Measurements of the pp → Wγγ and pp → Zγγ cross sections and limits on anomalous quartic gauge couplings at $\sqrt{s} = 8\,\text{TeV}$

The CMS Collaboration[*]

Abstract

Measurements are presented of Wγγ and Zγγ production in proton-proton collisions. Fiducial cross sections are reported based on a data sample corresponding to an integrated luminosity of $19.4\,\text{fb}^{-1}$ collected with the CMS detector at a center-of-mass energy of 8 TeV. Signal is identified through the $W \to \ell\nu$ and $Z \to \ell\ell$ decay modes, where ℓ is a muon or an electron. The production of Wγγ and Zγγ, measured with significances of 2.6 and 5.9 standard deviations, respectively, is consistent with standard model predictions. In addition, limits on anomalous quartic gauge couplings in Wγγ production are determined in the context of a dimension-8 effective field theory.

[*]See Appendix A for the list of collaboration members

arXiv:1704.00366v2 [hep-ex] 14 Oct 2017

1 Introduction

Production of three-boson final states in proton-proton collisions is predicted by the SU(2)×U(1) gauge structure of the standard model (SM). Cross sections for these processes include contributions from quartic gauge couplings (QGCs), which are sensitive to new phenomena that modify those couplings. In this paper, we present cross section measurements for the pp $\rightarrow$ W$\gamma\gamma$ and pp $\rightarrow$ Z$\gamma\gamma$ processes and a search for anomalous QGCs (aQGCs). The W $\rightarrow \ell\nu$ and Z $\rightarrow \ell\ell$ decay modes are selected for analysis, where ℓ is a muon or an electron. The cross sections are measured in fiducial regions that are defined by selection criteria similar to those used to select signal events. In particular, to avoid infrared divergences, minimum photon transverse momenta p_T of 25 and 15 GeV are required in the W$\gamma\gamma$ and Z$\gamma\gamma$ measurements, respectively. A dimension-8 effective field theory is used to model aQGCs, which would enhance W$\gamma\gamma$ production at high momentum scales. The W$\gamma\gamma$ and Z$\gamma\gamma$ processes were recently observed by the ATLAS Collaboration [1, 2] using 20.3 fb^{-1} of integrated luminosity at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV. Cross sections for W$\gamma\gamma$ and Z$\gamma\gamma$ production have also been computed with QCD corrections up to next-to-leading order (NLO) in Ref. [3, 4].

2 The CMS detector and particle reconstruction

The data used in these measurements amount to 19.4 fb^{-1} collected in 2012 with the CMS detector at the CERN LHC in proton-proton collisions at a center-of-mass energy of 8 TeV. A detailed description of the CMS detector, together with definitions of the coordinate system and relevant kinematic variables, can be found in Ref. [5]. 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 field volume are a silicon pixel and strip tracker, a lead tungstate crystal electromagnetic calorimeter (ECAL), and a brass and plastic scintillator hadron calorimeter (HCAL), each composed of a barrel and two endcap sections. Extensive forward calorimetry utilizing a steel absorber with embedded quartz fibers complements the coverage provided by the barrel and endcap detectors. Muons are measured in gas-ionization detectors embedded in the steel flux-return yoke outside the solenoid.

The particle-flow (PF) algorithm [6] reconstructs and identifies five types of particles with an optimized combination of information from the various elements of the CMS detector. Particle flow candidates provide the basis for the selection and measurement of muons, electrons, photons, jets, and the transverse momentum imbalance. In addition, the isolation characteristics of identified leptons and photons are measured using the p_T of PF charged hadrons, neutral hadrons, and photons.

Muons are identified as tracks in the muon spectrometer that are matched to tracks in the inner detector. Quality requirements are placed on tracks measured in the inner detector and muon spectrometer, as well as on the matching between them. Muons must also be isolated from nearby PF candidates. Selected muons in the momentum range $20 < p_T < 100$ GeV have a relative p_T resolution of 1.3–2.0% in the barrel ($|\eta| < 1.2$) and less than 6% in the endcaps ($1.2 < |\eta| < 2.4$) [7].

Photons and electrons are identified as clusters of energy deposits in the ECAL. The energy of photons is directly obtained from the ECAL measurement. Electrons are further identified by matching the ECAL cluster to a track reconstructed in the inner detector. The momenta of electrons are determined from a combination of the track momentum at the primary interaction vertex, the energy of the corresponding ECAL cluster, and the energy sum of all bremsstrahlung photons spatially compatible with originating from the electron track. To take

into account electron bremsstrahlung in the inner-detector material, a Gaussian sum filter algorithm [8] is used to measure the track momentum. The momentum resolution for electrons from $Z \rightarrow e^+e^-$ decays ranges from 1.7% for electrons in the barrel region to 4.5% for electrons that begin to shower before the calorimeter in the endcaps [9].

Electrons are selected in the $W\gamma\gamma$ analysis using a multivariate classifier based on the spatial distribution of the electron shower, the energy deposited in the HCAL region matched to the ECAL shower, and the quality of the inner-detector track. Electrons are selected in the $Z\gamma\gamma$ analysis by imposing looser requirements on the same variables, yielding improved signal acceptance. In both cases, electrons passing the selection must also be isolated from nearby PF candidates.

Photons are identified using a selection that requires a narrow shower in the ECAL, minimal energy deposited in the HCAL region matched to the ECAL shower, and isolation from nearby PF candidates. Separate isolation requirements are placed on the energies of PF charged hadrons, neutral hadrons, and photons. Photons that convert to an electron-positron pair are included and the same selection criteria are applied. The energy resolution is about 1% in the barrel section of the ECAL for unconverted or late converting photons in the tens of GeV energy range. The remaining barrel photons have a resolution of about 1.3% up to a pseudorapidity of $|\eta| = 1$, rising to about 2.5% at $|\eta| = 1.4$. In the endcaps, which cover a pseudorapidity of $1.5 < |\eta| < 2.5$, the resolution of unconverted photons is about 2.5%, while converted photons have a resolution between 3 and 4% [10].

The transverse momentum imbalance vector $\vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}}$ is defined as the projection on the plane perpendicular to the beams of the negative vector sum of the $\vec{p}_T$ of all reconstructed PF candidates in the event. Its magnitude is referred to as p_T^{miss}. Corrections to the energy scale and resolution of jets, described in [11], are propagated to the calculation of p_T^{miss}.

3   Event selection

Events are recorded using single-lepton triggers for the $W\gamma\gamma$ selection and dilepton triggers for the $Z\gamma\gamma$ selection [12]. The single-lepton triggers have p_T thresholds of 24 and 27 GeV for muons and electrons, respectively. The dimuon and dielectron triggers both have p_T thresholds of 17 and 8 GeV on the leading and subleading leptons, respectively. To ensure uniform trigger efficiency, reconstructed leptons are required to have p_T above the trigger thresholds. The p_T requirement is determined by measuring the efficiency of the trigger as a function of p_T and selecting the value at which the efficiency becomes approximately independent of p_T. For the $W\gamma\gamma$ ($Z\gamma\gamma$) analysis the muons and electrons must have minimum p_T of 25 (10) and 30 (20) GeV, respectively.

Events selected for the $W\gamma\gamma$ analysis must have one muon or electron and two photons. Each photon is required to have p_T greater than 25 GeV. Events are removed if a second lepton is present having p_T above 10 GeV. All reconstructed leptons and photons must be separated from each other by $\Delta R > 0.4$, where $\Delta R = \sqrt{(\Delta\phi)^2 + (\Delta\eta)^2}$ and ϕ is the azimuthal angle. To identify leptonic W boson decays and remove backgrounds not having genuine p_T^{miss}, the transverse mass, defined as

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

is required to be greater than 40 GeV; p_T^ℓ denotes the p_T of the lepton. In the electron channel, additional criteria are imposed to reject background events arising from Z boson decays

to electrons in which only one electron is correctly identified, the other is misidentified as a photon, and an additional prompt photon is present in the event. Both photons are required to pass an electron veto that rejects photons that match to tracks in the pixel detector. This requirement decreases the signal efficiency by removing converted photons, which are commonly matched to tracks in the pixel detector. However, the background contamination from electrons is further decreased by a factor of two. Events are also removed if the invariant mass of any combination of the electron and one or both photons is near the Z boson mass. In particular, events are removed if they have $86 < m_{e\gamma} < 96$ GeV for either combination of a photon with the electron, or if $86 < m_{e\gamma\gamma} < 96$ GeV, in which case one photon is likely to be from final-state radiation (FSR).

Events selected for the $Z\gamma\gamma$ analysis must have two electrons or muons of opposite charge and two photons. Each photon is required to have a minimum p_T of 15 GeV. Photons are required to pass an electron veto that has a higher signal efficiency than that used in the electron channel of the $W\gamma\gamma$ analysis. All reconstructed leptons and photons must be separated from each other by $\Delta R > 0.4$. The dilepton invariant mass must be greater than 40 GeV to remove backgrounds that have low dilepton invariant masses.

In both analyses, photons reconstructed in the barrel and endcaps are treated separately. The geometry of the ECAL differs between the barrel and endcaps and therefore different selection criteria are imposed for each case. Photons that are reconstructed in the endcaps are more likely to originate from misidentified jets. Events in which both reconstructed photons are in the endcaps are not considered in the analysis because of the unfavorable signal-to-background ratio.

4 Signal and background simulation

Simulated events are generated at NLO for the $W\gamma\gamma$ and $Z\gamma\gamma$ signals. These samples are generated with MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO (v5 2.2.2) [13] using the NNPDF-NLO (v.3.0) [14] parton distribution functions (PDFs), and showered with PYTHIA (v.8.1) [15] using the Monash tune [16].

Events are generated that model the aQGC signals and the diboson and triboson backgrounds at leading order (LO) using MADGRAPH (v5 2.2.2) using the CTEQ6L1 [17] PDF set, and then showered with PYTHIA (v.6.4) [18] Z2* tune [19].

Simulated aQGC events are assigned a set of weights, each of which reproduces the effect of an anomalous QGC. The weights are obtained by loading models of effective theories, provided in the Universal FeynRules Output format [20], into the event generator. The diboson and triboson predictions are normalized to the NLO cross section predictions obtained with MCFM (v.6.6) [21] and MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO (v5 2.2.2), respectively. All τ leptons included in samples showered with PYTHIA are decayed with TAUOLA (v.1.1.1a) [22].

The influence of additional proton-proton collisions in data events (pileup) is corrected by adding minimum-bias collisions to the simulated events. The number of added pileup collisions follows a distribution that is similar to the distribution observed in data and an additional weight is applied such that the simulated pileup distribution accurately represents the data. Finally, all simulated samples are passed through a detailed GEANT4 simulation [23] of the CMS detector.

Corrections for differences between the simulation and the data in the selection efficiencies of muons, electrons, and photons and in the trigger efficiencies are determined using the tag-

and-probe method and applied to the simulated events. Differences in the momentum scale of muons, electrons, and photons are determined from the Z boson line shape, and the simulation is corrected to agree with the data.

5   Background estimation

The main background contribution in both analyses consists of events in which one or two jets are misidentified as photons. In fact, while the photon shower and isolation requirements are designed to reject misidentified jets, the relatively large production rate of electroweak bosons with jets leads to a large contribution of jets misidentified as photons. A jet is commonly misidentified as a photon when it contains a neutral meson that decays to overlapping photons. If the photons carry a large fraction of the jet energy such that the other hadronization products have low momentum, the reconstructed photon can pass the isolation requirements. The probability for a jet to be misidentified as a photon is sensitive to how jets interact with the detector and is therefore difficult to predict with simulation. Moreover, the generation of a sufficiently large simulated sample is impractical because of the large rejection factor obtained through the photon identification criteria. A data-based method is therefore used to estimate the contamination from this source.

The background estimate is based on an analysis of the two-dimensional distribution of the charged hadron isolation variables $I_{ch,1}$ and $I_{ch,2}$ of the leading and subleading photon candidates, respectively. The isolation I_{ch} is defined as the scalar p_T sum of charged hadron PF candidates having $\Delta R < 0.3$ with respect to the photon candidate. Charged hadron PF candidates are required to have energy deposits in the HCAL and originate from the primary vertex, defined as the vertex with the highest sum of squared transverse momenta of its associated tracks [24]. Prompt photons have low values of I_{ch} while jets that are misidentified as photons tend to have larger values. The distribution of $I_{ch,1}$ versus $I_{ch,2}$ (a "template") is determined for each of the four sources of diphoton candidates: prompt-prompt (PP), prompt-jet (PJ), jet-prompt (JP), and jet-jet (JJ). The PP template represents the signal, while the PJ and JP templates represent background events having one prompt photon, and the JJ template represents background events having no prompt photons. Each template consists of four bins. The distribution of I_{ch} is divided into a "tight" region and a "loose" control region for each of the two photons. The tight region contains photon candidates that satisfy the nominal I_{ch} criterion, while the loose region contains photon candidates that fail the nominal, but pass a less stringent requirement. The value of the less stringent requirement is chosen such that candidates in the loose region are enriched in photon-like jets that are independent of, but sufficiently similar to those that contaminate the signal region. The four-bin structure of the templates provides discrimination between prompt photons and jets and allows for a straightforward matrix equation solution, taking account of correlations between $I_{ch,1}$ and $I_{ch,2}$. The contribution of each source is determined from control data samples. Three control data samples are formed from the combinations of the tight and loose regions: tight-loose (TL) and loose-tight (LT), where one photon passes the requirement and the other fails, and loose-loose (LL), where both photons fail the requirement. The signal region is labeled tight-tight (TT). The TL and LT regions are treated separately to take into account differences in photon p_T and differences between photons that are reconstructed in the barrel and endcaps. The normalizations of the four sources of photon candidates are determined through the matrix equation

$$\begin{pmatrix} N_{\text{TT}} \\ N_{\text{TL}} \\ N_{\text{LT}} \\ N_{\text{LL}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_{\text{PP}}^{\text{TT}} & \epsilon_{\text{PJ}}^{\text{TT}} & \epsilon_{\text{JP}}^{\text{TT}} & \epsilon_{\text{JJ}}^{\text{TT}} \\ \epsilon_{\text{PP}}^{\text{TL}} & \epsilon_{\text{PJ}}^{\text{TL}} & \epsilon_{\text{JP}}^{\text{TL}} & \epsilon_{\text{JJ}}^{\text{TL}} \\ \epsilon_{\text{PP}}^{\text{LT}} & \epsilon_{\text{PJ}}^{\text{LT}} & \epsilon_{\text{JP}}^{\text{LT}} & \epsilon_{\text{JJ}}^{\text{LT}} \\ \epsilon_{\text{PP}}^{\text{LL}} & \epsilon_{\text{PJ}}^{\text{LL}} & \epsilon_{\text{JP}}^{\text{LL}} & \epsilon_{\text{JJ}}^{\text{LL}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{\text{PP}} \\ \alpha_{\text{PJ}} \\ \alpha_{\text{JP}} \\ \alpha_{\text{JJ}} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{1}$$

where N_{XY} is the observed number of events in region XY, ϵ_{AB}^{XY} is the probability for an event from source AB to appear in region XY, as determined from the templates, and α_{AB} is the normalization of source AB. Each column in the matrix corresponds to the four bins from one template, and the entries in the column sum to unity by construction. The predicted number of events from source AB reconstructed in region XY is given by the product $\alpha_{AB}\,\epsilon_{AB}^{XY}$. The final background estimate is the sum of the contributions from the sources involving at least one jet:

$$\alpha_{\text{PJ}}\,\epsilon_{\text{PJ}}^{\text{TT}} + \alpha_{\text{JP}}\,\epsilon_{\text{JP}}^{\text{TT}} + \alpha_{\text{JJ}}\,\epsilon_{\text{JJ}}^{\text{TT}}.$$

Templates are constructed from both Monte Carlo (MC) simulation and data control samples. This procedure is applied separately for different ranges of photon p_{T} and η. The templates for the PP, PJ, and JP sources are determined from prompt and jet I_{ch} distributions obtained from single-photon events. The single-photon I_{ch} distributions are binned in the same manner as the templates to create two-bin distributions representing the leading and subleading photon. Products of the two-bin distributions corresponding to the leading and subleading photons are used to determine the four-bin templates, the entries of which appear in Eq. (1).

The I_{ch} distribution for prompt photons is taken from simulated Wγ events. Simulated events are required to contain one reconstructed photon that matches a photon in the generator record within $\Delta R = 0.2$ and passes all selection criteria except the I_{ch} requirement. The distributions obtained from simulation are validated with data events in which an FSR photon is identified in a Z boson decay to $\mu^+\mu^-$. To ensure that the photon results from FSR, the three-body invariant mass is required to be consistent with the Z boson mass and the photon must be within $\Delta R = 1$ of a muon. The available data sample is adequate to make this comparison for photons with p_{T} up to 40 GeV, and good agreement is observed between data and simulation. An uncertainty of 10–20% is applied, depending on the photon p_{T} and η, to take into account the observed differences and for the extrapolation to higher photon p_{T}.

The I_{ch} distribution for jets is taken from data. For this purpose, events are selected that contain two reconstructed muons with invariant mass consistent with the Z boson mass and a reconstructed photon that passes all selection criteria except the I_{ch} requirement. To exclude genuine photons from FSR, the photon is required to be separated from each muon by $\Delta R > 1$. The remaining contribution from prompt photons is subtracted using the prediction from a sample of simulated Zγ events normalized to its production cross section calculated at next-to-next-to-leading order [25]. This normalization is checked with a control data sample similar to that used to validate the I_{ch} distribution for prompt photons. Based on this comparison, a systematic uncertainty of 20%, dominated by the statistical uncertainty in the control sample, is assessed to the Zγ normalization.

Events that have two jets misidentified as photons represent approximately 30% and 10% of the total misidentified jet background in the W$\gamma\gamma$ and Z$\gamma\gamma$ analyses, respectively. In such events, nonnegligible correlations exist between the leading and subleading photons. These correlations originate from the event activity that affects the measured isolation energies of both photons. The JJ templates are therefore determined from a sample of candidate diphoton events in data that is independent of the signal region. For this selection, the requirement

on the ECAL transverse shower shape is inverted and the PF photon isolation requirement is relaxed. This procedure can result in a bias through correlations between the ECAL shower shape and the isolation. The systematic uncertainties are estimated by varying the maximum value of the relaxed requirements on the PF photon isolation. The largest deviation is taken as an estimate of the systematic uncertainty, which is approximately 10%. Using this method, rather than treating the photons as uncorrelated, increases the contribution from jet-jet events, which increases the estimated background by as much as 30%.

The total uncertainties in the estimated background contamination from misidentified jets are 19% and 28% for the muon and electron $W\gamma\gamma$ channels, respectively, and 14% for the muon and electron $Z\gamma\gamma$ channels. These uncertainties take into account systematic effects in the derivation of the probabilities for prompt photons and jets described above, and statistical uncertainties in the observed data. The larger uncertainty in the electron channel of the $W\gamma\gamma$ analysis results from the smaller amount of data as well as larger systematic variations in the JJ template determination.

In the electron channel of the $W\gamma\gamma$ analysis, a nonnegligible contamination is present from $Z(\rightarrow ee)\gamma$ events in which an electron is misidentified as a photon. An electron veto based on pixel tracks is used as a discriminating variable to determine a misidentification ratio. This ratio relates the number of events that fail the electron veto to the number that pass. The misidentification ratio is determined as a function of p_T and η in a control sample of data enriched in single Z boson events that have one reconstructed electron and one photon. The contamination in the signal region is obtained by multiplying the observed number of events outside the Z boson mass window where one photon fails the electron veto by the misidentification ratio. The number of electrons resulting from Z boson decays is extracted from a fit to the eγ invariant mass distribution using a Z boson line shape determined from simulation and a background function that models the contribution from events without a Z boson. The misidentification ratio is 0.01–0.03, depending on the p_T and η of the photon. A systematic uncertainty of 10% in the misidentification ratio is determined from a closure test in simulation. The contamination from misidentified jets in the control samples is determined using the method described above and subtracted from the data. This contamination is approximately 10% for events in which both photons are in the barrel and 20% for the remaining events.

Additional background contributions involving prompt photons are determined using MC simulations. The simulated events are corrected for observed differences in the selection efficiencies between data and simulation of electrons, muons, and photons and in the trigger efficiencies. In the $W\gamma\gamma$ analysis, the contamination from $Z\gamma\gamma$ is estimated using the $Z\gamma\gamma$ MC sample described in Section 4. The $Z\gamma\gamma$ contamination constitutes about 90% of the background that contains two prompt photons. The simulated sample is normalized to the NLO cross section with an uncertainty of 12.5%, based on the uncertainty in the theoretical prediction and differences in identification and reconstruction efficiencies between data and simulation. Contributions of less than an event per channel from top quark production and other multiboson processes, including $t\bar{t}\gamma\gamma$, $tW\gamma\gamma$, and $VV\gamma\gamma$, where V is a W or Z boson, are present in both the $W\gamma\gamma$ and $Z\gamma\gamma$ final states. These background sources are estimated using leading-order MC simulation. A systematic uncertainty of 20% is applied to the sum of these contributions to take into account higher-order corrections and differences in identification and reconstruction efficiencies between data and simulation.

Table 1 summarizes the background predictions and the observed numbers of events, which are consistent with the presence of signal. Figure 1 shows the diphoton p_T distribution with the predicted background, signal, and observed data for the $W\gamma\gamma$ and $Z\gamma\gamma$ analyses, separately in

Table 1: Background composition, expected signal, and observed yields in the W$\gamma\gamma$ (upper) and Z$\gamma\gamma$ (lower) analyses.

W$\gamma\gamma$	Electron channel	Muon channel
Jet $\to \gamma$ misidentification	22 ± 6	63 ± 12
Electron $\to \gamma$ misidentification	20 ± 2	—
Prompt diphoton	7 ± 1	14 ± 2
Total background	49 ± 6	77 ± 12
Expected signal	13 ± 1	25 ± 3
Data	63	108
Z$\gamma\gamma$	Electron channel	Muon channel
Jet $\to \gamma$ misidentification	62 ± 8	68 ± 9
Prompt diphoton	0.3 ± 0.1	0.6 ± 0.2
Total background	62 ± 8	69 ± 9
Expected signal	56 ± 8	73 ± 10
Data	117	141

the electron and muon channels. Figure 2 shows the same distributions with the electron and muon channels combined. The W$\gamma\gamma$ and Z$\gamma\gamma$ signals are observed with significances of 2.6 and 5.9 standard deviations, respectively. The significances of the signals are calculated using a profile likelihood that considers the observed data and predicted backgrounds in each of the muon and electron channels. In this calculation, separate categories are defined for events having both photons in the barrel and only one photon in the barrel, to take advantage of the higher signal-to-background ratio in the first category as compared to the second.

6 Cross section measurements

The W$\gamma\gamma$ and Z$\gamma\gamma$ cross sections are measured within fiducial regions identified by the selection criteria listed in Table 2. The acceptances of the fiducial regions for the signal processes as well as their reconstruction and selection efficiencies are determined using the signal MC samples described in Section 4. In the MC simulation, photons are required to satisfy a Frixione isolation requirement with a distance parameter of 0.05 [26]. The fiducial selection criteria are applied to the generated lepton four-momenta after a correction for FSR, which is obtained by adding to the generated four-momentum of each lepton the generated four-momenta of all photons within $\Delta R < 0.1$. The fiducial cross sections are defined for W and Z boson decays to a single lepton family (ℓ).

Leptonic decays of τ leptons resulting from W and Z decays also contribute to signal events. Based on simulation the τ lepton contamination in the W$\gamma\gamma$ fiducial region is approximately 2.5%, while in the Z$\gamma\gamma$ fiducial region it is less than 1%. The combined acceptances and efficiencies, after subtracting the τ lepton contribution, are 17.3 and 26.7% for the electron and muon channels of the W$\gamma\gamma$ analysis, respectively, and 22.5 and 29.1% for the Z$\gamma\gamma$ analysis.

Uncertainties in the acceptances result from uncertainties in the PDFs of the proton, the perturbative QCD renormalization and factorization scales, the number of additional pileup interactions, and the selection efficiencies of leptons, photons, and $p_{\mathrm{T}}^{\mathrm{miss}}$. The PDF uncertainties are evaluated by comparing the acceptances obtained with the NNPDF-NLO error sets and between the nominal NNPDF-NLO set and the MSTW-NLO 2008 [27] and CT10-NLO [28] PDF sets. The maximum deviation from the nominal acceptance is taken as a systematic uncertainty.

Figure 1: Distributions of the diphoton p_{T} for the $W\gamma\gamma$ (upper) and $Z\gamma\gamma$ (lower) analyses, in the electron (left) and muon (right) channels. The points display the observed data and the histograms show the predictions for the background and signal. The indicated uncertainties in the data points are calculated using Poisson statistics. The hatched area displays the total uncertainty in the sum of these predictions. The predictions for electrons and jets misidentified as photons are obtained with data-based methods. The remaining background and signal predictions are derived from MC simulation. The last bin includes all events in which the diphoton p_{T} exceeds 80 GeV.

Figure 2: Distributions of the diphoton p_T for the $W\gamma\gamma$ (left) and $Z\gamma\gamma$ (right) analyses with the electron and muon channels summed. The points display the observed data and the histograms give the predictions for the background and signal. The indicated uncertainties in the data points are calculated using Poisson statistics. The hatched area displays the total uncertainty in the sum of these predictions. The predictions for electrons and jets misidentified as photons are obtained with data-based methods. The remaining background and signal predictions are derived from MC simulation. The last bin includes all events in which the diphoton p_T exceeds 80 GeV.

The uncertainties related to the renormalization and factorization scales are evaluated by varying them independently by factors of 0.5 and 2. The largest variation is applied as a systematic uncertainty. The uncertainty in the pileup distribution is evaluated by varying the assumed minimum-bias cross section by $\pm 5\%$. Uncertainties in the selection efficiencies of electrons, muons, and photons and in the trigger requirements are derived from uncertainties in the tag-and-probe analyses. Estimates of the energy scale uncertainty for the electron, photon, and muon are made from comparisons of the Z boson line shape between data and simulation. Uncertainties in the p_T^{miss} energy scale are estimated by propagating the energy scale uncertainty for each object used in the p_T^{miss} calculation. The total uncertainties in the combined acceptances and efficiencies are 1–2%. The integrated luminosity used for these measurements is $19.4\,\mathrm{fb}^{-1}$ with an uncertainty of 2.6% [29]. A summary of the systematic uncertainties affecting the $W\gamma\gamma$ and $Z\gamma\gamma$ fiducial cross section measurements is reported in Table 3.

The cross sections measured in the electron and muon channels of each analysis are combined, assuming lepton universality, using the method of best linear unbiased estimates [30–32], thereby decreasing the statistical uncertainties. We measure fiducial cross sections of $4.9 \pm 1.4\,\text{(stat)} \pm 1.6\,\text{(syst)} \pm 0.1\,\text{(lumi)}\,\mathrm{fb}$ and $12.7 \pm 1.4\,\text{(stat)} \pm 1.8\,\text{(syst)} \pm 0.3\,\text{(lumi)}\,\mathrm{fb}$ for the $W\gamma\gamma$ and $Z\gamma\gamma$ processes, respectively. The measured cross sections are in agreement with the NLO theoretical predictions of $4.8 \pm 0.5\,\mathrm{fb}$ and $13.0 \pm 1.5\,\mathrm{fb}$ for the $W\gamma\gamma$ and $Z\gamma\gamma$ final states, respectively. The predicted cross sections are calculated within the fiducial phase space given in Table 2 using MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO . Table 4 summarizes these results.

7 Limits on aQGCs

Anomalous QGCs are modeled using a dimension-8 effective field theory parametrization [33]. The effective field theory extends the SM Lagrangian to terms of dimension larger than four. Each additional dimension is suppressed by a power of the energy scale Λ at which the new phenomena appear. The terms in the extended Lagrangian having odd-numbered dimen-

Table 2: Fiducial region definitions for the W$\gamma\gamma$ analysis (upper) and Z$\gamma\gamma$ analysis (lower). The transverse mass m_T is defined as in the event selection, but with $p_\mathrm{T}^{\mathrm{miss}}$ replaced by the neutrino transverse momentum.

Definition of the W$\gamma\gamma$ fiducial region
$p_\mathrm{T}^{\gamma} > 25\,\mathrm{GeV}$, $\lvert\eta^{\gamma}\rvert < 2.5$
$p_\mathrm{T}^{\ell} > 25\,\mathrm{GeV}$, $\lvert\eta^{\ell}\rvert < 2.4$
One candidate lepton and two candidate photons
$m_\mathrm{T} > 40\,\mathrm{GeV}$
$\Delta R(\gamma, \gamma) > 0.4$ and $\Delta R(\gamma, \ell) > 0.4$
Definition of the Z$\gamma\gamma$ fiducial region
$p_\mathrm{T}^{\gamma} > 15\,\mathrm{GeV}$, $\lvert\eta^{\gamma}\rvert < 2.5$
$p_\mathrm{T}^{\ell} > 10\,\mathrm{GeV}$, $\lvert\eta^{\ell}\rvert < 2.4$
Two oppositely charged candidate leptons and two candidate photons
leading $p_\mathrm{T}^{\ell} > 20\,\mathrm{GeV}$
$m_{\ell\ell} > 40\,\mathrm{GeV}$
$\Delta R(\gamma, \gamma) > 0.4$, $\Delta R(\gamma, \ell) > 0.4$, and $\Delta R(\ell, \ell) > 0.4$

Table 3: Systematic and statistical uncertainties affecting the W$\gamma\gamma$ and Z$\gamma\gamma$ fiducial cross section measurements, presented as percentages of the measured cross section.

	W$\gamma\gamma$		Z$\gamma\gamma$	
	e channel	μ channel	ee channel	$\mu\mu$ channel
Systematic uncertainties associated with the simulation				
Simulation statistical uncertainty	2.8	2.4	3.3	2.9
Trigger	0.5	0.3	1.3	1.2
Lepton and photon ID and energy scale	4.1	3.0	5.3	4.3
$p_\mathrm{T}^{\mathrm{miss}}$ scale	1.5	1.4	—	—
Pileup	0.5	0.2	1.3	0.4
PDFs, renorm. and fact. scales	1.5	1.6	1.2	1.3
Systematic uncertainties associated with backgrounds				
Misidentified jet	36.6	37.2	15.1	12.5
Misidentified electron	6.9	—	—	—
Prompt diphoton	6.7	5.8	0.2	0.3
Summary				
Total statistical	47.8	29.6	16.6	13.7
Total systematic	38.3	37.9	16.5	13.7
Integrated luminosity	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.6

Table 4: Measured fiducial cross section for each channel and for the combination of channels for the $W\gamma\gamma$ and $Z\gamma\gamma$ analyses. The combined cross sections assume lepton universality and are given for the decay to a single lepton family (ℓ). The predictions are reported as well.

Channel	Measured fiducial cross section
$W\gamma\gamma \rightarrow e^{\pm}\nu\gamma\gamma$	$4.2 \pm 2.0\,\text{(stat)} \pm 1.6\,\text{(syst)} \pm 0.1\,\text{(lumi)}\,\text{fb}$
$W\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \mu^{\pm}\nu\gamma\gamma$	$6.0 \pm 1.8\,\text{(stat)} \pm 2.3\,\text{(syst)} \pm 0.2\,\text{(lumi)}\,\text{fb}$
$W\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \ell^{\pm}\nu\gamma\gamma$	$4.9 \pm 1.4\,\text{(stat)} \pm 1.6\,\text{(syst)} \pm 0.1\,\text{(lumi)}\,\text{fb}$
$Z\gamma\gamma \rightarrow e^{+}e^{-}\gamma\gamma$	$12.5 \pm 2.1\,\text{(stat)} \pm 2.1\,\text{(syst)} \pm 0.3\,\text{(lumi)}\,\text{fb}$
$Z\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \mu^{+}\mu^{-}\gamma\gamma$	$12.8 \pm 1.8\,\text{(stat)} \pm 1.7\,\text{(syst)} \pm 0.3\,\text{(lumi)}\,\text{fb}$
$Z\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \ell^{+}\ell^{-}\gamma\gamma$	$12.7 \pm 1.4\,\text{(stat)} \pm 1.8\,\text{(syst)} \pm 0.3\,\text{(lumi)}\,\text{fb}$
Channel	Prediction
$W\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \ell^{\pm}\nu\gamma\gamma$	$4.8 \pm 0.5\,\text{fb}$
$Z\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \ell^{+}\ell^{-}\gamma\gamma$	$13.0 \pm 1.5\,\text{fb}$

sionality lead to baryon and lepton number violation and are therefore not considered here. The dimension-8 term is then the lowest-dimension term that produces aQGCs. Fourteen dimension-8 operators contribute to the $WW\gamma\gamma$ vertex [34, 35]. We focus our study on the couplings that contain products of electroweak field strength tensors, in particular those that are constrained by this analysis: $f_{M,2}$, $f_{M,3}$, $f_{T,0}$, $f_{T,1}$, and $f_{T,2}$ [36]. Anomalous QGCs enhance the production of signal events at high momentum scales. To increase sensitivity to these enhancements, limits on aQGCs are obtained using only events in which the leading-photon p_{T} exceeds 70 GeV. Figure 3 shows the predicted yield from an aQGC with $f_{T,0}/\Lambda^4 = 50\,\text{TeV}^{-4}$, compared to the signal and background predictions for the sum of the electron and muon channels. A profile likelihood is used to establish 95% confidence level (CL) intervals for the aQGC parameters. Each coupling is profiled individually, with the other couplings set to their SM values. Since all couplings predict an excess of the data at large photon p_{T}, the observed limits are larger than the expected limits for all couplings. The resulting limits are reported in Table 5.

Table 5: Expected and observed 95% CL limits on anomalous quartic gauge couplings. Limits are obtained using $W\gamma\gamma$ events in which the leading photon p_{T} exceeds 70 GeV.

$W\gamma\gamma$	Expected (TeV^{-4})	Observed (TeV^{-4})
$f_{M,2}/\Lambda^4$	$[-549, 531]$	$[-701, 683]$
$f_{M,3}/\Lambda^4$	$[-916, 950]$	$[-1170, 1220]$
$f_{T,0}/\Lambda^4$	$[-26.5, 27.0]$	$[-33.5, 34.0]$
$f_{T,1}/\Lambda^4$	$[-34.5, 34.8]$	$[-44.3, 44.8]$
$f_{T,2}/\Lambda^4$	$[-74.6, 73.7]$	$[-93.8, 93.2]$

8 Summary

Cross sections have been measured for $W\gamma\gamma$ and $Z\gamma\gamma$ production in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8\,\text{TeV}$ using data corresponding to an integrated luminosity of $19.4\,\text{fb}^{-1}$ collected with the CMS experiment. The cross sections were measured in fiducial regions that are defined by criteria similar to those used to select signal events. The fiducial cross sections are defined for W and Z

Figure 3: Distributions of the leading photon p_T for the W$\gamma\gamma$ analysis with the electron and muon channels summed. The points display the observed data and the histograms give the predictions for the background and signal. The indicated uncertainties in the data points are calculated using Poisson statistics. The hatched area displays the total uncertainty in the sum of these predictions. The expected distribution with the inclusion of an aQGC with $f_{T,0}/\Lambda^4 = 50\,\text{TeV}^{-4}$ is shown as the dashed line. The last bin includes all events in which the leading photon p_T exceeds 70 GeV.

boson decays to a single lepton family. The measured fiducial cross sections for these final states are, respectively, 4.9 ± 2.1 fb and 12.7 ± 2.3 fb, consistent with the NLO theoretical predictions of 4.8 ± 0.5 fb and 13.0 ± 1.5 fb. These measurements correspond to significances for observing the signal of 2.6 and 5.9 standard deviations for the W$\gamma\gamma$ and Z$\gamma\gamma$ final states, respectively. In comparison, the ATLAS experiment measured the W$\gamma\gamma$ and Z$\gamma\gamma$ final states with significances of greater than three standard deviations and equal to 6.3 standard deviations, respectively [1, 2]. The W$\gamma\gamma$ final state is used to place limits at 95% CL on anomalous quartic gauge couplings using a dimension-8 effective field theory. In particular, stringent limits are placed on the $f_{T,0}$ coupling parameter of $-33.5 < f_{T,0}/\Lambda^4 < 34.0\,\text{TeV}^{-4}$.

Acknowledgments

References

[1] ATLAS Collaboration, "Evidence of $W\gamma\gamma$ production in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV and limits on anomalous quartic gauge couplings with the ATLAS detector", *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115** (2015) 031802, `doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.031802`, `arXiv:1503.03243`.

[2] ATLAS Collaboration, "Measurements of $Z\gamma$ and $Z\gamma\gamma$ production in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV with the ATLAS detector", *Phys. Rev. D* **93** (2016) 112002, `doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.112002`, `arXiv:1604.05232`.

[3] G. Bozzi, F. Campanario, M. Rauch, and D. Zeppenfeld, "$W\gamma\gamma$ production with leptonic decays at NLO QCD", *Phys. Rev. D* **83** (2011) 114035, `doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.83.114035`, `arXiv:1103.4613`.

[4] G. Bozzi, F. Campanario, M. Rauch, and D. Zeppenfeld, "$Z\gamma\gamma$ production with leptonic decays and triple photon production at next-to-leading order QCD", *Phys. Rev. D* **84** (2011) 074028, `doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.84.074028`, `arXiv:1107.3149`.

[5] CMS Collaboration, "The CMS experiment at the CERN LHC", *JINST* **3** (2008) S08004, `doi:10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08004`.

[6] CMS Collaboration, "Particle-flow reconstruction and global event description with the CMS detector", (2017). `arXiv:1706.04965`.

[7] CMS Collaboration, "Performance of CMS muon reconstruction in pp collision events at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV", *JINST* **7** (2012) P10002, `doi:10.1088/1748-0221/7/10/P10002`, `arXiv:1206.4071`.

[8] W. Adam, R. Frühwirth, A. Strandlie, and T. Todorov, "Reconstruction of electrons with the Gaussian-sum filter in the CMS tracker at the LHC", *J. Phys. G* **31** (2005) N9, `doi:10.1088/0954-3899/31/9/N01`.

[9] CMS Collaboration, "Performance of electron reconstruction and selection with the CMS detector in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV", *JINST* **10** (2015) P06005, `doi:10.1088/1748-0221/10/06/P06005`, `arXiv:1502.02701`.

[10] CMS Collaboration, "Performance of photon reconstruction and identification with the CMS detector in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV", *JINST* **10** (2015) P08010, `doi:10.1088/1748-0221/10/08/P08010`, `arXiv:1502.02702`.

[11] CMS Collaboration, "Jet energy scale and resolution in the CMS experiment in pp collisions at 8 TeV", *JINST* **12** (2017) P02014, `doi:10.1088/1748-0221/12/02/P02014`, `arXiv:1607.03663`.

[12] CMS Collaboration, "The CMS trigger system", *JINST* **12** (2017) P01020, `doi:10.1088/1748-0221/12/01/P01020`, `arXiv:1609.02366`.

[13] J. Alwall et al., "The automated computation of tree-level and next-to-leading order differential cross sections, and their matching to parton shower simulations", *JHEP* **07** (2014) 079, `doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2014)079`, `arXiv:1405.0301`.

[14] NNPDF Collaboration, "Parton distributions for the LHC run II", *JHEP* **04** (2015) 040, `doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2015)040`, `arXiv:1410.8849`.

[15] T. Sjöstrand, S. Mrenna, and P. Z. Skands, "A brief introduction to PYTHIA 8.1", *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **178** (2008) 852, `doi:10.1016/j.cpc.2008.01.036`, `arXiv:0710.3820`.

[16] P. Skands, S. Carrazza, and J. Rojo, "Tuning PYTHIA 8.1: the Monash 2013 Tune", *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74** (2014) 3024, `doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-014-3024-y`, `arXiv:1404.5630`.

[17] J. Pumplin et al., "New generation of parton distributions with uncertainties from global QCD analysis", *JHEP* **07** (2002) 012, `doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2002/07/012`, `arXiv:hep-ph/0201195`.

[18] T. Sjöstrand, S. Mrenna, and P. Skands, "PYTHIA 6.4 physics and manual", *JHEP* **05** (2006) 026, `doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2006/05/026`, `arXiv:hep-ph/0603175`.

[19] CMS Collaboration, "Study of the underlying event at forward rapidity in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 0.9, 2.76$, and 7 TeV", *JHEP* **04** (2013) 072, `doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2013)072`, `arXiv:1302.2394`.

[20] C. Degrande et al., "UFO — the Universal FEYNRULES Output", *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **183** (2012) 1201, `doi:10.1016/j.cpc.2012.01.022`, `arXiv:1108.2040`.

[21] J. M. Campbell and R. K. Ellis, "MCFM for the Tevatron and the LHC", *Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl.* **205-206** (2010) 10, `doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysbps.2010.08.011`, `arXiv:1007.3492`.

[22] N. Davidson et al., "Universal interface of TAUOLA: Technical and physics documentation", *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **183** (2012) 821, `doi:10.1016/j.cpc.2011.12.009`, `arXiv:1002.0543`.

[23] GEANT4 Collaboration, "GEANT4—a simulation toolkit", *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **506** (2003) 250, `doi:10.1016/S0168-9002(03)01368-8`.

[24] CMS Collaboration, "Description and performance of track and primary-vertex reconstruction with the CMS tracker", *JINST* **9** (2014) P10009, `doi:10.1088/1748-0221/9/10/P10009`, `arXiv:1405.6569`.

[25] M. Grazzini, S. Kallweit, and D. Rathlev, "Wγ and Zγ production at the LHC in NNLO QCD", *JHEP* **07** (2015) 085, `doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2015)085`, `arXiv:1504.01330`.

[26] S. Frixione, "Isolated photons in perturbative QCD", *Phys. Lett. B* **429** (1998) 369, `doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(98)00454-7`, `arXiv:hep-ph/9801442`.

[27] A. D. Martin, W. J. Stirling, R. S. Thorne, and G. Watt, "Parton distributions for the LHC", *Eur. Phys. J. C* **63** (2009) 189, `doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-009-1072-5`, `arXiv:0901.0002`.

[28] H.-L. Lai et al., "New parton distributions for collider physics", *Phys. Rev. D* **82** (2010) 074024, `doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.82.074024`, `arXiv:1007.2241`.

[29] CMS Collaboration, "CMS luminosity based on pixel cluster counting — Summer 2013 update", CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-LUM-13-001, 2013.

[30] L. Lyons, D. Gibaut, and P. Clifford, "How to combine correlated estimates of a single physical quantity", *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **270** (1988) 110, `doi:10.1016/0168-9002(88)90018-6`.

[31] A. Valassi, "Combining correlated measurements of several different physical quantities", *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **500** (2003) 391, `doi:10.1016/S0168-9002(03)00329-2`.

[32] R. Nisius, "On the combination of correlated estimates of a physics observable", *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74** (2014) 3004, `doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-014-3004-2`.

[33] C. Degrande et al., "Effective field theory: A modern approach to anomalous couplings", *Annals Phys.* **335** (2013) 21, `doi:10.1016/j.aop.2013.04.016`, `arXiv:1205.4231`.

[34] G. Belanger et al., "Bosonic quartic couplings at LEP2", *Eur. Phys. J. C* **13** (2000) 293, `doi:10.1007/s100520000305`, `arXiv:hep-ph/9908254`.

[35] O. J. P. Eboli, M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia, and J. K. Mizukoshi, "$pp \to jje^\pm \mu^\pm \nu\nu$ and $jje^\pm \mu^\mp \nu\nu$ at $o(\alpha_{em}^6)$ and $o(\alpha_{em}^4 \alpha_s^2)$ for the study of the quartic electroweak gauge boson vertex at CERN LHC", *Phys. Rev. D* **74** (2006) 073005, `doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.74.073005`, `arXiv:hep-ph/0606118`.

[36] M. Baak et al., "Study of electroweak interactions at the energy frontier", (2013). `arXiv:1310.6708`.

A The CMS Collaboration

Yerevan Physics Institute, Yerevan, Armenia
A.M. Sirunyan, A. Tumasyan

Institut für Hochenergiephysik, Wien, Austria
W. Adam, E. Asilar, T. Bergauer, J. Brandstetter, E. Brondolin, M. Dragicevic, J. Erö, M. Flechl, M. Friedl, R. Frühwirth[1], V.M. Ghete, C. Hartl, N. Hörmann, J. Hrubec, M. Jeitler[1], A. König, I. Krätschmer, D. Liko, T. Matsushita, I. Mikulec, D. Rabady, N. Rad, B. Rahbaran, H. Rohringer, J. Schieck[1], J. Strauss, W. Waltenberger, C.-E. Wulz[1]

Institute for Nuclear Problems, Minsk, Belarus
O. Dvornikov, V. Makarenko, V. Mossolov, J. Suarez Gonzalez, V. Zykunov

National Centre for Particle and High Energy Physics, Minsk, Belarus
N. Shumeiko

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

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

Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium
H. Brun, B. Clerbaux, G. De Lentdecker, H. Delannoy, G. Fasanella, L. Favart, R. Goldouzian, A. Grebenyuk, G. Karapostoli, T. Lenzi, A. Léonard, J. Luetic, T. Maerschalk, A. Marinov, A. Randle-conde, T. Seva, C. Vander Velde, P. Vanlaer, D. Vannerom, R. Yonamine, F. Zenoni, F. Zhang[2]

Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium
T. Cornelis, D. Dobur, A. Fagot, M. Gul, I. Khvastunov, D. Poyraz, S. Salva, R. Schöfbeck, M. Tytgat, W. Van Driessche, W. Verbeke, N. Zaganidis

Université Catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium
H. Bakhshiansohi, O. Bondu, S. Brochet, G. Bruno, A. Caudron, S. De Visscher, C. Delaere, M. Delcourt, B. Francois, A. Giammanco, A. Jafari, M. Komm, G. Krintiras, V. Lemaitre, A. Magitteri, A. Mertens, M. Musich, K. Piotrzkowski, L. Quertenmont, M. Vidal Marono, S. Wertz

Université de Mons, Mons, Belgium
N. Beliy

Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Fisicas, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
W.L. Aldá Júnior, F.L. Alves, G.A. Alves, L. Brito, C. Hensel, A. Moraes, M.E. Pol, P. Rebello Teles

Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
E. Belchior Batista Das Chagas, W. Carvalho, J. Chinellato[3], A. Custódio, E.M. Da Costa, G.G. Da Silveira[4], D. De Jesus Damiao, C. De Oliveira Martins, S. Fonseca De Souza, L.M. Huertas Guativa, H. Malbouisson, D. Matos Figueiredo, C. Mora Herrera, L. Mundim, H. Nogima, W.L. Prado Da Silva, A. Santoro, A. Sznajder, E.J. Tonelli Manganote[3], F. Torres Da Silva De Araujo, A. Vilela Pereira

Universidade Estadual Paulista [a], Universidade Federal do ABC [b], São Paulo, Brazil
S. Ahuja[a], C.A. Bernardes[a], S. Dogra[a], T.R. Fernandez Perez Tomei[a], E.M. Gregores[b], P.G. Mercadante[b], C.S. Moon[a], S.F. Novaes[a], Sandra S. Padula[a], D. Romero Abad[b], J.C. Ruiz Vargas[a]

Institute for Nuclear Research and Nuclear Energy, Sofia, Bulgaria
A. Aleksandrov, R. Hadjiiska, P. Iaydjiev, M. Rodozov, S. Stoykova, G. Sultanov, M. Vutova

University of Sofia, Sofia, Bulgaria
A. Dimitrov, I. Glushkov, L. Litov, B. Pavlov, P. Petkov

Beihang University, Beijing, China
W. Fang[5], X. Gao[5]

Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing, China
M. Ahmad, J.G. Bian, G.M. Chen, H.S. Chen, M. Chen, Y. Chen, T. Cheng, C.H. Jiang, D. Leggat, Z. Liu, F. Romeo, M. Ruan, S.M. Shaheen, A. Spiezia, J. Tao, C. Wang, Z. Wang, E. Yazgan, H. Zhang, J. Zhao

State Key Laboratory of Nuclear Physics and Technology, Peking University, Beijing, China
Y. Ban, G. Chen, Q. Li, S. Liu, Y. Mao, S.J. Qian, D. Wang, Z. Xu

Universidad de Los Andes, Bogota, Colombia
C. Avila, A. Cabrera, L.F. Chaparro Sierra, C. Florez, J.P. Gomez, C.F. González Hernández, J.D. Ruiz Alvarez[6], J.C. Sanabria

University of Split, Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering and Naval Architecture, Split, Croatia
N. Godinovic, D. Lelas, I. Puljak, P.M. Ribeiro Cipriano, T. Sculac

University of Split, Faculty of Science, Split, Croatia
Z. Antunovic, M. Kovac

Institute Rudjer Boskovic, Zagreb, Croatia
V. Brigljevic, D. Ferencek, K. Kadija, B. Mesic, T. Susa

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

Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic
M. Finger[7], M. Finger Jr.[7]

Universidad San Francisco de Quito, Quito, Ecuador
E. Carrera Jarrin

Academy of Scientific Research and Technology of the Arab Republic of Egypt, Egyptian Network of High Energy Physics, Cairo, Egypt
E. El-khateeb[8], S. Elgammal[9], A. Mohamed[10]

National Institute of Chemical Physics and Biophysics, Tallinn, Estonia
M. Kadastik, L. Perrini, M. Raidal, A. Tiko, C. Veelken

Department of Physics, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland
P. Eerola, J. Pekkanen, M. Voutilainen

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

Lappeenranta University of Technology, Lappeenranta, Finland
J. Talvitie, T. Tuuva

IRFU, CEA, Université Paris-Saclay, Gif-sur-Yvette, France
M. Besancon, F. Couderc, M. Dejardin, D. Denegri, B. Fabbro, J.L. Faure, C. Favaro, F. Ferri, S. Ganjour, S. Ghosh, A. Givernaud, P. Gras, G. Hamel de Monchenault, P. Jarry, I. Kucher, E. Locci, M. Machet, J. Malcles, J. Rander, A. Rosowsky, M. Titov

Laboratoire Leprince-Ringuet, Ecole polytechnique, CNRS/IN2P3, Université Paris-Saclay
A. Abdulsalam, I. Antropov, S. Baffioni, F. Beaudette, P. Busson, L. Cadamuro, E. Chapon, C. Charlot, O. Davignon, R. Granier de Cassagnac, M. Jo, S. Lisniak, A. Lobanov, P. Miné, M. Nguyen, C. Ochando, G. Ortona, P. Paganini, P. Pigard, S. Regnard, R. Salerno, Y. Sirois, A.G. Stahl Leiton, T. Strebler, Y. Yilmaz, A. Zabi, A. Zghiche

Université de Strasbourg, CNRS, IPHC UMR 7178, F-67000 Strasbourg, France
J.-L. Agram[11], J. Andrea, D. Bloch, J.-M. Brom, M. Buttignol, E.C. Chabert, N. Chanon, C. Collard, E. Conte[11], X. Coubez, J.-C. Fontaine[11], D. Gelé, U. Goerlach, A.-C. Le Bihan, P. Van Hove

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

Université de Lyon, Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, CNRS-IN2P3, Institut de Physique Nucléaire de Lyon, Villeurbanne, France
S. Beauceron, C. Bernet, G. Boudoul, C.A. Carrillo Montoya, R. Chierici, D. Contardo, B. Courbon, P. Depasse, H. El Mamouni, J. Fay, L. Finco, S. Gascon, M. Gouzevitch, G. Grenier, B. Ille, F. Lagarde, I.B. Laktineh, M. Lethuillier, L. Mirabito, A.L. Pequegnot, S. Perries, A. Popov[12], V. Sordini, M. Vander Donckt, P. Verdier, S. Viret

Georgian Technical University, Tbilisi, Georgia
A. Khvedelidze[7]

Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia
Z. Tsamalaidze[7]

RWTH Aachen University, I. Physikalisches Institut, Aachen, Germany
C. Autermann, S. Beranek, L. Feld, M.K. Kiesel, K. Klein, M. Lipinski, M. Preuten, C. Schomakers, J. Schulz, T. Verlage

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

RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut B, Aachen, Germany
V. Cherepanov, G. Flügge, B. Kargoll, T. Kress, A. Künsken, J. Lingemann, T. Müller, A. Nehrkorn, A. Nowack, C. Pistone, O. Pooth, A. Stahl[13]

Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Hamburg, Germany
M. Aldaya Martin, T. Arndt, C. Asawatangtrakuldee, K. Beernaert, O. Behnke, U. Behrens, A.A. Bin Anuar, K. Borras[14], A. Campbell, P. Connor, C. Contreras-Campana, F. Costanza, C. Diez Pardos, G. Dolinska, G. Eckerlin, D. Eckstein, T. Eichhorn, E. Eren, E. Gallo[15], J. Garay Garcia, A. Geiser, A. Gizhko, J.M. Grados Luyando, A. Grohsjean, P. Gunnellini, A. Harb, J. Hauk, M. Hempel[16], H. Jung, A. Kalogeropoulos, O. Karacheban[16], M. Kasemann, J. Keaveney, C. Kleinwort, I. Korol, D. Krücker, W. Lange, A. Lelek, T. Lenz, J. Leonard, K. Lipka, W. Lohmann[16], R. Mankel, I.-A. Melzer-Pellmann, A.B. Meyer, G. Mittag, J. Mnich, A. Mussgiller, E. Ntomari, D. Pitzl, R. Placakyte, A. Raspereza, B. Roland, M.Ö. Sahin, P. Saxena, T. Schoerner-Sadenius, S. Spannagel, N. Stefaniuk, G.P. Van Onsem, R. Walsh, C. Wissing

University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany
V. Blobel, M. Centis Vignali, A.R. Draeger, T. Dreyer, E. Garutti, D. Gonzalez, J. Haller, M. Hoffmann, A. Junkes, R. Klanner, R. Kogler, N. Kovalchuk, S. Kurz, T. Lapsien, I. Marchesini, D. Marconi, M. Meyer, M. Niedziela, D. Nowatschin, F. Pantaleo[13], T. Peiffer, A. Perieanu, C. Scharf, P. Schleper, A. Schmidt, S. Schumann, J. Schwandt, J. Sonneveld, H. Stadie, G. Steinbrück, F.M. Stober, M. Stöver, H. Tholen, D. Troendle, E. Usai, L. Vanelderen, A. Vanhoefer, B. Vormwald

Institut für Experimentelle Kernphysik, Karlsruhe, Germany
M. Akbiyik, C. Barth, S. Baur, C. Baus, J. Berger, E. Butz, R. Caspart, T. Chwalek, F. Colombo, W. De Boer, A. Dierlamm, S. Fink, B. Freund, R. Friese, M. Giffels, A. Gilbert, P. Goldenzweig, D. Haitz, F. Hartmann[13], S.M. Heindl, U. Husemann, F. Kassel[13], I. Katkov[12], S. Kudella, H. Mildner, M.U. Mozer, Th. Müller, M. Plagge, G. Quast, K. Rabbertz, S. Röcker, F. Roscher, M. Schröder, I. Shvetsov, G. Sieber, H.J. Simonis, R. Ulrich, S. Wayand, M. Weber, T. Weiler, S. Williamson, C. Wöhrmann, R. Wolf

Institute of Nuclear and Particle Physics (INPP), NCSR Demokritos, Aghia Paraskevi, Greece
G. Anagnostou, G. Daskalakis, T. Geralis, V.A. Giakoumopoulou, A. Kyriakis, D. Loukas, I. Topsis-Giotis

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece
S. Kesisoglou, A. Panagiotou, N. Saoulidou, E. Tziaferi

National Technical University of Athens, Athens, Greece
K. Kousouris

University of Ioánnina, Ioánnina, Greece
I. Evangelou, G. Flouris, C. Foudas, P. Kokkas, N. Loukas, N. Manthos, I. Papadopoulos, E. Paradas, F.A. Triantis

MTA-ELTE Lendület CMS Particle and Nuclear Physics Group, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary
N. Filipovic, G. Pasztor

Wigner Research Centre for Physics, Budapest, Hungary
G. Bencze, C. Hajdu, D. Horvath[17], F. Sikler, V. Veszpremi, G. Vesztergombi[18], A.J. Zsigmond

Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary
N. Beni, S. Czellar, J. Karancsi[19], A. Makovec, J. Molnar, Z. Szillasi

Institute of Physics, University of Debrecen
M. Bartók[18], P. Raics, Z.L. Trocsanyi, B. Ujvari

Indian Institute of Science (IISc)
S. Choudhury, J.R. Komaragiri

National Institute of Science Education and Research, Bhubaneswar, India
S. Bahinipati[20], S. Bhowmik[21], P. Mal, K. Mandal, A. Nayak[22], D.K. Sahoo[20], N. Sahoo, S.K. Swain

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

University of Delhi, Delhi, India
Ashok Kumar, A. Bhardwaj, B.C. Choudhary, R.B. Garg, S. Keshri, A. Kumar, S. Malhotra, M. Naimuddin, K. Ranjan, R. Sharma, V. Sharma

Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, Kolkata, India
R. Bhattacharya, S. Bhattacharya, K. Chatterjee, S. Dey, S. Dutt, S. Dutta, S. Ghosh, N. Majumdar, A. Modak, K. Mondal, S. Mukhopadhyay, S. Nandan, A. Purohit, A. Roy, D. Roy, S. Roy Chowdhury, S. Sarkar, M. Sharan, S. Thakur

Indian Institute of Technology Madras, Madras, India
P.K. Behera

Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, Mumbai, India
R. Chudasama, D. Dutta, V. Jha, V. Kumar, A.K. Mohanty[13], P.K. Netrakanti, L.M. Pant, P. Shukla, A. Topkar

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-A, Mumbai, India
T. Aziz, S. Dugad, G. Kole, B. Mahakud, S. Mitra, G.B. Mohanty, B. Parida, N. Sur, B. Sutar

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-B, Mumbai, India
S. Banerjee, R.K. Dewanjee, S. Ganguly, M. Guchait, Sa. Jain, S. Kumar, M. Maity[21], G. Majumder, K. Mazumdar, T. Sarkar[21], N. Wickramage[23]

Indian Institute of Science Education and Research (IISER), Pune, India
S. Chauhan, S. Dube, V. Hegde, A. Kapoor, K. Kothekar, S. Pandey, A. Rane, S. Sharma

Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM), Tehran, Iran
S. Chenarani[24], E. Eskandari Tadavani, S.M. Etesami[24], M. Khakzad, M. Mohammadi Najafabadi, M. Naseri, S. Paktinat Mehdiabadi[25], F. Rezaei Hosseinabadi, B. Safarzadeh[26], M. Zeinali

University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland
M. Felcini, M. Grunewald

INFN Sezione di Bari ^{a}, Università di Bari ^{b}, Politecnico di Bari ^{c}, Bari, Italy
M. Abbrescia^{a,b}, C. Calabria^{a,b}, C. Caputo^{a,b}, A. Colaleo^a, D. Creanza^{a,c}, L. Cristella^{a,b}, N. De Filippis^{a,c}, M. De Palma^{a,b}, L. Fiore^a, G. Iaselli^{a,c}, G. Maggi^{a,c}, M. Maggi^a, G. Miniello^{a,b}, S. My^{a,b}, S. Nuzzo^{a,b}, A. Pompili^{a,b}, G. Pugliese^{a,c}, R. Radogna^{a,b}, A. Ranieri^a, G. Selvaggi^{a,b}, A. Sharma^a, L. Silvestris^{a,13}, R. Venditti^a, P. Verwilligen^a

INFN Sezione di Bologna ^{a}, Università di Bologna ^{b}, Bologna, Italy
G. Abbiendi^a, C. Battilana, D. Bonacorsi^{a,b}, S. Braibant-Giacomelli^{a,b}, L. Brigliadori^{a,b},

R. Campanini[a,b], P. Capiluppi[a,b], A. Castro[a,b], F.R. Cavallo[a], S.S. Chhibra[a,b], G. Codispoti[a,b], M. Cuffiani[a,b], G.M. Dallavalle[a], F. Fabbri[a], A. Fanfani[a,b], D. Fasanella[a,b], P. Giacomelli[a], C. Grandi[a], L. Guiducci[a,b], S. Marcellini[a], G. Masetti[a], A. Montanari[a], F.L. Navarria[a,b], A. Perrotta[a], A.M. Rossi[a,b], T. Rovelli[a,b], G.P. Siroli[a,b], N. Tosi[a,b,13]

INFN Sezione di Catania [a], Università di Catania [b], Catania, Italy
S. Albergo[a,b], S. Costa[a,b], A. Di Mattia[a], F. Giordano[a,b], R. Potenza[a,b], A. Tricomi[a,b], C. Tuve[a,b]

INFN Sezione di Firenze [a], Università di Firenze [b], Firenze, Italy
G. Barbagli[a], V. Ciulli[a,b], C. Civinini[a], R. D'Alessandro[a,b], E. Focardi[a,b], P. Lenzi[a,b], M. Meschini[a], S. Paoletti[a], L. Russo[a,27], G. Sguazzoni[a], D. Strom[a], L. Viliani[a,b,13]

INFN Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, Frascati, Italy
L. Benussi, S. Bianco, F. Fabbri, D. Piccolo, F. Primavera[13]

INFN Sezione di Genova [a], Università di Genova [b], Genova, Italy
V. Calvelli[a,b], F. Ferro[a], M.R. Monge[a,b], E. Robutti[a], S. Tosi[a,b]

INFN Sezione di Milano-Bicocca [a], Università di Milano-Bicocca [b], Milano, Italy
L. Brianza[a,b,13], F. Brivio[a,b], V. Ciriolo, M.E. Dinardo[a,b], S. Fiorendi[a,b,13], S. Gennai[a], A. Ghezzi[a,b], P. Govoni[a,b], M. Malberti[a,b], S. Malvezzi[a], R.A. Manzoni[a,b], D. Menasce[a], L. Moroni[a], M. Paganoni[a,b], D. Pedrini[a], S. Pigazzini[a,b], S. Ragazzi[a,b], T. Tabarelli de Fatis[a,b]

INFN Sezione di Napoli [a], Università di Napoli 'Federico II' [b], Napoli, Italy, Università della Basilicata [c], Potenza, Italy, Università G. Marconi [d], Roma, Italy
S. Buontempo[a], N. Cavallo[a,c], G. De Nardo[a,b], S. Di Guida[a,d,13], M. Esposito[a,b], F. Fabozzi[a,c], F. Fienga[a,b], A.O.M. Iorio[a,b], G. Lanza[a], L. Lista[a], S. Meola[a,d,13], P. Paolucci[a,13], C. Sciacca[a,b], F. Thyssen[a]

INFN Sezione di Padova [a], Università di Padova [b], Padova, Italy, Università di Trento [c], Trento, Italy
P. Azzi[a,13], N. Bacchetta[a], L. Benato[a,b], D. Bisello[a,b], A. Boletti[a,b], R. Carlin[a,b], P. Checchia[a], M. Dall'Osso[a,b], P. De Castro Manzano[a], T. Dorigo[a], F. Gasparini[a,b], U. Gasparini[a,b], A. Gozzelino[a], S. Lacaprara[a], M. Margoni[a,b], A.T. Meneguzzo[a,b], M. Michelotto[a], J. Pazzini[a,b], N. Pozzobon[a,b], P. Ronchese[a,b], R. Rossin[a,b], F. Simonetto[a,b], E. Torassa[a], S. Ventura[a], M. Zanetti[a,b], P. Zotto[a,b]

INFN Sezione di Pavia [a], Università di Pavia [b], Pavia, Italy
A. Braghieri[a], F. Fallavollita[a,b], A. Magnani[a,b], P. Montagna[a,b], S.P. Ratti[a,b], V. Re[a], M. Ressegotti, C. Riccardi[a,b], P. Salvini[a], I. Vai[a,b], P. Vitulo[a,b]

INFN Sezione di Perugia [a], Università di Perugia [b], Perugia, Italy
L. Alunni Solestizi[a,b], G.M. Bilei[a], D. Ciangottini[a,b], L. Fanò[a,b], P. Lariccia[a,b], R. Leonardi[a,b], G. Mantovani[a,b], V. Mariani[a,b], M. Menichelli[a], A. Saha[a], A. Santocchia[a,b]

INFN Sezione di Pisa [a], Università di Pisa [b], Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa [c], Pisa, Italy
K. Androsov[a], P. Azzurri[a,13], G. Bagliesi[a], J. Bernardini[a], T. Boccali[a], R. Castaldi[a], M.A. Ciocci[a,b], R. Dell'Orso[a], G. Fedi[a], A. Giassi[a], M.T. Grippo[a,27], F. Ligabue[a,c], T. Lomtadze[a], L. Martini[a,b], A. Messineo[a,b], F. Palla[a], A. Rizzi[a,b], A. Savoy-Navarro[a,28], P. Spagnolo[a], R. Tenchini[a], G. Tonelli[a,b], A. Venturi[a], P.G. Verdini[a]

INFN Sezione di Roma [a], Università di Roma [b], Roma, Italy
L. Barone[a,b], F. Cavallari[a], M. Cipriani[a,b], D. Del Re[a,b,13], M. Diemoz[a], S. Gelli[a,b], E. Longo[a,b], F. Margaroli[a,b], B. Marzocchi[a,b], P. Meridiani[a], G. Organtini[a,b], R. Paramatti[a,b], F. Preiato[a,b], S. Rahatlou[a,b], C. Rovelli[a], F. Santanastasio[a,b]

INFN Sezione di Torino [a]**, Università di Torino** [b]**, Torino, Italy, Università del Piemonte Orientale** [c]**, Novara, Italy**
N. Amapane[a,b], R. Arcidiacono[a,c,13], S. Argiro[a,b], M. Arneodo[a,c], N. Bartosik[a], R. Bellan[a,b], C. Biino[a], N. Cartiglia[a], F. Cenna[a,b], M. Costa[a,b], R. Covarelli[a,b], A. Degano[a,b], N. Demaria[a], B. Kiani[a,b], C. Mariotti[a], S. Maselli[a], E. Migliore[a,b], V. Monaco[a,b], E. Monteil[a,b], M. Monteno[a], M.M. Obertino[a,b], L. Pacher[a,b], N. Pastrone[a], M. Pelliccioni[a], G.L. Pinna Angioni[a,b], F. Ravera[a,b], A. Romero[a,b], M. Ruspa[a,c], R. Sacchi[a,b], K. Shchelina[a,b], V. Sola[a], A. Solano[a,b], A. Staiano[a], P. Traczyk[a,b]

INFN Sezione di Trieste [a]**, Università di Trieste** [b]**, Trieste, Italy**
S. Belforte[a], M. Casarsa[a], F. Cossutti[a], G. Della Ricca[a,b], A. Zanetti[a]

Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea
D.H. Kim, G.N. Kim, M.S. Kim, J. Lee, S. Lee, S.W. Lee, Y.D. Oh, S. Sekmen, D.C. Son, Y.C. Yang

Chonbuk National University, Jeonju, Korea
A. Lee

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

Hanyang University, Seoul, Korea
J.A. Brochero Cifuentes, J. Goh, T.J. Kim

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

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

University of Seoul, Seoul, Korea
M. Choi, H. Kim, J.H. Kim, J.S.H. Lee, I.C. Park, G. Ryu, M.S. Ryu

Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon, Korea
Y. Choi, C. Hwang, J. Lee, I. Yu

Vilnius University, Vilnius, Lithuania
V. Dudenas, A. Juodagalvis, J. Vaitkus

National Centre for Particle Physics, Universiti Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
I. Ahmed, Z.A. Ibrahim, M.A.B. Md Ali[29], F. Mohamad Idris[30], W.A.T. Wan Abdullah, M.N. Yusli, Z. Zolkapli

Centro de Investigacion y de Estudios Avanzados del IPN, Mexico City, Mexico
H. Castilla-Valdez, E. De La Cruz-Burelo, I. Heredia-De La Cruz[31], R. Lopez-Fernandez, R. Magaña Villalba, J. Mejia Guisao, A. Sanchez-Hernandez

Universidad Iberoamericana, Mexico City, Mexico
S. Carrillo Moreno, C. Oropeza Barrera, F. Vazquez Valencia

Benemerita Universidad Autonoma de Puebla, Puebla, Mexico
S. Carpinteyro, I. Pedraza, H.A. Salazar Ibarguen, C. Uribe Estrada

Universidad Autónoma de San Luis Potosí, San Luis Potosí, Mexico
A. Morelos Pineda

University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand
D. Krofcheck

University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand
P.H. Butler

National Centre for Physics, Quaid-I-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan
A. Ahmad, M. Ahmad, Q. Hassan, H.R. Hoorani, W.A. Khan, A. Saddique, M.A. Shah, M. Shoaib, M. Waqas

National Centre for Nuclear Research, Swierk, Poland
H. Bialkowska, M. Bluj, B. Boimska, T. Frueboes, M. Górski, M. Kazana, K. Nawrocki, K. Romanowska-Rybinska, M. Szleper, P. Zalewski

Institute of Experimental Physics, Faculty of Physics, University of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland
K. Bunkowski, A. Byszuk[32], K. Doroba, A. Kalinowski, M. Konecki, J. Krolikowski, M. Misiura, M. Olszewski, A. Pyskir, M. Walczak

Laboratório de Instrumentação e Física Experimental de Partículas, Lisboa, Portugal
P. Bargassa, C. Beirão Da Cruz E Silva, B. Calpas, A. Di Francesco, P. Faccioli, M. Gallinaro, J. Hollar, N. Leonardo, L. Lloret Iglesias, M.V. Nemallapudi, J. Seixas, O. Toldaiev, D. Vadruccio, J. Varela

Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia
S. Afanasiev, P. Bunin, M. Gavrilenko, I. Golutvin, I. Gorbunov, A. Kamenev, V. Karjavin, A. Lanev, A. Malakhov, V. Matveev[33,34], V. Palichik, V. Perelygin, S. Shmatov, S. Shulha, N. Skatchkov, V. Smirnov, N. Voytishin, A. Zarubin

Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, Gatchina (St. Petersburg), Russia
L. Chtchipounov, V. Golovtsov, Y. Ivanov, V. Kim[35], E. Kuznetsova[36], V. Murzin, V. Oreshkin, V. Sulimov, A. Vorobyev

Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia
Yu. Andreev, A. Dermenev, S. Gninenko, N. Golubev, A. Karneyeu, M. Kirsanov, N. Krasnikov, A. Pashenkov, D. Tlisov, A. Toropin

Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia
V. Epshteyn, V. Gavrilov, N. Lychkovskaya, V. Popov, I. Pozdnyakov, G. Safronov, A. Spiridonov, M. Toms, E. Vlasov, A. Zhokin

Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Moscow, Russia
T. Aushev, A. Bylinkin[34]

National Research Nuclear University 'Moscow Engineering Physics Institute' (MEPhI), Moscow, Russia
M. Chadeeva[37], V. Rusinov, E. Tarkovskii

P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia
V. Andreev, M. Azarkin[34], I. Dremin[34], M. Kirakosyan, A. Leonidov[34], A. Terkulov

Skobeltsyn Institute of Nuclear Physics, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia
A. Baskakov, A. Belyaev, E. Boos, M. Dubinin[38], L. Dudko, A. Ershov, A. Gribushin, V. Klyukhin, O. Kodolova, I. Lokhtin, I. Miagkov, S. Obraztsov, S. Petrushanko, V. Savrin, A. Snigirev

Novosibirsk State University (NSU), Novosibirsk, Russia
V. Blinov[39], Y.Skovpen[39], D. Shtol[39]

State Research Center of Russian Federation, Institute for High Energy Physics, Protvino, Russia
I. Azhgirey, I. Bayshev, S. Bitioukov, D. Elumakhov, V. Kachanov, A. Kalinin, D. Konstantinov, V. Krychkine, V. Petrov, R. Ryutin, A. Sobol, S. Troshin, N. Tyurin, A. Uzunian, A. Volkov

University of Belgrade, Faculty of Physics and Vinca Institute of Nuclear Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia
P. Adzic[40], P. Cirkovic, D. Devetak, M. Dordevic, J. Milosevic, V. Rekovic

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

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain
J.F. de Trocóniz, M. Missiroli, D. Moran

Universidad de Oviedo, Oviedo, Spain
J. Cuevas, C. Erice, J. Fernandez Menendez, I. Gonzalez Caballero, J.R. González Fernández, E. Palencia Cortezon, S. Sanchez Cruz, I. Suárez Andrés, P. Vischia, J.M. Vizan Garcia

Instituto de Física de Cantabria (IFCA), CSIC-Universidad de Cantabria, Santander, Spain
I.J. Cabrillo, A. Calderon, E. Curras, M. Fernandez, J. Garcia-Ferrero, G. Gomez, A. Lopez Virto, J. Marco, C. Martinez Rivero, F. Matorras, J. Piedra Gomez, T. Rodrigo, A. Ruiz-Jimeno, L. Scodellaro, N. Trevisani, I. Vila, R. Vilar Cortabitarte

CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland
D. Abbaneo, E. Auffray, G. Auzinger, P. Baillon, A.H. Ball, D. Barney, P. Bloch, A. Bocci, C. Botta, T. Camporesi, R. Castello, M. Cepeda, G. Cerminara, Y. Chen, A. Cimmino, D. d'Enterria, A. Dabrowski, V. Daponte, A. David, M. De Gruttola, A. De Roeck, E. Di Marco[41], M. Dobson, B. Dorney, T. du Pree, M. Dünser, N. Dupont, A. Elliott-Peisert, P. Everaerts, S. Fartoukh, G. Franzoni, J. Fulcher, W. Funk, D. Gigi, K. Gill, M. Girone, F. Glege, D. Gulhan, S. Gundacker, M. Guthoff, P. Harris, J. Hegeman, V. Innocente, P. Janot, J. Kieseler, H. Kirschenmann, V. Knünz, A. Kornmayer[13], M.J. Kortelainen, M. Krammer[1], C. Lange, P. Lecoq, C. Lourenço, M.T. Lucchini, L. Malgeri, M. Mannelli, A. Martelli, F. Meijers, J.A. Merlin, S. Mersi, E. Meschi, P. Milenovic[42], F. Moortgat, S. Morovic, M. Mulders, H. Neugebauer, S. Orfanelli, L. Orsini, L. Pape, E. Perez, M. Peruzzi, A. Petrilli, G. Petrucciani, A. Pfeiffer, M. Pierini, A. Racz, T. Reis, G. Rolandi[43], M. Rovere, H. Sakulin, J.B. Sauvan, C. Schäfer, C. Schwick, M. Seidel, M. Selvaggi, A. Sharma, P. Silva, P. Sphicas[44], J. Steggemann, M. Stoye, Y. Takahashi, M. Tosi, D. Treille, A. Triossi, A. Tsirou, V. Veckalns[45], G.I. Veres[18], M. Verweij, N. Wardle, H.K. Wöhri, A. Zagozdzinska[32], W.D. Zeuner

Paul Scherrer Institut, Villigen, Switzerland
W. Bertl, K. Deiters, W. Erdmann, R. Horisberger, Q. Ingram, H.C. Kaestli, D. Kotlinski, U. Langenegger, T. Rohe, S.A. Wiederkehr

Institute for Particle Physics, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland
F. Bachmair, L. Bäni, L. Bianchini, B. Casal, G. Dissertori, M. Dittmar, M. Donegà, C. Grab,

C. Heidegger, D. Hits, J. Hoss, G. Kasieczka, W. Lustermann, B. Mangano, M. Marionneau, P. Martinez Ruiz del Arbol, M. Masciovecchio, M.T. Meinhard, D. Meister, F. Micheli, P. Musella, F. Nessi-Tedaldi, F. Pandolfi, J. Pata, F. Pauss, G. Perrin, L. Perrozzi, M. Quittnat, M. Rossini, M. Schönenberger, A. Starodumov[46], V.R. Tavolaro, K. Theofilatos, R. Wallny

Universität Zürich, Zurich, Switzerland
T.K. Aarrestad, C. Amsler[47], L. Caminada, M.F. Canelli, A. De Cosa, S. Donato, C. Galloni, A. Hinzmann, T. Hreus, B. Kilminster, J. Ngadiuba, D. Pinna, G. Rauco, P. Robmann, D. Salerno, C. Seitz, Y. Yang, A. Zucchetta

National Central University, Chung-Li, Taiwan
V. Candelise, T.H. Doan, Sh. Jain, R. Khurana, M. Konyushikhin, C.M. Kuo, W. Lin, A. Pozdnyakov, S.S. Yu

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

Chulalongkorn University, Faculty of Science, Department of Physics, Bangkok, Thailand
B. Asavapibhop, G. Singh, N. Srimanobhas, N. Suwonjandee

Cukurova University - Physics Department, Science and Art Faculty
A. Adiguzel, F. Boran, S. Damarseckin, Z.S. Demiroglu, C. Dozen, E. Eskut, S. Girgis, G. Gokbulut, Y. Guler, I. Hos[48], E.E. Kangal[49], O. Kara, A. Kayis Topaksu, U. Kiminsu, M. Oglakci, G. Onengut[50], K. Ozdemir[51], S. Ozturk[52], A. Polatoz, B. Tali[53], S. Turkcapar, I.S. Zorbakir, C. Zorbilmez

Middle East Technical University, Physics Department, Ankara, Turkey
B. Bilin, B. Isildak[54], G. Karapinar[55], M. Yalvac, M. Zeyrek

Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey
E. Gülmez, M. Kaya[56], O. Kaya[57], E.A. Yetkin[58], T. Yetkin[59]

Istanbul Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey
A. Cakir, K. Cankocak, S. Sen[60]

Institute for Scintillation Materials of National Academy of Science of Ukraine, Kharkov, Ukraine
B. Grynyov

National Scientific Center, Kharkov Institute of Physics and Technology, Kharkov, Ukraine
L. Levchuk, P. Sorokin

University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom
R. Aggleton, F. Ball, L. Beck, J.J. Brooke, D. Burns, E. Clement, D. Cussans, H. Flacher, J. Goldstein, M. Grimes, G.P. Heath, H.F. Heath, J. Jacob, L. Kreczko, C. Lucas, D.M. Newbold[61], S. Paramesvaran, A. Poll, T. Sakuma, S. Seif El Nasr-storey, D. Smith, V.J. Smith

Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom
K.W. Bell, A. Belyaev[62], C. Brew, R.M. Brown, L. Calligaris, D. Cieri, D.J.A. Cockerill, J.A. Coughlan, K. Harder, S. Harper, E. Olaiya, D. Petyt, C.H. Shepherd-Themistocleous, A. Thea, I.R. Tomalin, T. Williams

Imperial College, London, United Kingdom
M. Baber, R. Bainbridge, O. Buchmuller, A. Bundock, S. Casasso, M. Citron, D. Colling, L. Corpe, P. Dauncey, G. Davies, A. De Wit, M. Della Negra, R. Di Maria, P. Dunne,

A. Elwood, D. Futyan, Y. Haddad, G. Hall, G. Iles, T. James, R. Lane, C. Laner, L. Lyons, A.-M. Magnan, S. Malik, L. Mastrolorenzo, J. Nash, A. Nikitenko[46], J. Pela, B. Penning, M. Pesaresi, D.M. Raymond, A. Richards, A. Rose, E. Scott, C. Seez, S. Summers, A. Tapper, K. Uchida, M. Vazquez Acosta[63], T. Virdee[13], J. Wright, S.C. Zenz

Brunel University, Uxbridge, United Kingdom
J.E. Cole, P.R. Hobson, A. Khan, P. Kyberd, I.D. Reid, P. Symonds, L. Teodorescu, M. Turner

Baylor University, Waco, USA
A. Borzou, K. Call, J. Dittmann, K. Hatakeyama, H. Liu, N. Pastika

Catholic University of America
R. Bartek, A. Dominguez

The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, USA
A. Buccilli, S.I. Cooper, C. Henderson, P. Rumerio, C. West

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

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

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

University of California, Los Angeles, USA
M. Bachtis, C. Bravo, R. Cousins, A. Dasgupta, A. Florent, J. Hauser, M. Ignatenko, N. Mccoll, D. Saltzberg, C. Schnaible, V. Valuev, M. Weber

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

University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, USA
J.G. Branson, G.B. Cerati, S. Cittolin, M. Derdzinski, R. Gerosa, A. Holzner, D. Klein, V. Krutelyov, J. Letts, I. Macneill, D. Olivito, S. Padhi, M. Pieri, M. Sani, V. Sharma, S. Simon, M. Tadel, A. Vartak, S. Wasserbaech[64], C. Welke, J. Wood, F. Würthwein, A. Yagil, G. Zevi Della Porta

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

California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA
D. Anderson, J. Bendavid, A. Bornheim, J. Bunn, J.M. Lawhorn, A. Mott, H.B. Newman, C. Pena, M. Spiropulu, J.R. Vlimant, S. Xie, R.Y. Zhu

Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, USA
M.B. Andrews, T. Ferguson, M. Paulini, J. Russ, M. Sun, H. Vogel, I. Vorobiev, M. Weinberg

University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, USA
J.P. Cumalat, W.T. Ford, F. Jensen, A. Johnson, M. Krohn, S. Leontsinis, T. Mulholland, K. Stenson, S.R. Wagner

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

Fairfield University, Fairfield, USA
D. Winn

Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, USA
S. Abdullin, M. Albrow, G. Apollinari, A. Apresyan, S. Banerjee, L.A.T. Bauerdick, A. Beretvas, J. Berryhill, P.C. Bhat, G. Bolla, K. Burkett, J.N. Butler, H.W.K. Cheung, F. Chlebana, S. Cihangir[†], M. Cremonesi, J. Duarte, V.D. Elvira, I. Fisk, J. Freeman, E. Gottschalk, L. Gray, D. Green, S. Grünendahl, O. Gutsche, R.M. Harris, S. Hasegawa, J. Hirschauer, Z. Hu, B. Jayatilaka, S. Jindariani, M. Johnson, U. Joshi, B. Klima, B. Kreis, S. Lammel, J. Linacre, D. Lincoln, R. Lipton, M. Liu, T. Liu, R. Lopes De Sá, J. Lykken, K. Maeshima, N. Magini, J.M. Marraffino, S. Maruyama, D. Mason, P. McBride, P. Merkel, S. Mrenna, S. Nahn, V. O'Dell, K. Pedro, O. Prokofyev, G. Rakness, L. Ristori, 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, Y. Wu

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

Florida International University, Miami, USA
S. Linn, P. Markowitz, G. Martinez, J.L. Rodriguez

Florida State University, Tallahassee, USA
A. Ackert, T. Adams, A. Askew, S. Bein, S. Hagopian, V. Hagopian, K.F. Johnson, T. Kolberg, T. Perry, H. Prosper, A. Santra, R. Yohay

Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, USA
M.M. Baarmand, V. Bhopatkar, S. Colafranceschi, M. Hohlmann, D. Noonan, T. Roy, F. Yumiceva

University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC), Chicago, USA
M.R. Adams, L. Apanasevich, D. Berry, R.R. Betts, R. Cavanaugh, X. Chen, O. Evdokimov, C.E. Gerber, D.A. Hangal, D.J. Hofman, K. Jung, J. Kamin, I.D. Sandoval Gonzalez, H. Trauger, N. Varelas, H. Wang, Z. Wu, J. Zhang

The University of Iowa, Iowa City, USA
B. Bilki[65], W. Clarida, K. Dilsiz, S. Durgut, R.P. Gandrajula, M. Haytmyradov, V. Khristenko, J.-P. Merlo, H. Mermerkaya[66], A. Mestvirishvili, A. Moeller, J. Nachtman, H. Ogul, Y. Onel, F. Ozok[67], A. Penzo, C. Snyder, E. Tiras, J. Wetzel, K. Yi

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

The University of Kansas, Lawrence, USA
A. Al-bataineh, P. Baringer, A. Bean, S. Boren, J. Bowen, J. Castle, L. Forthomme, S. Khalil, A. Kropivnitskaya, D. Majumder, W. Mcbrayer, M. Murray, S. Sanders, R. Stringer, J.D. Tapia Takaki, Q. Wang

Kansas State University, Manhattan, USA
A. Ivanov, K. Kaadze, Y. Maravin, A. Mohammadi, L.K. Saini, N. Skhirtladze, S. Toda

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, USA
F. Rebassoo, D. Wright

University of Maryland, College Park, USA
C. Anelli, A. Baden, O. Baron, A. Belloni, B. Calvert, S.C. Eno, C. Ferraioli, N.J. Hadley, S. Jabeen, G.Y. Jeng, R.G. Kellogg, J. Kunkle, A.C. Mignerey, F. Ricci-Tam, Y.H. Shin, A. Skuja, M.B. Tonjes, S.C. Tonwar

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, USA
D. Abercrombie, B. Allen, A. Apyan, V. Azzolini, R. Barbieri, A. Baty, R. Bi, K. Bierwagen, S. Brandt, W. Busza, I.A. Cali, M. D'Alfonso, Z. Demiragli, G. Gomez Ceballos, M. Goncharov, D. Hsu, Y. Iiyama, G.M. Innocenti, M. Klute, D. Kovalskyi, K. Krajczar, Y.S. Lai, Y.-J. Lee, A. Levin, P.D. Luckey, B. Maier, A.C. Marini, C. Mcginn, C. Mironov, S. Narayanan, X. Niu, C. Paus, C. Roland, G. Roland, J. Salfeld-Nebgen, G.S.F. Stephans, K. Tatar, D. Velicanu, J. Wang, T.W. Wang, B. Wyslouch

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, USA
A.C. Benvenuti, R.M. Chatterjee, A. Evans, P. Hansen, S. Kalafut, S.C. Kao, Y. Kubota, Z. Lesko, J. Mans, S. Nourbakhsh, N. Ruckstuhl, R. Rusack, N. Tambe, J. Turkewitz

University of Mississippi, Oxford, USA
J.G. Acosta, S. Oliveros

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, USA
E. Avdeeva, K. Bloom, D.R. Claes, C. Fangmeier, R. Gonzalez Suarez, R. Kamalieddin, I. Kravchenko, A. Malta Rodrigues, J. Monroy, J.E. Siado, G.R. Snow, B. Stieger

State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, USA
M. Alyari, J. Dolen, A. Godshalk, C. Harrington, I. Iashvili, D. Nguyen, A. Parker, S. Rappoccio, B. Roozbahani

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

Northwestern University, Evanston, USA
S. Bhattacharya, O. Charaf, K.A. Hahn, N. Mucia, N. Odell, B. Pollack, M.H. Schmitt, K. Sung, M. Trovato, M. Velasco

University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, USA
N. Dev, M. Hildreth, K. Hurtado Anampa, C. Jessop, D.J. Karmgard, N. Kellams, K. Lannon, N. Marinelli, F. Meng, C. Mueller, Y. Musienko[33], M. Planer, A. Reinsvold, R. Ruchti, N. Rupprecht, G. Smith, S. Taroni, M. Wayne, M. Wolf, A. Woodard

The Ohio State University, Columbus, USA
J. Alimena, L. Antonelli, B. Bylsma, L.S. Durkin, S. Flowers, B. Francis, A. Hart, C. Hill, W. Ji, B. Liu, W. Luo, D. Puigh, B.L. Winer, H.W. Wulsin

Princeton University, Princeton, USA
S. Cooperstein, O. Driga, P. Elmer, J. Hardenbrook, P. Hebda, D. Lange, J. Luo, D. Marlow, T. Medvedeva, K. Mei, I. Ojalvo, J. Olsen, C. Palmer, P. Piroué, D. Stickland, A. Svyatkovskiy, C. Tully

University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez, USA
S. Malik

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

Purdue University Northwest, Hammond, USA
N. Parashar, J. Stupak

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

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

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, Piscataway, USA
A. Agapitos, J.P. Chou, Y. Gershtein, T.A. Gómez Espinosa, E. Halkiadakis, M. Heindl, E. Hughes, S. Kaplan, R. Kunnawalkam Elayavalli, S. Kyriacou, A. Lath, R. Montalvo, K. Nash, M. Osherson, H. Saka, S. Salur, S. Schnetzer, D. Sheffield, S. Somalwar, R. Stone, S. Thomas, P. Thomassen, M. Walker

University of Tennessee, Knoxville, USA
A.G. Delannoy, M. Foerster, J. Heideman, G. Riley, K. Rose, S. Spanier, K. Thapa

Texas A&M University, College Station, USA
O. Bouhali[68], A. Celik, M. Dalchenko, M. De Mattia, A. Delgado, S. Dildick, R. Eusebi, J. Gilmore, T. Huang, E. Juska, T. Kamon[69], R. Mueller, Y. Pakhotin, R. Patel, A. Perloff, L. Perniè, D. Rathjens, A. Safonov, A. Tatarinov, K.A. Ulmer

Texas Tech University, Lubbock, USA
N. Akchurin, J. Damgov, F. De Guio, C. Dragoiu, P.R. Dudero, J. Faulkner, E. Gurpinar, S. Kunori, K. Lamichhane, S.W. Lee, T. Libeiro, T. Peltola, S. Undleeb, I. Volobouev, Z. Wang

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

University of Virginia, Charlottesville, USA
M.W. Arenton, P. Barria, B. Cox, R. Hirosky, A. Ledovskoy, H. Li, C. Neu, T. Sinthuprasith, X. Sun, Y. Wang, E. Wolfe, F. Xia

Wayne State University, Detroit, USA
C. Clarke, R. Harr, P.E. Karchin, J. Sturdy, S. Zaleski

University of Wisconsin - Madison, Madison, WI, USA
D.A. Belknap, J. Buchanan, C. Caillol, S. Dasu, L. Dodd, S. Duric, B. Gomber, M. Grothe, M. Herndon, A. Hervé, U. Hussain, P. Klabbers, A. Lanaro, A. Levine, K. Long, R. Loveless, G.A. Pierro, G. Polese, T. Ruggles, A. Savin, N. Smith, W.H. Smith, D. Taylor, N. Woods

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

43: Also at Scuola Normale e Sezione dell'INFN, Pisa, Italy
44: Also at National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece
45: Also at Riga Technical University, Riga, Latvia
46: Also at Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia
47: Also at Albert Einstein Center for Fundamental Physics, Bern, Switzerland
48: Also at Istanbul Aydin University, Istanbul, Turkey
49: Also at Mersin University, Mersin, Turkey
50: Also at Cag University, Mersin, Turkey
51: Also at Piri Reis University, Istanbul, Turkey
52: Also at Gaziosmanpasa University, Tokat, Turkey
53: Also at Adiyaman University, Adiyaman, Turkey
54: Also at Ozyegin University, Istanbul, Turkey
55: Also at Izmir Institute of Technology, Izmir, Turkey
56: Also at Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey
57: Also at Kafkas University, Kars, Turkey
58: Also at Istanbul Bilgi University, Istanbul, Turkey
59: Also at Yildiz Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey
60: Also at Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey
61: Also at Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom
62: Also at School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southampton, Southampton, United Kingdom
63: Also at Instituto de Astrofísica de Canarias, La Laguna, Spain
64: Also at Utah Valley University, Orem, USA
65: Also at BEYKENT UNIVERSITY, Istanbul, Turkey
66: Also at Erzincan University, Erzincan, Turkey
67: Also at Mimar Sinan University, Istanbul, Istanbul, Turkey
68: Also at Texas A&M University at Qatar, Doha, Qatar
69: Also at Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea