, P. Bloch, J. Borg, S. Breeze, O. Buchmuller, A. Bundock, S. Casasso, D. Colling, L. Corpe, P. Dauncey, G. Davies, M. Della Negra, R. Di Maria, Y. Haddad, G. Hall, G. Iles, T. James, M. Komm, C. Laner, L. Lyons, A.-M. Magnan, S. Malik, A. Martelli, J. Nash⁶⁰, A. Nikitenko⁶, V. Palladino, M. Pesaresi, A. Richards, A. Rose, E. Scott, C. Seez, A. Shtipliyski, G. Singh, M. Stoye, T. Strebler, S. Summers, A. Tapper, K. Uchida, T. Virdee¹⁴, N. Wardle, D. Winterbottom, J. Wright, S.C. Zenz

Imperial College, London, United Kingdom

J.E. Cole, P.R. Hobson, A. Khan, P. Kyberd, C.K. Mackay, A. Morton, I.D. Reid, L. Teodorescu, S. Zahid

Brunel University, Uxbridge, United Kingdom

K. Call, J. Dittmann, K. Hatakeyama, H. Liu, C. Madrid, B. McMaster, N. Pastika, C. Smith

Baylor University, Waco, USA

R. Bartek, A. Dominguez

Catholic University of America, Washington DC, USA

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

The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, USA

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

Boston University, Boston, USA

G. Benelli, X. Coubez, D. Cutts, M. Hadley, J. Hakala, U. Heintz, J.M. Hogan⁶¹, K.H.M. Kwok, E. Laird, G. Landsberg, J. Lee, Z. Mao, M. Narain, J. Pazzini, S. Piperov, S. Sagir⁶², R. Syarif, E. Usai, D. Yu

Brown University, Providence, USA

R. Band, C. Brainerd, R. Breedon, D. Burns, M. Calderon De La Barca Sanchez, M. Chertok, J. Conway, R. Conway, P.T. Cox, R. Erbacher, C. Flores, G. Funk, W. Ko, O. Kukral, R. Lander, C. Mclean, M. Mulhearn, D. Pellett, J. Pilot, S. Shalhout, M. Shi, D. Stolp, D. Taylor, K. Tos, M. Tripathi, Z. Wang, F. Zhang

University of California, Davis, Davis, USA

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

University of California, Los Angeles, USA

E. Bouvier, K. Burt, R. Clare, J.W. Gary, S.M.A. Ghiasi Shirazi, G. Hanson, G. Karapostoli, E. Kennedy, F. Lacroix, O.R. Long, M. Olmedo Negrete, M.I. Paneva, W. Si, L. Wang, H. Wei, S. Wimpenny, B.R. Yates

University of California, Riverside, Riverside, USA

J.G. Branson, S. Cittolin, M. Derdzinski, R. Gerosa, D. Gilbert, B. Hashemi, A. Holzner, D. Klein, G. Kole, V. Krutelyov, J. Letts, 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, San Diego, La Jolla, USA

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

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

D. Anderson, A. Bornheim, J.M. Lawhorn, H.B. Newman, T.Q. Nguyen, M. Spiropulu, J.R. Vlimant, R. Wilkinson, S. Xie, Z. Zhang, R.Y. Zhu

California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA

M.B. Andrews, T. Ferguson, T. Mudholkar, M. Paulini, M. Sun, I. Vorobiev, M. Weinberg

Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, USA

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

University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, USA

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

Cornell University, Ithaca, USA

S. Abdullin, M. Albrow, M. Alyari, 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, J. Hanlon, R.M. Harris, S. Hasegawa, J. Hirschauer, Z. Hu, B. Jayatilaka, S. Jindariani, M. Johnson, U. Joshi, B. Klima, M.J. Kortelainen, B. Kreis, S. Lammel, D. Lincoln, R. Lipton, M. Liu, T. Liu, J. Lykken, K. Maeshima, J.M. Marraffino, D. Mason, P. McBride, P. Merkel, S. Mrenna, S. Nahn, V. O'Dell, K. Pedro, C. Pena, O. Prokofyev, G. Rakness, L. Ristori, A. Savoy-Navarro⁶⁴, 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

Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, USA

D. Acosta, P. Avery, P. Bortignon, D. Bourilkov, A. Brinkerhoff, L. Cadamuro, A. Carnes, M. Carver, D. Curry, R.D. Field, S.V. Gleyzer, B.M. Joshi, J. Konigsberg, A. Korytov, P. Ma, K. Matchev, H. Mei, G. Mitselmakher, K. Shi, D. Sperka, J. Wang, S. Wang

University of Florida, Gainesville, USA

Y.R. Joshi, S. Linn

Florida International University, Miami, USA

A. Ackert, T. Adams, A. Askew, S. Hagopian, V. Hagopian, K.F. Johnson, T. Kolberg, G. Martinez, T. Perry, H. Prosper, A. Saha, V. Sharma, R. Yohay

Florida State University, Tallahassee, USA

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

Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, USA

M.R. Adams, L. Apanasevich, D. Berry, R.R. Betts, R. Cavanaugh, X. Chen, S. Dittmer, O. Evdokimov, C.E. Gerber, D.A. Hangal, D.J. Hofman, K. Jung, J. Kamin, C. Mills, I.D. Sandoval Gonzalez, M.B. Tonjes, N. Varelas, H. Wang, X. Wang, Z. Wu, J. Zhang

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

M. Alhusseini, B. Bilki⁶⁵, W. Clarida, K. Dilsiz⁶⁶, S. Durgut, R.P. Gandrajula, M. Haytmyradov, V. Khristenko, J.-P. Merlo, A. Mestvirishvili, A. Moeller, J. Nachtman, H. Ogul⁶⁷, Y. Onel, F. Ozok⁶⁸, A. Penzo, C. Snyder, E. Tiras, J. Wetzel

The University of Iowa, Iowa City, USA

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

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA

A. Al-bataineh, P. Baringer, A. Bean, S. Boren, J. Bowen, A. Bylinkin, J. Castle, S. Khalil, A. Kropivnitskaya, D. Majumder, W. Mcbrayer, M. Murray, C. Rogan, S. Sanders, E. Schmitz, J.D. Tapia Takaki, Q. Wang

The University of Kansas, Lawrence, USA

A. Ivanov, K. Kaadze, D. Kim, Y. Maravin, D.R. Mendis, T. Mitchell, A. Modak, A. Mohammadi, L.K. Saini, N. Skhirtladze

Kansas State University, Manhattan, USA

F. Rebassoo, D. Wright

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, USA

A. Baden, O. Baron, A. Belloni, S.C. Eno, Y. Feng, 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, K. Wong

University of Maryland, College Park, USA

D. Abercrombie, B. Allen, V. Azzolini, A. Baty, G. Bauer, R. Bi, S. Brandt, W. Busza, I.A. Cali, M. D'Alfonso, Z. Demiragli, G. Gomez Ceballos, M. Goncharov, P. Harris, D. Hsu, M. Hu, Y. Iiyama, G.M. Innocenti, M. Klute, D. Kovalskyi, Y.-J. Lee, P.D. Luckey, B. Maier, A.C. Marini, C. McGinn, C. Mironov, S. Narayanan, X. Niu, C. Paus, C. Roland, G. Roland, G.S.F. Stephans, K. Sumorok, K. Tatar, D. Velicanu, J. Wang, T.W. Wang, B. Wyslouch, S. Zhaozhong

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, 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, M.A. Wadud

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, USA

J.G. Acosta, S. Oliveros

University of Mississippi, Oxford, USA

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

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, USA

A. Godshalk, C. Harrington, I. Iashvili, A. Kharchilava, D. Nguyen, A. Parker, S. Rappoccio, B. Roobahani

State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, USA

G. Alverson, E. Barberis, C. Freer, A. Hortiangtham, D.M. Morse, T. Orimoto, R. Teixeira De Lima, T. Wamorkar, B. Wang, A. Wisecarver, D. Wood

Northeastern University, Boston, USA

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

Northwestern University, Evanston, USA

R. Bucci, N. Dev, M. Hildreth, K. Hurtado Anampa, C. Jessop, D.J. Karmgard, N. Kellams, K. Lannon, W. Li, N. Loukas, N. Marinelli, F. Meng, C. Mueller, Y. Musienko³², M. Planer, A. Reinsvold, R. Ruchti, P. Siddireddy, G. Smith, S. Taroni, M. Wayne, A. Wightman, M. Wolf, A. Woodard

University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, USA

J. Alimena, L. Antonelli, B. Bylsma, L.S. Durkin, S. Flowers, B. Francis, A. Hart, C. Hill, W. Ji, T.Y. Ling, W. Luo, B.L. Winer, H.W. Wulsin

The Ohio State University, Columbus, USA

S. Cooperstein, P. Elmer, J. Hardenbrook, P. Hebda, S. Higginbotham, A. Kalogeropoulos, D. Lange, M.T. Lucchini, J. Luo, D. Marlow, K. Mei, I. Ojalvo, J. Olsen, C. Palmer, P. Piroué, J. Salfeld-Nebgen, D. Stickland, C. Tully

Princeton University, Princeton, USA

S. Malik, S. Norberg

University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez, USA

A. Barker, V.E. Barnes, S. Das, L. Gutay, M. Jones, A.W. Jung, A. Khatiwada, B. Mahakud, D.H. Miller, N. Neumeister, C.C. Peng, H. Qiu, J.F. Schulte, J. Sun, F. Wang, R. Xiao, W. Xie

Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA

T. Cheng, J. Dolen, N. Parashar

Purdue University Northwest, Hammond, USA

Z. Chen, K.M. Ecklund, S. Freed, F.J.M. Geurts, M. Kilpatrick, W. Li, B. Michlin, B.P. Padley, J. Roberts, J. Rorie, W. Shi, Z. Tu, J. Zabel, A. Zhang

Rice University, Houston, USA

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

University of Rochester, Rochester, 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

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

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

University of Tennessee, Knoxville, USA

O. Bouhali⁶⁹, A. Celik, M. Dalchenko, M. De Mattia, A. Delgado, S. Dildick, R. Eusebi, J. Gilmore, T. Huang, T. Kamon⁷⁰, S. Luo, R. Mueller, Y. Pakhotin, R. Patel, A. Perloff, L. Perniè, D. Rathjens, A. Safonov, A. Tatarinov

Texas A&M University, College Station, USA

N. Akchurin, J. Damgov, F. De Guio, P.R. Duderu, S. Kunori, K. Lamichhane, S.W. Lee, T. Mengke, S. Muthumuni, T. Peltola, S. Undleeb, I. Volobouev, Z. Wang

Texas Tech University, Lubbock, USA

S. Greene, A. Gurrola, R. Janjam, W. Johns, C. Maguire, A. Melo, H. Ni, K. Padeken, J.D. Ruiz Alvarez, P. Sheldon, S. Tuo, J. Velkovska, M. Verweij, Q. Xu

Vanderbilt University, Nashville, USA

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

University of Virginia, Charlottesville, USA

R. Harr, P.E. Karchin, N. Poudyal, J. Sturdy, P. Thapa, S. Zaleski

Wayne State University, Detroit, USA

M. Brodski, J. Buchanan, C. Caillol, D. Carlsmith, S. Dasu, L. Dodd, S. Duric, B. Gomber, M. Grothe, M. Herndon, A. Hervé, U. Hussain, P. Klabbbers, A. Lanaro, A. Levine, K. Long, R. Loveless, T. Ruggles, A. Savin, N. Smith, W.H. Smith, N. Woods

University of Wisconsin – Madison, Madison, WI, USA

† Deceased.

- ¹ Also at Vienna University of Technology, Vienna, Austria.
- ² Also at IRFU, CEA, Université Paris-Saclay, Gif-sur-Yvette, France.
- ³ Also at Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, Brazil.
- ⁴ Also at Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, 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 Also at Cairo University, Cairo, Egypt.
- ⁹ Also at Helwan University, Cairo, Egypt.
- ¹⁰ Now at Zewail City of Science and Technology, Zewail, Egypt.
- ¹¹ Also at Department of Physics, King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia.
- ¹² Also at Université de Haute Alsace, Mulhouse, France.
- ¹³ Also at Skobeltsyn Institute of Nuclear Physics, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia.
- ¹⁴ Also at CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland.
- ¹⁵ Also at RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut A, Aachen, Germany.
- ¹⁶ Also at University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany.
- ¹⁷ Also at Brandenburg University of Technology, Cottbus, Germany.
- ¹⁸ Also at MTA-ELTE Lendület CMS Particle and Nuclear Physics Group, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary.
- ¹⁹ Also at Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary.
- ²⁰ Also at Institute of Physics, University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary.
- ²¹ Also at Indian Institute of Technology Bhubaneswar, Bhubaneswar, India.
- ²² Also at Institute of Physics, Bhubaneswar, India.
- ²³ Also at Shoolini University, Solan, India.
- ²⁴ Also at University of Visva-Bharati, Santiniketan, India.
- ²⁵ Also at Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, 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 International Islamic University of Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
- ²⁹ Also at Malaysian Nuclear Agency, MOSTI, Kajang, Malaysia.
- ³⁰ Also at Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología, Mexico city, Mexico.
- ³¹ Also at Warsaw University of Technology, Institute of Electronic Systems, Warsaw, Poland.
- ³² Also at Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia.
- ³³ Now at National Research Nuclear University 'Moscow Engineering Physics Institute' (MEPhI), Moscow, Russia.
- ³⁴ Also at St. Petersburg State Polytechnical University, St. Petersburg, Russia.
- ³⁵ Also at University of Florida, Gainesville, USA.
- ³⁶ Also at P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia.
- ³⁷ Also at California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA.
- ³⁸ Also at Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, Novosibirsk, Russia.
- ³⁹ Also at Faculty of Physics, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia.
- ⁴⁰ Also at INFN Sezione di Pavia^a, Università di Pavia^b, Pavia, Italy.
- ⁴¹ Also at University of Belgrade, Faculty of Physics and Vinca Institute of Nuclear Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia.
- ⁴² Also at Scuola Normale e Sezione dell'INFN, Pisa, Italy.
- ⁴³ Also at National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece.
- ⁴⁴ Also at Riga Technical University, Riga, Latvia.
- ⁴⁵ Also at Universität Zürich, Zurich, Switzerland.
- ⁴⁶ Also at Stefan Meyer Institute for Subatomic Physics (SMI), Vienna, Austria.
- ⁴⁷ Also at Adiyaman University, Adiyaman, Turkey.
- ⁴⁸ Also at Istanbul Aydin University, Istanbul, Turkey.
- ⁴⁹ Also at Mersin University, Mersin, Turkey.
- ⁵⁰ Also at Piri Reis University, Istanbul, Turkey.
- ⁵¹ Also at Gaziosmanpasa University, Tokat, Turkey.
- ⁵² Also at Ozyegin University, Istanbul, Turkey.
- ⁵³ Also at Izmir Institute of Technology, Izmir, Turkey.
- ⁵⁴ Also at Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey.
- ⁵⁵ Also at Kafkas University, Kars, Turkey.
- ⁵⁶ Also at Istanbul Bilgi University, Istanbul, Turkey.
- ⁵⁷ Also at Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.
- ⁵⁸ Also at Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom.
- ⁵⁹ Also at School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southampton, Southampton, United Kingdom.
- ⁶⁰ Also at Monash University, Faculty of Science, Clayton, Australia.
- ⁶¹ Also at Bethel University, St. Paul, USA.
- ⁶² Also at Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University, Karaman, Turkey.
- ⁶³ Also at Utah Valley University, Orem, USA.
- ⁶⁴ Also at Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA.
- ⁶⁵ Also at Beykent University, Istanbul, Turkey.
- ⁶⁶ Also at Bingol University, Bingol, Turkey.
- ⁶⁷ Also at Sinop University, Sinop, Turkey.
- ⁶⁸ Also at Mimar Sinan University, Istanbul, Istanbul, Turkey.