CERN-PH-EP/2012-292
2013/11/11

CMS-EXO-12-012

Search for a non-standard-model Higgs boson decaying to a pair of new light bosons in four-muon final states

The CMS Collaboration*

Abstract

Results are reported from a search for non-standard-model Higgs boson decays to pairs of new light bosons, each of which decays into the $\mu^+\mu^-$ final state. The new bosons may be produced either promptly or via a decay chain. The data set corresponds to an integrated luminosity of 5.3 fb^{-1} of proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7\text{ TeV}$, recorded by the CMS experiment at the LHC in 2011. Such Higgs boson decays are predicted in several scenarios of new physics, including supersymmetric models with extended Higgs sectors or hidden valleys. Thus, the results of the search are relevant for establishing whether the new particle observed in Higgs boson searches at the LHC has the properties expected for a standard model Higgs boson. No excess of events is observed with respect to the yields expected from standard model processes. A model-independent upper limit of $0.86 \pm 0.06\text{ fb}$ on the product of the cross section times branching fraction times acceptance is obtained. The results, which are applicable to a broad spectrum of new physics scenarios, are compared with the predictions of two benchmark models as functions of a Higgs boson mass larger than $86\text{ GeV}/c^2$ and of a new light boson mass within the range $0.25\text{--}3.55\text{ GeV}/c^2$.

Published in Physics Letters B as doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2013.09.009.

1 Introduction

The observation of a new particle [1, 2] with a mass near $125 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ in searches for the standard model (SM) Higgs boson [3–5] at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) raises the critical question of whether the new particle is in fact the SM Higgs boson. The precision of the comparisons of the new particle’s production and decay properties with the final states predicted by the SM will improve with additional data. However, distinguishing a true SM Higgs boson from a non-SM Higgs bosons with couplings moderately different from the SM values will remain a challenge. Searches for non-SM Higgs boson production and decay modes are therefore particularly timely as they provide a complementary path, which in many cases can allow a discovery or rule out broad ranges of new physics scenarios with existing data.

This Letter presents a search for the production of a non-SM Higgs boson (h) decaying into a pair of new light bosons (a) of the same mass, which subsequently decay to pairs of oppositely charged muons (*dimuons*) isolated from the rest of the event activity: $h \rightarrow 2a + X \rightarrow 4\mu + X$, where X denotes possible additional particles from cascade decays of a Higgs boson. This sequence of decays is predicted in several classes of models beyond the SM. One example is the next-to-minimal supersymmetric standard model (NMSSM) [6–14], which extends the minimal supersymmetric standard model (MSSM) [15–17] by an additional gauge singlet field under new $U(1)_{PQ}$ symmetry in the Higgs sector of the superpotential. Compared to the MSSM, the NMSSM naturally generates the mass parameter μ in the Higgs superpotential at the electroweak scale [18] and significantly reduces the amount of fine tuning required [19–21]. The Higgs sector of the NMSSM consists of 3 CP -even Higgs bosons $h_{1,2,3}$ and 2 CP -odd Higgs bosons $a_{1,2}$.

In the NMSSM, the CP -even Higgs bosons h_1 and h_2 can decay via $h_{1,2} \rightarrow 2a_1$, where one of the h_1 or h_2 is a SM-like Higgs boson that could correspond to the newly observed state at the LHC with a mass near $125 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ [1, 2] and a_1 is a new CP -odd light Higgs boson [22–26]. The Higgs boson production cross section may differ substantially from that of the SM, depending on the parameters of a specific model. The new light boson a_1 couples weakly to SM particles, with the coupling to fermions proportional to the fermion mass, and can have a substantial branching fraction $\mathcal{B}(a_1 \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-)$ if its mass is within the range $2m_\mu < m_{a_1} < 2m_\tau$ [27, 28].

Pair production of light bosons can also occur in supersymmetric models with additional hidden (or *dark*) valleys [29–31], which are motivated by the excesses in positron spectra observed by satellite experiments [32, 33]. These dark-SUSY models predict cold dark matter with a mass scale of $\sim 1 \text{ TeV}/c^2$, which can provide the right amount of relic density due to the Sommerfeld enhancement in the annihilation cross section arising from a new $U(1)_D$ symmetry [34, 35]. In these models, $U(1)_D$ is broken, giving rise to light but massive dark photons γ_D that weakly couple to the SM particles via a small kinetic mixing [36–38] with photons. The lightest neutralino n_1 in the *visible* (as opposed to *hidden*) part of the SUSY spectrum is no longer stable and can decay via e.g. $n_1 \rightarrow n_D + \gamma_D$, where n_D is a light dark fermion (dark neutralino) that escapes detection. The SM-like Higgs boson can decay via $h \rightarrow 2n_1$, if $m_h > 2m_{n_1}$. The branching fraction $\mathcal{B}(h \rightarrow 2n_1)$ can vary from very small to large, bounded by the LHC measurements in the context of Higgs searches, since the bounds obtained at LEP can be circumvented [31]. The lack of an anti-proton excess in the measurements of the cosmic ray spectrum constrains the mass of γ_D to be $\leq \mathcal{O}(1) \text{ GeV}/c^2$ [39]. Assuming that γ_D can only decay to SM particles, the branching fraction $\mathcal{B}(\gamma_D \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-)$ can be as large as 45%, depending on m_{γ_D} [31]. The Higgs boson production cross section may or may not be enhanced compared to the SM, depending on the specific parameters of the model. The search described in this Letter was designed to be independent of the details of specific models, and the results can be interpreted in the context

of other models predicting the production of the same final states.

Previous searches for the pair production of new light bosons decaying into dimuons were performed at the Tevatron with a 4.2 fb^{-1} data sample [40] and more recently at the LHC with a 35 pb^{-1} [41] and a 1.9 fb^{-1} [42] data samples. Associated production of the light CP -odd scalar bosons has been searched for at e^+e^- colliders [43, 44] and the Tevatron [45]. Direct production of the a_1 has been studied at the LHC [46], but in the framework of NMSSM the sensitivity of these searches is limited by the typically very weak coupling of the a_1 to SM particles. The most stringent limits on the Higgs sector of the NMSSM are provided by the WMAP data [47] and LEP searches [48–50] ($m_{h_1} > 86 \text{ GeV}/c^2$). In the framework of dark SUSY, experimental searches for γ_D have focused on the production of dark photons at the end of SUSY cascades at the Tevatron [51–53] and the LHC [41]. Furthermore, if the newly observed particle at the LHC [1, 2] is indeed a Higgs boson, the studies of its SM decays will provide additional constraints on the allowed branching fractions for the non-SM decays.

2 The CMS detector

The analysis presented in this Letter uses experimental data collected by the Compact Muon Solenoid (CMS) experiment at the LHC in 2011. 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 superconducting solenoid volume are a silicon pixel and strip tracker, a lead tungstate crystal electromagnetic calorimeter, and a brass/scintillator hadron calorimeter. The inner tracker measures charged particles within the pseudorapidity range $|\eta| < 2.5$, where $\eta = -\ln[\tan(\theta/2)]$ and θ is the polar angle with respect to the direction of the counterclockwise proton beam that is the z -axis of the CMS reference frame. The tracker provides an impact parameter resolution of $\sim 15 \mu\text{m}$ and a transverse momentum (p_T) resolution of about 1.5% for $100 \text{ GeV}/c$ particles. Muons are measured in gas-ionization detectors embedded in the steel return yoke. The muon detectors are made using the following technologies: drift tubes ($|\eta| < 1.2$), cathode strip chambers ($0.9 < |\eta| < 2.4$), and resistive-plate chambers ($|\eta| < 1.6$). Matching the muons to the tracks measured in the silicon tracker results in a transverse momentum resolution between 1 and 5% for p_T values up to $1 \text{ TeV}/c$. A more detailed description can be found in Ref. [54].

3 Data selection

The search is performed as a “blind” analysis, i.e. data in the signal region were not used to define the reconstruction and selection procedures. The analysis is based on a data sample corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 5.3 fb^{-1} of proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7 \text{ TeV}$, obtained in 2011. The data were collected with a trigger selecting events containing at least two muons, one with $p_T > 17 \text{ GeV}/c$ and one with $p_T > 8 \text{ GeV}/c$. In the offline analysis, events are selected by requiring at least one primary vertex reconstructed with at least four tracks and with its z coordinate within 24 cm of the nominal collision point. Offline muon candidates are built using tracks reconstructed in the inner tracker matched to track segments in the muon system, using an arbitration algorithm [55]. The candidates are further required to have at least eight hits in the tracker, with the $\chi^2/\text{Ndof} < 4$ for the track fit in the inner tracker (where Ndof is the number of degrees of freedom), and at least two matched segments in the muon system. The data are further selected by requiring at least four offline muon candidates with $p_T > 8 \text{ GeV}/c$ and $|\eta| < 2.4$; at least one of the candidates must have $p_T > 17 \text{ GeV}/c$ and be reconstructed in the central region, $|\eta| < 0.9$. Application of the selection requirements

described above yields 1,745 events in the data. The trigger efficiency for the selected events is high (96–97%) and is nearly independent of the p_T and η of any of the four muons. The $|\eta| < 0.9$ requirement is tighter than that imposed by the trigger, but eliminates significant model dependence attributable to the reduced trigger performance in the forward region in the presence of multiple spatially close muons. This η requirement causes an overall reduction in the analysis acceptance of about 20%, as obtained in a simulation study with one of the NMSSM benchmark samples used in the analysis.

Next, oppositely charged muons are grouped into dimuons (a muon may be shared between several dimuons) if their pairwise invariant mass satisfies $m_{\mu\mu} < 5 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ and if either the fit of the two muon tracks for a common vertex has a χ^2 fit probability greater than 1% or the two muon tracks satisfy the cone size requirement $\Delta R(\mu^+, \mu^-) = \sqrt{(\eta_{\mu^+} - \eta_{\mu^-})^2 + (\phi_{\mu^+} - \phi_{\mu^-})^2} < 0.01$, where ϕ is the azimuthal angle in radians. The ΔR requirement compensates for the reduced efficiency of the vertex probability requirement for dimuons with very low mass ($m_{\mu\mu} \gtrsim 2m_\mu$), in which the two muon tracks are nearly parallel to each other at the point of closest approach.

Once all dimuons are constructed, only events with exactly two dimuons not sharing common muons are selected for further analysis. There is no restriction on the number of ungrouped (*orphan*) muons. Assuming that each dimuon is a decay product of a new light boson, we require that the two dimuons have invariant masses in the range 0.25–3.55 GeV/c^2 . We reconstruct $z_{\mu\mu}$, the projected z coordinate of the dimuon system at the point of the closest approach to the beam line, using the dimuon momentum measured at the common vertex and the vertex position. We ensure that the two dimuons originate from the same pp interaction by requiring $|z_{\mu\mu_1} - z_{\mu\mu_2}| < 1 \text{ mm}$. This selection yields 139 events in data and it is fully efficient for signal events while reducing the probability of selecting rare events with dimuons from two separate primary interactions.

To suppress backgrounds with dimuons coming from jets, we require that the dimuons be isolated from other activity in the event, using the criterion $I_{\text{sum}} < 3 \text{ GeV}/c$, where the isolation parameter of the dimuon system I_{sum} is defined as the scalar sum of the transverse momenta of all additional charged tracks with $p_T > 0.5 \text{ GeV}/c$ within a cone of size $\Delta R = 0.4$ centered on the momentum vector of the dimuon system. Tracks used in the calculation of I_{sum} must also have a z coordinate at the point of the closest approach to the beam line that lies within 1 mm of the z coordinate of the dimuon system. The I_{sum} selection yields three events in data and it suppresses the contamination from $b\bar{b}$ production by about a factor of 40 (measured in data) while rejecting less than 10% of the signal events (obtained from the simulation study).

Finally, we require that the invariant masses of the two reconstructed dimuons are compatible with each other within the detector resolution $|m_1 - m_2| < 0.13 \text{ GeV}/c^2 + 0.065 \times (m_1 + m_2)/2$, where $m_1 = m_{\mu\mu_1}$ and $m_2 = m_{\mu\mu_2}$. The numerical parameters in this last requirement correspond to at least five times the size of the core resolution in dimuon mass, including the differences in resolution in the central and forward regions. The signal inefficiency of this $m_1 \simeq m_2$ selection is less than 5% per event; it is due to QED final-state radiation and is unrelated to the detector resolution. No constraint is imposed on the four-muon invariant mass, in order to maintain the model independence of the analysis, in particular with respect to models resulting in cascade decays such as dark-SUSY, where an unknown fraction of the energy goes into the light dark fermions, which escape detection.

To demonstrate the ability of the analysis to select a possible signal, we use the two benchmark models introduced earlier. The NMSSM samples are simulated with the PYTHIA 6.4.26 event

Table 1: Event selection efficiencies $\epsilon_{\text{full}}^{\text{MC}}(m_{h_1}, m_{a_1})$, as obtained from the full detector simulation, and the geometric and kinematic acceptances $\alpha_{\text{gen}}(m_{h_1}, m_{a_1})$ calculated using generator level information only, with statistical uncertainties for the NMSSM benchmark model. The experimental data-to-simulation scale factors are not applied.

m_{h_1} [GeV/ c^2]	90	100	125	125	125	125	125	150
m_{a_1} [GeV/ c^2]	2	2	0.25	0.5	1	2	3	2
$\epsilon_{\text{full}}^{\text{MC}}$ [%]	12.1 ± 0.1	14.7 ± 0.1	46.2 ± 0.1	24.6 ± 0.2	21.1 ± 0.1	20.1 ± 0.1	19.7 ± 0.1	24.0 ± 0.1
α_{gen} [%]	16.6 ± 0.1	20.0 ± 0.1	62.2 ± 0.1	33.2 ± 0.3	28.6 ± 0.1	27.5 ± 0.1	27.1 ± 0.1	33.2 ± 0.1
$\epsilon_{\text{full}}^{\text{MC}}/\alpha_{\text{gen}}$ [%]	73.0 ± 0.3	73.5 ± 0.3	74.3 ± 0.3	74.2 ± 0.6	73.8 ± 0.3	72.6 ± 0.3	72.7 ± 0.3	72.2 ± 0.2

Table 2: Event selection efficiencies $\epsilon_{\text{full}}^{\text{MC}}(m_h, m_{\gamma_D})$, as obtained from the full detector simulation, and the geometric and kinematic acceptances $\alpha_{\text{gen}}(m_h, m_{\gamma_D})$ calculated using generator level information only, with statistical uncertainties for a dark-SUSY benchmark model, as obtained from simulation. The experimental data-to-simulation scale factors are not applied.

m_h [GeV/ c^2]	90	125	150
m_{γ_D} [GeV/ c^2]	0.4	0.4	0.4
$\epsilon_{\text{full}}^{\text{MC}}$ [%]	2.7 ± 0.1	7.6 ± 0.1	11.4 ± 0.1
α_{gen} [%]	3.6 ± 0.1	10.1 ± 0.1	15.2 ± 0.1
$\epsilon_{\text{full}}^{\text{MC}}/\alpha_{\text{gen}}$ [%]	76.1 ± 0.8	75.5 ± 0.5	74.9 ± 0.4

generator [56] using MSSM Higgs boson production via gluon-gluon fusion $gg \rightarrow H_{\text{MSSM}}^0$, where the Higgs bosons are forced to decay via $H_{\text{MSSM}}^0 \rightarrow 2A_{\text{MSSM}}^0$. The masses of H_{MSSM}^0 and A_{MSSM}^0 are set to the desired values for the h_1 mass and a_1 mass, respectively. Both A_{MSSM}^0 bosons are forced to decay to a pair of muons. The dark-SUSY samples are simulated with the MADGRAPH 4.5.2 event generator [57] using SM Higgs boson production via gluon-gluon fusion $gg \rightarrow h_{\text{SM}}$, where the mass of h_{SM} is set to the desired value for the h mass. The BRIDGE software [58] was used to implement the new physics model that forces the Higgs bosons h_{SM} to undergo a non-SM decay to a pair of neutralinos n_1 , each of which decays $n_1 \rightarrow n_D + \gamma_D$, where $m_{n_1} = 10 \text{ GeV}/c^2$, $m_{n_D} = 1 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ and $m_{\gamma_D} = 0.4 \text{ GeV}/c^2$. Both dark photons γ_D are forced to decay to two muons, while both dark neutralinos n_D escape detection. The narrow width approximation is imposed by setting the widths of the Higgs bosons and dark photons to a small value ($10^{-3} \text{ GeV}/c^2$). All benchmark samples are generated using the leading-order CTEQ6L1 [59] set of parton distribution functions (PDF), and are interfaced with PYTHIA 6.4.26 using the Z2 tune [60] for “underlying event” (UE) activity at the LHC and to simulate jet fragmentation, when applicable.

All events in the benchmark signal samples are processed through a detailed simulation of the CMS detector based on GEANT4 [61] and are reconstructed with the same algorithms used for data analysis. Tables 1 and 2 show the event selection efficiencies $\epsilon_{\text{full}}^{\text{MC}}$ obtained using the simulated signal events for these two benchmark models using representative choices for masses of h , a_1 or γ_D . To provide a simple recipe for future reinterpretations of the results in the context of other models, we separately determine α_{gen} , the geometric and kinematic acceptance of this analysis calculated using generator level information only. It is defined with the criteria that an event contains at least four muons with $p_T > 8 \text{ GeV}/c$ and $|\eta| < 2.4$, with at least one of these muons having $p_T > 17 \text{ GeV}/c$ and $|\eta| < 0.9$. Tables 1 and 2 also show α_{gen} along with the ratio $\epsilon_{\text{full}}^{\text{MC}}/\alpha_{\text{gen}}$.

The model independence of the ratio $\epsilon_{\text{full}}^{\text{MC}}/\alpha_{\text{gen}}$ permits an estimate of the full event selection efficiency of this analysis for an arbitrary new physics model predicting the signature with a pair of new light bosons. The analysis makes some assumptions on the nature and characteristics of the new light bosons, namely that they should be of the same type, have a mass in range $2m_\mu < m_a < 2m_\tau$, decay to the $\mu^+\mu^-$ final state and not have a significant lifetime. In addition, the two bosons, should be isolated and sufficiently separated from each other to avoid being vetoed by the isolation requirement. The acceptance α_{gen} may be calculated using only the generator level selection requirements that have been defined above. The full efficiency ϵ_{full} could then be calculated by multiplying α_{gen} by the ratio $\epsilon_{\text{full}}/\alpha_{\text{gen}} = r \times \epsilon_{\text{full}}^{\text{MC}}/\alpha_{\text{gen}} = 0.67 \pm 0.05$, where $r = \epsilon_{\text{full}}/\epsilon_{\text{full}}^{\text{MC}} = 0.91 \pm 0.07$ is the scale factor defined in Sec. 5 that accounts for differences between data and simulation, and $\epsilon_{\text{full}}^{\text{MC}}/\alpha_{\text{gen}} = 0.74 \pm 0.02$ is an average ratio over all of the benchmark points used. The systematic uncertainty in the ratio $\epsilon_{\text{full}}/\alpha_{\text{gen}}$ is around 7.4%. For reference, the individual systematics uncertainties in α_{gen} and ϵ_{full} are 3.0% and 8.0%, respectively, as discussed in Sec. 5.

4 Background estimation

The background contributions after final selections are dominated by $b\bar{b}$ and direct J/ψ pair production events. The leading part of the $b\bar{b}$ contribution is due to b-quark decays to pairs of muons via double semileptonic decays or resonances, i.e. $\omega, \rho, \phi, J/\psi$. A smaller contribution comes from events with one real dimuon and a second dimuon with a muon from a semileptonic b-quark decay and a charged hadron misidentified as another muon. The misidentification typically occurs due to the incorrect association of the track of the charged hadron with the track segments from a real muon in the muon system. The contribution of other SM processes has been found to be negligible (less than 0.1 events combined), for example low mass Drell–Yan production is heavily suppressed by the requirement of additional muons, and $pp \rightarrow Z/\gamma^* \rightarrow 4\mu$ production is suppressed by the requirement of small and mutually consistent masses of the dimuons [27]. The analysis is not sensitive to SM process $pp \rightarrow H \rightarrow ZZ \rightarrow 4\mu$ because the invariant mass of the dimuons is substantially lower than the Z mass.

Using data control samples, the $b\bar{b}$ background is modeled as a two dimensional (2D) template $B_{b\bar{b}}(m_1, m_2)$ in the plane of the invariant masses of the two dimuons in the selected events, where m_1 always refers to the dimuon containing a muon with $p_T > 17 \text{ GeV}/c$ and $|\eta| < 0.9$. For events with both dimuons containing such a muon, the assignment of m_1 and m_2 is random. As each b quark fragments independently, we construct the template describing the 2D probability density function as a Cartesian product $B_{17+8}(m_1) \times B_{8+8}(m_2)$, where the B_{17+8} and B_{8+8} templates model the invariant-mass distributions for dimuons with or without the requirement that the dimuon contains at least one muon satisfying $p_T > 17 \text{ GeV}/c$ and $|\eta| < 0.9$. This distinction is necessary as the shape of the dimuon invariant mass distribution depends on the transverse momentum thresholds used to select muons and whether the muons are in the central ($|\eta| < 0.9$) or in the forward ($0.9 < |\eta| < 2.4$) regions, owing to the differences in momentum resolution of the barrel and endcap regions of the tracker. The B_{17+8} shape is measured using a data sample enriched in $b\bar{b}$ events with exactly one dimuon and one orphan muon under the assumption that one of the b quarks decays to a dimuon containing at least one muon with $p_T > 17 \text{ GeV}/c$ and $|\eta| < 0.9$, while the other b quark decays semileptonically resulting in an orphan muon with $p_T > 8 \text{ GeV}/c$. For the B_{8+8} shape, we use a similar sample and procedure but only require the dimuon to have both muons with $p_T > 8 \text{ GeV}/c$, while the orphan muon has to have $p_T > 17 \text{ GeV}/c$ and $|\eta| < 0.9$. Both data samples used to measure




Figure 1: Left: Comparison of the data (solid circles) failing the $m_1 \simeq m_2$ requirement in the control sample where no isolation requirement is applied to reconstructed dimuons with the prediction of the background shape model (solid line) scaled to the number of entries in the data. The insets show the B_{17+8} and B_{8+8} templates (solid lines) for dimuons obtained with background-enriched data samples. Right: Distribution of the invariant masses m_1 vs. m_2 for the isolated dimuon systems for the three events in the data (shown as empty circles) surviving all selections except the requirement that these two masses fall into the diagonal signal region $m_1 \simeq m_2$ (outlined with dashed lines). The intensity (color online) of the shading indicates the background expectation which is a sum of the $b\bar{b}$ and the direct J/ψ pair production contributions.

background shapes are collected with the same trigger and with kinematic properties similar to those $b\bar{b}$ events passing the selections of the main analysis. These event samples do not overlap the sample containing two dimuons that is used for the main analysis, and they have negligible contributions from non- $b\bar{b}$ backgrounds. The B_{17+8} and B_{8+8} distributions, fitted with a parametric analytical function using a combination of Bernstein polynomials [62] and Crystal Ball functions [63] describing resonances, are shown as insets in Fig. 1 (left). Once the $B_{b\bar{b}}(m_1, m_2)$ template is constructed, it is used to provide a description of the $b\bar{b}$ background shape in the main analysis.

To validate the constructed $B_{b\bar{b}}(m_1, m_2)$ template, we compare its shape with the distribution of the invariant masses m_1 vs. m_2 from events obtained with all standard selections except the requirement that each of the two reconstructed dimuons is isolated. Omitting the isolation requirement provides a high-statistics control sample of events with two dimuons highly enriched with $b\bar{b}$ events. To avoid unblinding the search, the diagonal signal region is excluded in both the data and the template, i.e. the comparison has been limited to the data events that satisfy all analysis selections but fail the $m_1 \simeq m_2$ requirement. Distributions of m_1 and m_2 are consistent with the projections of the $B_{b\bar{b}}(m_1, m_2)$ template on the respective axes normalized to the number of events in the data control sample. The sum of the m_1 and m_2 distributions agrees well with the sum of the template projections as shown in Fig. 1 (left).

Another cross-check has been performed using data events which satisfy all analysis selections except that the isolation parameters of each dimuon system have been required to satisfy $3 \text{ GeV}/c < I_{\text{sum}} < 8 \text{ GeV}/c$, which removes potential signal events since the signal selections

require $I_{\text{sum}} < 3 \text{ GeV}/c$ for each dimuon. These selections with both dimuons in isolation sideband yield four events in the off-diagonal region and zero events in the diagonal region of (m_1, m_2) plane. Normalizing the background distribution to these four observed events, we predict $0.9 \pm 0.4 \text{ b}\bar{\text{b}}$ events in the diagonal region of the (m_1, m_2) plane with both dimuons in the isolation sideband ($3 \text{ GeV}/c < I_{\text{sum}} < 8 \text{ GeV}/c$). This prediction is consistent with no events being observed there.

To normalize the constructed $B_{\text{b}\bar{\text{b}}}(m_1, m_2)$ template, we use the data events that satisfy all analysis selections, but fail the $m_1 \simeq m_2$ requirement. These selections yield three events in the off-diagonal sideband region of the (m_1, m_2) plane, leading, in the diagonal signal region, to an expected number of $0.7 \pm 0.4 \text{ b}\bar{\text{b}}$ events, where the estimated uncertainty is dominated by the statistical uncertainty. These three events in the off-diagonal sidebands of the (m_1, m_2) plane are shown as empty circles in Fig. 1 (right).

The direct J/ψ pair production contribution is estimated using simulations normalized to the data in the region of low invariant mass of the two J/ψ candidates. The data for the study were collected using a trigger requiring three muon candidates with transverse momenta $p_T > 1 \text{ GeV}/c$ and a scalar sum of momenta $p(\mu_1) + p(\mu_2) + p(\mu_3) > 2.5 \text{ GeV}/c$. In addition, among these muon candidates there must be at least one pair with opposite charges, originating from a common vertex and having an invariant mass in the range $2.8 < m_{\mu\mu} < 3.35 \text{ GeV}/c^2$. In the offline selection, four high quality muon candidates are required, forming two J/ψ candidates within this same mass window. The resulting data sample has significant contamination from non-prompt J/ψ pairs produced in heavy flavor decays, combinatorial backgrounds, and combinations of the two. The rate of prompt double J/ψ production in the data sample is extracted by extrapolating in the plane of the transverse lifetime ct_{xy} of the two J/ψ candidates and their measured invariant masses. The rate thus obtained from data is used to normalize the simulation, which is produced using the double parton scattering (DPS) J/ψ pair production process in the PYTHIA 8.108 event generator [64], applying the same selections as applied to the data. This calculation provides an estimate of the background rate due to prompt double J/ψ production in the signal region. To evaluate the systematic uncertainty, this normalization factor is recalculated separately for each of the four ranges of the invariant masses $m_{2J/\psi}$ of the two J/ψ candidates: 6–13, 13–22, 22–35, and 35–80 GeV/c^2 . Although the control samples overlap with the data sample used for the search, for none of the benchmark models considered are the control samples significantly contaminated with the signal. This is because the dark-SUSY models predict new bosons with a mass of less than $1 \text{ GeV}/c^2$, and LEP measurements set an upper limit of about $90 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ on the NMSSM CP-even Higgs boson mass. With approximately 1500 events in the prompt double J/ψ control sample, the statistical component of the prompt double J/ψ background uncertainty is very small compared to the systematic error. For this reason, the correlation introduced into the limit calculation by the potential presence of a small amount of signal in the control region may be safely neglected. Nevertheless, we have treated the higher mass ranges with particular caution, as an excess there could be a sign of a potential signal of new physics, in which case it would have been necessary to change the strategy of this analysis. Measurements in all ranges of $m_{2J/\psi}$ yield consistently low estimates of the contamination due to the prompt double J/ψ background in the signal region. The final estimate of the rate is 0.3 ± 0.3 , where the uncertainty accounts for both statistical and systematic effects. This value is used to normalize a 2D Gaussian template $B_{2J/\psi}(m_1, m_2)$ in the (m_1, m_2) plane that models the double J/ψ background contribution.

The distribution of the total background expectation in the (m_1, m_2) plane is $B_{\text{b}\bar{\text{b}}}(m_1, m_2) + B_{2J/\psi}(m_1, m_2)$, i.e. a sum of the $\text{b}\bar{\text{b}}$ and the direct J/ψ pair production contributions. It is shown by the intensity of the shading in Fig. 1 (right). The background expectation in the diagonal sig-




Figure 2: Left: The 95% CL upper limits as functions of m_{h_1} , for the NMSSM case, on $\sigma(pp \rightarrow h_{1,2} \rightarrow 2a_1) \times B^2(a_1 \rightarrow 2\mu)$ with $m_{a_1} = 0.25 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ (dashed curve), $m_{a_1} = 2 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ (dash-dotted curve) and $m_{a_1} = 3.55 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ (dotted curve). As an illustration, the limits are compared to the predicted rate (solid curve) obtained using a simplified scenario with $\sigma(pp \rightarrow h_1) = \sigma_{\text{SM}}(m_{h_1})$ [65], $\sigma(pp \rightarrow h_2) \times B(h_2 \rightarrow 2a_1) = 0$, $B(h_1 \rightarrow 2a_1) = 3\%$, and $B(a_1 \rightarrow 2\mu) = 7.7\%$. The chosen $B(a_1 \rightarrow 2\mu)$ is taken from [28] for $m_{a_1} = 2 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ and NMSSM parameter $\tan \beta = 20$. Right: The 95% CL upper limit as a function of m_h , for the dark-SUSY case, on $\sigma(pp \rightarrow h \rightarrow 2n_1 \rightarrow 2n_D + 2\gamma_D) \times B^2(\gamma_D \rightarrow 2\mu)$ with $m_{n_1} = 10 \text{ GeV}/c^2$, $m_{n_D} = 1 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ and $m_{\gamma_D} = 0.4 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ (dashed curve). As an illustration, the limit is compared to the predicted rate (solid curve) obtained using a simplified scenario with SM Higgs boson production cross section $\sigma(pp \rightarrow h) = \sigma_{\text{SM}}(m_h)$ [65], $B(h \rightarrow 2n_1) = 1\%$, $B(n_1 \rightarrow n_D + \gamma_D) = 50\%$, and $B(\gamma_D \rightarrow 2\mu) = 45\%$. The chosen $B(\gamma_D \rightarrow 2\mu)$ is taken from [31] for $m_{\gamma_D} = 0.4 \text{ GeV}/c^2$.

nal region is 1.0 ± 0.5 events, where the uncertainty accounts for both statistical and systematic effects.

5 Systematic uncertainties

The selection efficiencies of offline muon reconstruction, trigger, and dimuon isolation criteria are obtained with simulation and have been corrected with scale factors derived from a comparison of data and simulation using $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ and $J/\psi \rightarrow \mu\mu$ samples. The scale factor per event is $r = 0.91 \pm 0.07$ (syst.). It accounts for the differences in the efficiency of the trigger, the efficiency of the muon reconstruction and identification for each of the four muon candidates, and the combined efficiency of the isolation requirement for the two dimuon candidates. The correlations due to the presence of two close muons have been taken into account. The main systematic uncertainty is in the offline muon reconstruction (5.7%) which includes an uncertainty (1% per muon) to cover variations of the scale factor as a function of p_T and η of muons. Other systematic uncertainties include the uncertainty in the trigger (1.5%), dimuon isolation (negligible), dimuon reconstruction effects related to overlaps of muon trajectories in the tracker and in the muon system (3.5%), and dimuon mass shape, which affects the efficiency of the requirement that the two dimuon masses are compatible (1.5%). The uncertainty in the LHC integrated luminosity of the data sample (2.2%) is also included [66]. All the uncertainties




Figure 3: Left: The 95% CL upper limits as functions of m_{a_1} , for the NMSSM case, on $\sigma(pp \rightarrow h_{1,2} \rightarrow 2a_1) \times \mathcal{B}^2(a_1 \rightarrow 2\mu)$ with $m_{h_1} = 90 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ (dashed curve), $m_{h_1} = 125 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ (dash-dotted curve) and $m_{h_1} = 150 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ (dotted curve). The limits are compared to the predicted rate (solid curve) obtained using a simplified scenario with $\mathcal{B}(h_1 \rightarrow 2a_1) = 3\%$, $\sigma(pp \rightarrow h_1) = \sigma_{\text{SM}}(m_{h_1} = 125 \text{ GeV}/c^2)$ [65], $\sigma(pp \rightarrow h_2) \times \mathcal{B}(h_2 \rightarrow 2a_1) = 0$, and $\mathcal{B}(a_1 \rightarrow 2\mu)$ as a function of m_{a_1} which is taken from [28] for NMSSM parameter $\tan \beta = 20$. Right: The 95% CL upper limits on $\mathcal{B}(h_1 \rightarrow 2a_1) \times \mathcal{B}^2(a_1 \rightarrow 2\mu)$ with $m_{h_1} = 90 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ (dashed curve), $m_{h_1} = 125 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ (dash-dotted curve) and $m_{h_1} = 150 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ (dotted curve) assuming $\sigma(pp \rightarrow h_1) = \sigma_{\text{SM}}(m_{h_1})$ [65] and $\sigma(pp \rightarrow h_2) \times \mathcal{B}(h_2 \rightarrow 2a_1) = 0$. The limits are compared to the predicted branching fraction (solid line) obtained using a simplified scenario with $\mathcal{B}(h_1 \rightarrow 2a_1) = 3\%$ and $\mathcal{B}(a_1 \rightarrow 2\mu)$ as a function of m_{a_1} which is taken from [28] for NMSSM parameter $\tan \beta = 20$.

quoted above, which relate to the final analysis selection efficiency for signal events, sum up to 7.4%. The uncertainties related to the parton distribution functions (PDFs) and the knowledge of the strong coupling constant α_s are estimated by comparing the PDFs in CTEQ6.6 [67] with those in NNPDF2.0 [68] and MSTW2008 [69] following the PDF4LHC recommendations [70]. Using the analysis benchmark samples, they are found to be 3% for the signal acceptance. Varying the QCD renormalization/factorization scales has a negligible effect. The total systematic uncertainty in the signal acceptance and selection efficiency is 8.0%.

6 Results

When the data satisfying all analysis selections were unblinded, no events were observed in the signal diagonal region, as illustrated in Fig. 1 (right). The expected background in the diagonal signal region is 1.0 ± 0.5 events, where the uncertainty accounts for both statistical and systematic effects. This background includes contributions from $b\bar{b}$ production and direct J/ψ pair production, as discussed in Sec. 4.

For an arbitrary new physics model predicting the signature investigated in this Letter, the results can be presented as the 95% confidence level (CL) upper limit:

$$\sigma(pp \rightarrow 2a + X) \times \mathcal{B}^2(a \rightarrow 2\mu) \times \alpha_{\text{gen}} < 0.86 \pm 0.06 \text{ fb}^{-1},$$

where α_{gen} is the generator-level kinematic and geometric acceptance defined in Sec. 3. The calculation uses the value of the integrated luminosity $\mathcal{L} = 5.3 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ of the data, and takes the ratio $\epsilon_{\text{full}}/\alpha_{\text{gen}} = 0.67 \pm 0.05$, derived in Sec. 3. This ratio includes the scale factor that corrects for experimental effects not accounted for by the simulation. The variation in this ratio over all of the used benchmark points is covered by systematic uncertainties. The limit is applicable to models with two pairs of muons coming from light bosons of the same type with a mass in range $0.25 < m_a < 3.55 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ where the new light bosons are typically isolated, spatially separated to not be vetoed by the isolation requirement and have no substantial lifetime. The efficiency of the selections in this analysis abruptly deteriorates if the light boson's decay vertex is more than $\sim 4 \text{ cm}$ from the beamline in the transverse plane.

We interpret these results in the context of the NMSSM and the dark-SUSY benchmark models, taking into account the dependence of the signal selection efficiencies on m_h and m_a (see Tab. 1 and Tab. 2), and derive 95% CL upper limits on the product of the cross section and branching fraction, using a Bayesian prescription. We also compare the derived experimental limits with a few simplified prediction scenarios. In the representative models, for any fixed combinations of m_h and m_a both the Higgs boson production cross section and the branching fractions can vary significantly, depending on the choice of parameters. In the absence of broadly accepted benchmark scenarios, we normalize the production cross sections in these examples to that of the SM Higgs boson [65].

For the NMSSM, the 95% CL upper limit is derived for $\sigma(\text{pp} \rightarrow h_{1,2} \rightarrow 2a_1) \times \mathcal{B}(a_1 \rightarrow 2\mu)$ as a function of m_{h_1} for three choices of m_{a_1} as shown in Fig. 2 (left) and as a function of m_{a_1} for three choices of m_{h_1} as shown in Fig. 3 (left). As m_{h_2} is unrestricted for any given m_{h_1} , we use $\epsilon_{\text{full}}(m_{h_2}) = \epsilon_{\text{full}}(m_{h_1})$ to simplify the interpretation. This is conservative since $\epsilon_{\text{full}}(m_{h_2}) > \epsilon_{\text{full}}(m_{h_1})$ if $m_{h_2} > m_{h_1}$, for any m_{a_1} . We also derive the 95% CL upper limit for $\mathcal{B}(h_1 \rightarrow 2a_1) \times \mathcal{B}(a_1 \rightarrow 2\mu)$ as a function of m_{a_1} for three choices of m_{h_1} as shown in Fig. 3 (right) assuming that only h_1 gives a significant contribution to the final state considered in this analysis and has the production cross section of a SM Higgs boson, i.e. $\sigma(\text{pp} \rightarrow h_1) = \sigma_{\text{SM}}(m_{h_1})$ and $\sigma(\text{pp} \rightarrow h_2) \times \mathcal{B}(h_2 \rightarrow 2a_1) = 0$. For the NMSSM simplified prediction scenario we use $\mathcal{B}(a_1 \rightarrow 2\mu)$ as a function of m_{a_1} , calculated in [28] for $\tan \beta = 20$ with no hadronization effects included in the $m_{a_1} < 2m_\tau$ region. The branching fraction $\mathcal{B}(a_1 \rightarrow 2\mu)$ is influenced by the $a_1 \rightarrow s\bar{s}$ and $a_1 \rightarrow g\bar{g}$ channels. The significant structures in the predicted curves visible in Fig. 3 arise from the fact that $\mathcal{B}(a_1 \rightarrow g\bar{g})$ varies rapidly in that region of m_{a_1} . The rapid variation in $\mathcal{B}(a_1 \rightarrow g\bar{g})$ occurs when m_{a_1} crosses the internal quark loop thresholds. The representative value of $\mathcal{B}(a_1 \rightarrow 2\mu)$ is equal to 7.7% for $m_{a_1} \approx 2 \text{ GeV}/c^2$. Finally, we choose $\mathcal{B}(h_1 \rightarrow 2a_1) = 3\%$, which yields predictions for the rates of dimuon pair events comparable to the obtained experimental limits.

In the case of the dark-SUSY model, the 95% CL upper limit is derived for $\sigma(\text{pp} \rightarrow h \rightarrow 2n_1 \rightarrow 2n_D + 2\gamma_D) \times \mathcal{B}(\gamma_D \rightarrow 2\mu)$ as a function of m_h . This limit is shown in Fig. 2 (right) for $m_{n_1} = 10 \text{ GeV}/c^2$, $m_{n_D} = 1 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ and $m_{\gamma_D} = 0.4 \text{ GeV}/c^2$. For the dark-SUSY simplified prediction scenario we use the branching fraction $\mathcal{B}(\gamma_D \rightarrow 2\mu)$ close to its maximum at $m_{\gamma_D} = 0.4 \text{ GeV}/c^2$, of 45%, calculated in [31]. We also use $\mathcal{B}(n_1 \rightarrow n_D + \gamma_D) = 50\%$, allowing for other possible decays. Finally, we choose $\mathcal{B}(h \rightarrow 2n_1) = 1\%$, which yields predictions for the rates of dimuon pair events comparable to the obtained experimental limits.

The sensitivity of this search can be compared to that of a similar analysis performed at the Tevatron [40] after rescaling with the ratio of the Higgs boson cross sections at the LHC and the Tevatron. If plotted in Fig. 2 and Fig. 3 (left), the Tevatron results would have exclusion limits above $\sim 130 \text{ fb}$, therefore the search presented in this Letter has one order of magnitude better sensitivity compared to previous experimental constraints.

7 Summary

A search for non-standard-model Higgs boson decays to pairs of new light bosons, which subsequently decay to pairs of oppositely charged muons ($h \rightarrow 2a + X \rightarrow 4\mu + X$) has been presented. The search is based on a data sample corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 5.3 fb^{-1} collected by the CMS experiment in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7 \text{ TeV}$ in 2011. No excess is observed with respect to the SM predictions. An upper limit at 95% confidence level on the product of the cross section times branching fraction times acceptance is obtained. The limit is valid for new light-boson masses in the range $0.25 < m_a < 3.55 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ and for Higgs boson masses in the range $m_h > 86 \text{ GeV}/c^2$. Although the results have been interpreted in the context of the NMSSM and the dark-SUSY benchmark models for $m_h < 150 \text{ GeV}/c^2$, it is possible to extend them by smoothly extrapolating the model-independent cross section limit to higher masses. The analysis has been designed as a quasi-model-independent search allowing interpretation of its results in the context of a broad range of new physics scenarios predicting the same type of signature. In the context of the NMSSM and one of the SUSY models with hidden valleys this search provides the best experimental limits to date, significantly surpassing the sensitivity of similar searches performed at the Tevatron.

8 Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Joshua Ruderman (LBNL and University of California at Berkeley) for his guidance with the theoretically motivated benchmark samples of dark SUSY and useful discussions. We wish to congratulate our colleagues in the CERN accelerator departments for the excellent performance of the LHC machine. We thank the technical and administrative staff at CERN and other CMS institutes, and acknowledge support from: FMSR (Austria); FNRS and FWO (Belgium); CNPq, CAPES, FAPERJ, and FAPESP (Brazil); MES (Bulgaria); CERN; CAS, MoST, and NSFC (China); COLCIENCIAS (Colombia); MSES (Croatia); RPF (Cyprus); Academy of Sciences and NICPB (Estonia); Academy of Finland, MEC, and HIP (Finland); CEA and CNRS/IN2P3 (France); BMBF, DFG, and HGF (Germany); GSRT (Greece); OTKA and NKTH (Hungary); DAE and DST (India); IPM (Iran); SFI (Ireland); INFN (Italy); NRF and WCU (Korea); LAS (Lithuania); CINVESTAV, CONACYT, SEP, and UASLP-FAI (Mexico); MSI (New Zealand); PAEC (Pakistan); SCSR (Poland); FCT (Portugal); JINR (Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, Ukraine, Uzbekistan); MST and MAE (Russia); MSTB (Serbia); MICINN and CPAN (Spain); Swiss Funding Agencies (Switzerland); NSC (Taipei); TUBITAK and TAEK (Turkey); STFC (United Kingdom); DOE and NSF (USA).

References

- [1] 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, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2012.08.020, arXiv:1207.7214.
- [2] 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, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2012.08.021, arXiv:1207.7235.
- [3] F. Englert and R. Brout, “Broken symmetry and the mass of gauge vector mesons”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **13** (1964) 321, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.13.321.

- [4] P. W. Higgs, “Broken symmetries and the masses of gauge bosons”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **13** (1964) 508, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.13.508.
- [5] G. S. Guralnik, C. R. Hagen, and T. W. B. Kibble, “Global conservation laws and massless particles”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **13** (1964) 585, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.13.585.
- [6] P. Fayet, “Supergauge invariant extension of the Higgs mechanism and a model for the electron and its neutrino”, *Nucl. Phys. B* **90** (1975) 104, doi:10.1016/0550-3213(75)90636-7.
- [7] R. K. Kaul and P. Majumdar, “Cancellation of quadratically divergent mass corrections in globally supersymmetric spontaneously broken gauge theories”, *Nucl. Phys. B* **199** (1982) 36, doi:10.1016/0550-3213(82)90565-X.
- [8] R. Barbieri, S. Ferrara, and C. A. Savoy, “Gauge models with spontaneously broken local supersymmetry”, *Phys. Lett. B* **119** (1982) 343, doi:10.1016/0370-2693(82)90685-2.
- [9] H. P. Nilles, M. Srednicki, and D. Wyler, “Weak interaction breakdown induced by supergravity”, *Phys. Lett.* **120** (1983) 346, doi:10.1016/0370-2693(83)90460-4.
- [10] J.-M. Frere, D. R. T. Jones, and S. Raby, “Fermion masses and induction of the weak scale by supergravity”, *Nucl. Phys. B* **222** (1983) 11, doi:10.1016/0550-3213(83)90606-5.
- [11] J.-P. Derendinger and C. A. Savoy, “Quantum effects and $SU(2) \times U(1)$ breaking in supergravity gauge theories”, *Nucl. Phys. B* **237** (1984) 307, doi:10.1016/0550-3213(84)90162-7.
- [12] M. Drees, “Supersymmetric models with extended Higgs sector”, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **4** (1989) 3635, doi:10.1142/S0217751X89001448.
- [13] M. Maniatis, “The next-to-minimal supersymmetric extension of the standard model reviewed”, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **25** (2010) 3505, doi:10.1142/S0217751X10049827, arXiv:0906.0777.
- [14] U. Ellwanger, C. Hugonie, and A. M. Teixeira, “The next-to-minimal supersymmetric standard model”, *Phys. Rept.* **496** (2010) 1, doi:10.1016/j.physrep.2010.07.001, arXiv:0910.1785.
- [15] H. P. Nilles, “Supersymmetry, supergravity and particle physics”, *Phys. Rept.* **110** (1984) 1, doi:10.1016/0370-1573(84)90008-5.
- [16] S. P. Martin, “A supersymmetry primer”, (1997). arXiv:hep-ph/9709356.
- [17] D. J. H. Chung et al., “The soft supersymmetry breaking Lagrangian: theory and applications”, *Phys. Rept.* **407** (2005) 1, doi:10.1016/j.physrep.2004.08.032, arXiv:hep-ph/0312378.
- [18] J. E. Kim and H. P. Nilles, “The μ -problem and the strong CP-problem”, *Phys. Lett. B* **138** (1984) 150, doi:10.1016/0370-2693(84)91890-2.
- [19] J. A. Casas, J. R. Espinosa, and I. Hidalgo, “The MSSM fine tuning problem: a way out”, *JHEP* **01** (2004) 008, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2004/01/008, arXiv:hep-ph/0310137.

- [20] R. Dermisek and 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, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.95.041801, arXiv:hep-ph/0502105.
- [21] S. Chang, R. Dermisek, J. F. Gunion, and N. Weiner, “Nonstandard Higgs boson decays”, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **58** (2008) 75, doi:10.1146/annurev.nucl.58.110707.171200, arXiv:0801.4554.
- [22] J. Ellis et al., “Higgs bosons in a nonminimal supersymmetric model”, *Phys. Rev. D* **39** (1989) 844, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.39.844.
- [23] U. Ellwanger, M. Rausch de Traubenberg, and C. A. Savoy, “Particle spectrum in supersymmetric models with a gauge singlet”, *Phys. Lett. B* **315** (1993) 331, doi:10.1016/0370-2693(93)91621-S, arXiv:hep-ph/9307322.
- [24] U. Ellwanger, M. Rausch de Traubenberg, and C. A. Savoy, “Higgs phenomenology of the supersymmetric model with a gauge singlet”, *Z. Phys. C* **67** (1995) 665, doi:10.1007/BF01553993, arXiv:hep-ph/9502206.
- [25] B. A. Dobrescu, G. L. Landsberg, and K. T. Matchev, “Higgs boson decays to CP-odd scalars at the Tevatron and beyond”, *Phys. Rev. D* **63** (2001) 075003, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.63.075003, arXiv:hep-ph/0005308.
- [26] D. J. Miller, R. Nevzorov, and P. M. Zerwas, “The Higgs sector of the next-to-minimal supersymmetric standard model”, *Nucl. Phys. B* **681** (2004) 3, doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2003.12.021, arXiv:hep-ph/0304049.
- [27] A. Belyaev et al., “LHC discovery potential of the lightest NMSSM Higgs in the $h_1 \rightarrow a_1 a_1 \rightarrow 4\mu$ channel”, *Phys. Rev. D* **81** (2010) 075021, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.81.075021, arXiv:1002.1956.
- [28] R. Dermisek and J. F. Gunion, “New constraints on a light CP-odd Higgs boson and related NMSSM ideal Higgs scenarios”, *Phys. Rev. D* **81** (2010) 075003, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.81.075003, arXiv:1002.1971.
- [29] N. Arkani-Hamed, D. P. Finkbeiner, T. R. Slatyer, and N. Weiner, “A theory of dark matter”, *Phys. Rev. D* **79** (2009) 015014, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.79.015014, arXiv:0810.0713.
- [30] M. Baumgart et al., “Non-Abelian dark sectors and their collider signatures”, *JHEP* **04** (2009) 014, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2009/04/014, arXiv:0901.0283.
- [31] A. Falkowski, J. T. Ruderman, T. Volansky, and J. Zupan, “Hidden Higgs decaying to lepton jets”, *JHEP* **05** (2010) 077, doi:10.1007/JHEP05(2010)077, arXiv:1002.2952.
- [32] PAMELA Collaboration, “An anomalous positron abundance in cosmic rays with energies 1.5-100 GeV”, *Nature* **458** (2009) 607, doi:10.1038/nature07942, arXiv:0810.4995.
- [33] Fermi LAT Collaboration, “Measurement of separate cosmic-ray electron and positron spectra with the Fermi Large Area Telescope”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108** (2012) 011103, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.108.011103, arXiv:1109.0521.

- [34] J. Hisano, S. Matsumoto, and M. M. Nojiri, “Explosive dark matter annihilation”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92** (2004) 031303, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.92.031303, arXiv:hep-ph/0307216.
- [35] M. Cirelli, M. Kadastik, M. Raidal, and A. Strumia, “Model-independent implications of the e^\pm, \bar{p} cosmic ray spectra on properties of dark matter”, *Nucl. Phys. B* **813** (2009) 1, doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2008.11.031, arXiv:0809.2409.
- [36] B. Holdom, “Two U(1)’s and ϵ charge shifts”, *Phys. Lett. B* **166** (1986) 196, doi:10.1016/0370-2693(86)91377-8.
- [37] K. R. Dienes, C. F. Kolda, and J. March-Russell, “Kinetic mixing and the supersymmetric gauge hierarchy”, *Nucl. Phys. B* **492** (1997) 104, doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(97)00173-9, arXiv:hep-ph/9610479.
- [38] C. Cheung, J. T. Ruderman, L.-T. Wang, and I. Yavin, “Kinetic mixing as the origin of light dark scales”, *Phys. Rev. D* **80** (2009) 035008, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.80.035008, arXiv:0902.3246.
- [39] PAMELA Collaboration, “PAMELA results on the cosmic-ray antiproton flux from 60 MeV to 180 GeV in kinetic energy”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105** (2010) 121101, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.105.121101, arXiv:1007.0821.
- [40] D0 Collaboration, “Search for NMSSM Higgs bosons in the $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow \mu\mu\mu\mu, \mu\mu\tau\tau$ channels using $p\bar{p}$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 1.96$ TeV”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103** (2009) 061801, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.103.061801, arXiv:0905.3381.
- [41] CMS Collaboration, “Search for light resonances decaying into pairs of muons as a signal of new physics”, *JHEP* **07** (2011) 098, doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2011)098, arXiv:1106.2375.
- [42] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for displaced muonic lepton jets from light Higgs boson decay in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV with the ATLAS detector”, (2012). arXiv:1210.0435. Submitted to Phys. Lett. B.
- [43] CLEO Collaboration, “Search for very light CP-odd Higgs boson in radiative decays of $Y(1S)$ ”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101** (2008) 151802, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.101.151802, arXiv:0807.1427.
- [44] BABAR Collaboration, “Search for dimuon decays of a light scalar boson in radiative transitions $Y \rightarrow \gamma A_0$ ”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103** (2009) 081803, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.103.081803, arXiv:0905.4539.
- [45] CDF Collaboration, “Search for a very light CP-odd Higgs boson in top quark decays from $p\bar{p}$ Collisions at 1.96 TeV”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107** (2011) 031801, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.107.031801, arXiv:1104.5701.
- [46] CMS Collaboration, “Search for a light pseudoscalar Higgs boson in the dimuon decay channel in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109** (2012) 121801, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.121801, arXiv:1206.6326.
- [47] N. Jarosik et al., “Seven-year Wilkinson microwave anisotropy probe (WMAP) observations: sky maps, systematic errors, and basic results”, *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **192** (2011) 14, doi:10.1088/0067-0049/192/2/14, arXiv:1001.4744.

- [48] OPAL Collaboration, “Decay mode independent searches for new scalar bosons with the OPAL detector at LEP”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **27** (2003) 311, doi:10.1140/epjc/s2002-01115-1, arXiv:hep-ex/0206022.
- [49] OPAL Collaboration, “Search for a low mass CP-odd Higgs boson in e^+e^- collisions with the OPAL detector at LEP-2”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **27** (2003) 483, doi:10.1140/epjc/s2003-01139-y, arXiv:hep-ex/0209068.
- [50] ALEPH, DELPHI, L3, OPAL, LEP Working Group for Higgs Boson Searches Collaboration, “Search for neutral MSSM Higgs bosons at LEP”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **47** (2006) 547, doi:10.1140/epjc/s2006-02569-7, arXiv:hep-ex/0602042.
- [51] D0 Collaboration, “Search for dark photons from supersymmetric hidden valleys”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103** (2009) 081802, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.103.081802, arXiv:0905.1478.
- [52] D0 Collaboration, “Search for events with leptonic jets and missing transverse energy in $p\bar{p}$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 1.96$ TeV”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105** (2010) 211802, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.105.211802, arXiv:1008.3356.
- [53] CDF Collaboration, “Search for anomalous production of multiple leptons in association with W and Z bosons at CDF”, *Phys. Rev. D* **85** (2012) 092001, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.85.092001, arXiv:1202.1260.
- [54] CMS Collaboration, “The CMS experiment at the CERN LHC”, *JINST* **3** (2008) S08004, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08004.
- [55] 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.
- [56] T. Sjöstrand, S. Mrenna, and P. Z. Skands, “PYTHIA 6.4 physics and manual”, *JHEP* **05** (2006) 026, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2006/05/026, arXiv:hep-ph/0603175.
- [57] J. Alwall et al., “MadGraph/MadEvent v4: the new web generation”, *JHEP* **09** (2007) 028, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2007/09/028, arXiv:0706.2334.
- [58] P. Meade and M. Reece, “BRIDGE: branching ratio inquiry / decay generated events”, (2007). arXiv:hep-ph/0703031.
- [59] 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.
- [60] CMS Collaboration, “Measurement of the Underlying Event Activity at the LHC with $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV and Comparison with $\sqrt{s} = 0.9$ TeV”, *JHEP* **1109** (2011) 109, doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2011)109, arXiv:1107.0330.
- [61] J. Allison et al., “Geant4 developments and applications”, *IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci.* **53** (2006) 270, doi:10.1109/TNS.2006.869826.
- [62] S. Bernstein, “Demonstration du theoreme de Weierstrass fondee sur le calcul des probabilités”, *Comm. Soc. Math. Kharkov* **13** (1912) 1.

- [63] M. J. Oreglia, “A study of the reactions $\psi' \rightarrow \gamma\gamma\psi$ ”. PhD thesis, Stanford University, 1980. SLAC Report SLAC-R-236, Appendix D.
- [64] 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.
- [65] LHC Higgs Cross Section Working Group Collaboration, “Handbook of LHC Higgs cross sections: 1. Inclusive observables”, (2011). arXiv:1101.0593.
- [66] CMS Collaboration, “Absolute Calibration of the Luminosity Measurement at CMS: Winter 2012 Update”, CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-SMP-12-008, (2012).
- [67] P. M. Nadolsky et al., “Implications of CTEQ global analysis for collider observables”, *Phys. Rev. D* **78** (2008) 013004, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.78.013004, arXiv:0802.0007.
- [68] R. D. Ball et al., “A first unbiased global NLO determination of parton distributions and their uncertainties”, *Nucl. Phys. B* **838** (2010) 136, doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2010.05.008, arXiv:1002.4407.
- [69] 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.
- [70] M. Botje et al., “The PDF4LHC working group interim recommendations”, (2011). arXiv:1101.0538.

A The CMS Collaboration

Yerevan Physics Institute, Yerevan, Armenia

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

Institut für Hochenergiephysik der OeAW, Wien, Austria

W. Adam, E. Aguilo, T. Bergauer, M. Dragicevic, J. Erö, C. Fabjan¹, M. Friedl, R. Frühwirth¹, V.M. Ghete, J. Hammer, N. Hörmann, J. Hrubec, M. Jeitler¹, W. Kiesenhofer, V. Knünz, M. Krammer¹, I. Krätschmer, D. Liko, I. Mikulec, M. Pernicka[†], B. Rahbaran, C. Rohringer, H. Rohringer, R. Schöfbeck, J. Strauss, A. Taurok, W. Waltenberger, G. Walzel, E. Widl, C.-E. Wulz¹

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

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

Universiteit Antwerpen, Antwerpen, Belgium

M. Bansal, S. Bansal, T. Cornelis, E.A. De Wolf, X. Janssen, S. Luyckx, L. Mucibello, S. Ochesanu, B. Roland, R. Rougny, M. Selvaggi, Z. Staykova, H. Van Haevermaet, P. Van Mechelen, N. Van Remortel, A. Van Spillbeeck

Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussel, Belgium

F. Blekman, S. Blyweert, J. D'Hondt, R. Gonzalez Suarez, A. Kalogeropoulos, M. Maes, A. Olbrechts, W. Van Doninck, P. Van Mulders, G.P. Van Onsem, I. Villella

Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium

B. Clerbaux, G. De Lentdecker, V. Dero, A.P.R. Gay, T. Hreus, A. Léonard, P.E. Marage, A. Mohammadi, T. Reis, L. Thomas, G. Vander Marcken, C. Vander Velde, P. Vanlaer, J. Wang

Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

V. Adler, K. Beernaert, A. Cimmino, S. Costantini, G. Garcia, M. Grunewald, B. Klein, J. Lellouch, A. Marinov, J. McCartin, A.A. Ocampo Rios, D. Ryckbosch, N. Strobbe, F. Thyssen, M. Tytgat, P. Verwilligen, S. Walsh, E. Yazgan, N. Zaganidis

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

S. Basegmez, G. Bruno, R. Castello, L. Ceard, C. Delaere, T. du Pree, D. Favart, L. Forthomme, A. Giammanco², J. Hollar, V. Lemaitre, J. Liao, O. Militaru, C. Nuttens, D. Pagano, A. Pin, K. Piotrkowski, N. Schul, J.M. Vizan Garcia

Université de Mons, Mons, Belgium

N. Beliy, T. Caebergs, E. Daubie, G.H. Hammad

Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Fisicas, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

G.A. Alves, M. Correa Martins Junior, T. Martins, M.E. Pol, M.H.G. Souza

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

W.L. Aldá Júnior, W. Carvalho, A. Custódio, E.M. Da Costa, D. De Jesus Damiao, C. De Oliveira Martins, S. Fonseca De Souza, D. Matos Figueiredo, L. Mundim, H. Nogima, V. Oguri, W.L. Prado Da Silva, A. Santoro, L. Soares Jorge, A. Sznajder

Instituto de Fisica Teorica, Universidade Estadual Paulista, Sao Paulo, Brazil

T.S. Anjos³, C.A. Bernardes³, F.A. Dias⁴, T.R. Fernandez Perez Tomei, E.M. Gregores³, C. Lagana, F. Marinho, P.G. Mercadante³, S.F. Novaes, Sandra S. Padula

Institute for Nuclear Research and Nuclear Energy, Sofia, Bulgaria

V. Genchev⁵, P. Iaydjiev⁵, S. Piperov, M. Rodozov, S. Stoykova, G. Sultanov, V. Tcholakov, R. Trayanov, M. Vutova

University of Sofia, Sofia, Bulgaria

A. Dimitrov, R. Hadjiiska, V. Kozhuharov, L. Litov, B. Pavlov, P. Petkov

Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing, China

J.G. Bian, G.M. Chen, H.S. Chen, C.H. Jiang, D. Liang, S. Liang, X. Meng, J. Tao, J. Wang, X. Wang, Z. Wang, H. Xiao, M. Xu, J. Zang, Z. Zhang

State Key Lab. of Nucl. Phys. and Tech., Peking University, Beijing, China

C. Asawatangtrakuldee, Y. Ban, Y. Guo, W. Li, S. Liu, Y. Mao, S.J. Qian, H. Teng, D. Wang, L. Zhang, W. Zou

Universidad de Los Andes, Bogota, Colombia

C. Avila, J.P. Gomez, B. Gomez Moreno, A.F. Osorio Oliveros, J.C. Sanabria

Technical University of Split, Split, Croatia

N. Godinovic, D. Lelas, R. Plestina⁶, D. Polic, I. Puljak⁵

University of Split, Split, Croatia

Z. Antunovic, M. Kovac

Institute Rudjer Boskovic, Zagreb, Croatia

V. Brigljevic, S. Duric, K. Kadija, J. Luetic, S. Morovic

University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus

A. Attikis, M. Galanti, G. Mavromanolakis, J. Mousa, C. Nicolaou, F. Ptochos, P.A. Razis

Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

M. Finger, M. Finger Jr.

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

Y. Assran⁷, S. Elgammal⁸, A. Ellithi Kamel⁹, M.A. Mahmoud¹⁰, A. Radi^{11,12}

National Institute of Chemical Physics and Biophysics, Tallinn, Estonia

M. Kadastik, M. Müntel, M. Raidal, L. Rebane, A. Tiko

Department of Physics, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

P. Eerola, G. Fedi, M. Voutilainen

Helsinki Institute of Physics, Helsinki, Finland

J. Härkönen, A. Heikkinen, V. Karimäki, R. Kinnunen, M.J. Kortelainen, T. Lampén, K. Lassila-Perini, S. Lehti, T. Lindén, P. Luukka, T. Mäenpää, T. Peltola, E. Tuominen, J. Tuominiemi, E. Tuovinen, D. Ungaro, L. Wendland

Lappeenranta University of Technology, Lappeenranta, Finland

K. Banzuzi, A. Karjalainen, A. Korpela, T. Tuuva

DSM/IRFU, CEA/Saclay, Gif-sur-Yvette, France

M. Besancon, S. Choudhury, M. Dejjardin, D. Denegri, B. Fabbro, J.L. Faure, F. Ferri, S. Ganjour, A. Givernaud, P. Gras, G. Hamel de Monchenault, P. Jarry, E. Locci, J. Malcles, L. Millischer, A. Nayak, J. Rander, A. Rosowsky, I. Shreyber, M. Titov

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

S. Baffioni, F. Beaudette, L. Benhabib, L. Bianchini, M. Bluj¹³, C. Broutin, P. Busson, C. Charlot, N. Daci, T. Dahms, M. Dalchenko, L. Dobrzynski, R. Granier de Cassagnac, M. Haguenaue, P. Miné, C. Mironov, I.N. Naranjo, M. Nguyen, C. Ochando, P. Paganini, D. Sabes, R. Salerno, Y. Sirois, C. Veelken, A. Zabi

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

J.-L. Agram¹⁴, J. Andrea, D. Bloch, D. Bodin, J.-M. Brom, M. Cardaci, E.C. Chabert, C. Collard, E. Conte¹⁴, F. Drouhin¹⁴, C. Ferro, J.-C. Fontaine¹⁴, D. Gelé, U. Goerlach, P. Juillot, 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, Villeurbanne, France

F. Fassi, D. Mercier

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

S. Beauceron, N. Beaupere, O. Bondu, G. Boudoul, J. Chasserat, R. Chierici⁵, D. Contardo, P. Depasse, H. El Mamouni, J. Fay, S. Gascon, M. Gouzevitch, B. Ille, T. Kurca, M. Lethuillier, L. Mirabito, S. Perries, L. Sgandurra, V. Sordini, Y. Tschudi, P. Verdier, S. Viret

Institute of High Energy Physics and Informatization, Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia

Z. Tsamalaidze¹⁵

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

G. Anagnostou, C. Autermann, S. Beranek, M. Edelhoff, L. Feld, N. Heracleous, O. Hindrichs, R. Jussen, K. Klein, J. Merz, A. Ostapchuk, A. Perieanu, F. Raupach, J. Sammet, S. Schael, D. Sprenger, H. Weber, B. Wittmer, V. Zhukov¹⁶

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

M. Ata, J. Caudron, E. Dietz-Laursonn, D. Duchardt, M. Erdmann, R. Fischer, A. Güth, T. Hebbeker, C. Heidemann, K. Hoepfner, D. Klingebiel, P. Kreuzer, M. Merschmeyer, A. Meyer, M. Olschewski, P. Papacz, H. Pieta, H. Reithler, S.A. Schmitz, L. Sonnenschein, J. Steggemann, D. Teyssier, M. Weber

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

M. Bontenackels, V. Cherepanov, Y. Erdogan, G. Flügge, H. Geenen, M. Geisler, W. Haj Ahmad, F. Hoehle, B. Kargoll, T. Kress, Y. Kuessel, J. Lingemann⁵, A. Nowack, L. Perchalla, O. Pooth, P. Sauerland, A. Stahl

Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Hamburg, Germany

M. Aldaya Martin, J. Behr, W. Behrenhoff, U. Behrens, M. Bergholz¹⁷, A. Bethani, K. Borras, A. Burgmeier, A. Cakir, L. Calligaris, A. Campbell, E. Castro, F. Costanza, D. Dammann, C. Diez Pardos, G. Eckerlin, D. Eckstein, G. Flucke, A. Geiser, I. Glushkov, P. Gunnellini, S. Habib, J. Hauk, G. Hellwig, H. Jung, M. Kasemann, P. Katsas, C. Kleinwort, H. Kluge, A. Knutsson, M. Krämer, D. Krücker, E. Kuznetsova, W. Lange, W. Lohmann¹⁷, B. Lutz, R. Mankel, I. Marfin, M. Marienfeld, I.-A. Melzer-Pellmann, A.B. Meyer, J. Mnich, A. Mussgiller, S. Naumann-Emme, O. Novgorodova, J. Olzem, H. Perrey, A. Petrukhin, D. Pitzl, A. Raspereza, P.M. Ribeiro Cipriano, C. Riedl, E. Ron, M. Rosin, J. Salfeld-Nebgen, R. Schmidt¹⁷, T. Schoerner-Sadenius, N. Sen, A. Spiridonov, M. Stein, R. Walsh, C. Wissing

University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany

V. Blobel, J. Draeger, H. Enderle, J. Erfle, U. Gebbert, M. Görner, T. Hermanns, R.S. Höing, K. Kaschube, G. Kaussen, H. Kirschenmann, R. Klanner, J. Lange, B. Mura, F. Nowak, T. Peiffer, N. Pietsch, D. Rathjens, C. Sander, H. Schettler, P. Schleper, E. Schlieckau, A. Schmidt, M. Schröder, T. Schum, M. Seidel, J. Sibille¹⁸, V. Sola, H. Stadie, G. Steinbrück, J. Thomsen, L. Vanelderen

Institut für Experimentelle Kernphysik, Karlsruhe, Germany

C. Barth, J. Berger, C. Böser, T. Chwalek, W. De Boer, A. Descroix, A. Dierlamm, M. Feindt, M. Guthoff⁵, C. Hackstein, F. Hartmann, T. Hauth⁵, M. Heinrich, H. Held, K.H. Hoffmann, U. Husemann, I. Katkov¹⁶, J.R. Komaragiri, P. Lobelle Pardo, D. Martschei, S. Mueller, Th. Müller, M. Niegel, A. Nürnberg, O. Oberst, A. Oehler, J. Ott, G. Quast, K. Rabbertz, F. Ratnikov, N. Ratnikova, S. Röcker, F.-P. Schilling, G. Schott, H.J. Simonis, F.M. Stober, D. Troendle, R. Ulrich, J. Wagner-Kuhr, S. Wayand, T. Weiler, M. Zeise

Institute of Nuclear Physics "Demokritos", Aghia Paraskevi, Greece

G. Daskalakis, T. Gerasis, S. Kesisoglou, A. Kyriakis, D. Loukas, I. Manolakos, A. Markou, C. Markou, C. Mavrommatis, E. Ntomari

University of Athens, Athens, Greece

L. Gouskos, T.J. Mertzimekis, A. Panagiotou, N. Saoulidou

University of Ioánnina, Ioánnina, Greece

I. Evangelou, C. Foudas, P. Kokkas, N. Manthos, I. Papadopoulos, V. Patras

KFKI Research Institute for Particle and Nuclear Physics, Budapest, Hungary

G. Bencze, C. Hajdu, P. Hidas, D. Horvath¹⁹, F. Sikler, V. Veszpremi, G. Vesztergombi²⁰

Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary

N. Beni, S. Czellar, J. Molnar, J. Palinkas, Z. Szillasi

University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary

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

Panjab University, Chandigarh, India

S.B. Beri, V. Bhatnagar, N. Dhingra, R. Gupta, M. Kaur, M.Z. Mehta, N. Nishu, L.K. Saini, A. Sharma, J.B. Singh

University of Delhi, Delhi, India

Ashok Kumar, Arun Kumar, S. Ahuja, A. Bhardwaj, B.C. Choudhary, S. Malhotra, M. Naimuddin, K. Ranjan, V. Sharma, R.K. Shivpuri

Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, Kolkata, India

S. Banerjee, S. Bhattacharya, S. Dutta, B. Gomber, Sa. Jain, Sh. Jain, R. Khurana, S. Sarkar, M. Sharan

Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, Mumbai, India

A. Abdulsalam, R.K. Choudhury, D. Dutta, S. Kailas, V. Kumar, P. Mehta, A.K. Mohanty⁵, L.M. Pant, P. Shukla

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research - EHEP, Mumbai, India

T. Aziz, S. Ganguly, M. Guchait²¹, M. Maity²², G. Majumder, K. Mazumdar, G.B. Mohanty, B. Parida, K. Sudhakar, N. Wickramage

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research - HECR, Mumbai, India

S. Banerjee, S. Dugad

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

H. Arfaei²³, H. Bakhshiansohi, S.M. Etesami²⁴, A. Fahim²³, M. Hashemi, H. Hesari, A. Jafari, M. Khakzad, M. Mohammadi Najafabadi, S. Paktinat Mehdiabadi, B. Safarzadeh²⁵, M. Zeinali

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

M. Abbrescia^{a,b}, L. Barbone^{a,b}, C. Calabria^{a,b,5}, S.S. Chhibra^{a,b}, A. Colaleo^a, D. Creanza^{a,c}, N. De

Filippis^{a,c,5}, M. De Palma^{a,b}, L. Fiore^a, G. Iaselli^{a,c}, G. Maggi^{a,c}, M. Maggi^a, B. Marangelli^{a,b}, S. My^{a,c}, S. Nuzzo^{a,b}, N. Pacifico^{a,b}, A. Pompili^{a,b}, G. Pugliese^{a,c}, G. Selvaggi^{a,b}, L. Silvestris^a, G. Singh^{a,b}, R. Venditti^{a,b}, G. Zito^a

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

G. Abbiendi^a, A.C. Benvenuti^a, D. Bonacorsi^{a,b}, S. Braibant-Giacomelli^{a,b}, L. Brigliadori^{a,b}, P. Capiluppi^{a,b}, A. Castro^{a,b}, F.R. Cavallo^a, M. Cuffiani^{a,b}, G.M. Dallavalle^a, F. Fabbri^a, A. Fanfani^{a,b}, D. Fasanella^{a,b,5}, P. Giacomelli^a, C. Grandi^a, L. Guiducci^{a,b}, S. Marcellini^a, G. Masetti^a, M. Meneghelli^{a,b,5}, A. Montanari^a, F.L. Navarria^{a,b}, F. Odorici^a, A. Perrotta^a, F. Primavera^{a,b}, A.M. Rossi^{a,b}, T. Rovelli^{a,b}, G.P. Siroli^{a,b}, R. Travaglini^{a,b}

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

S. Albergo^{a,b}, G. Cappello^{a,b}, M. Chiorboli^{a,b}, S. Costa^{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}, S. Frosali^{a,b}, E. Gallo^a, S. Gonzi^{a,b}, M. Meschini^a, S. Paoletti^a, G. Sguazzoni^a, A. Tropiano^{a,b}

INFN Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, Frascati, Italy

L. Benussi, S. Bianco, S. Colafranceschi²⁶, F. Fabbri, D. Piccolo

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

P. Fabbriatore^a, R. Musenich^a, S. Tosi^{a,b}

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

A. Benaglia^{a,b}, F. De Guio^{a,b}, L. Di Matteo^{a,b,5}, S. Fiorendi^{a,b}, S. Gennai^{a,5}, A. Ghezzi^{a,b}, S. Malvezzi^a, R.A. Manzoni^{a,b}, A. Martelli^{a,b}, A. Massironi^{a,b,5}, D. Menasce^a, L. Moroni^a, M. Paganoni^{a,b}, D. Pedrini^a, S. Ragazzi^{a,b}, N. Redaelli^a, S. Sala^a, T. Tabarelli de Fatis^{a,b}

INFN Sezione di Napoli ^a, Università di Napoli "Federico II" ^b, Napoli, Italy

S. Buontempo^a, C.A. Carrillo Montoya^a, N. Cavallo^{a,27}, A. De Cosa^{a,b,5}, O. Dogangun^{a,b}, F. Fabozzi^{a,27}, A.O.M. Iorio^{a,b}, L. Lista^a, S. Meola^{a,28}, M. Merola^a, P. Paolucci^{a,5}

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

P. Azzi^a, N. Bacchetta^{a,5}, D. Bisello^{a,b}, A. Branca^{a,b,5}, R. Carlin^{a,b}, P. Checchia^a, T. Dorigo^a, F. Gasparini^{a,b}, U. Gasparini^{a,b}, A. Gozzelino^a, K. Kanishchev^{a,c}, S. Lacaprara^a, I. Lazzizzera^{a,c}, M. Margoni^{a,b}, A.T. Meneguzzo^{a,b}, M. Passaseo^a, J. Pazzini^{a,b}, M. Pegoraro^a, N. Pozzobon^{a,b}, P. Ronchese^{a,b}, F. Simonetto^{a,b}, E. Torassa^a, M. Tosi^{a,b}, S. Vanini^{a,b}, P. Zotto^{a,b}

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

M. Gabusi^{a,b}, S.P. Ratti^{a,b}, C. Riccardi^{a,b}, P. Torre^{a,b}, P. Vitulo^{a,b}

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

M. Biasini^{a,b}, G.M. Bilei^a, L. Fanò^{a,b}, P. Lariccia^{a,b}, G. Mantovani^{a,b}, M. Menichelli^a, A. Nappi^{a,b†}, F. Romeo^{a,b}, A. Saha^a, A. Santocchia^{a,b}, A. Spiezia^{a,b}, S. Taroni^{a,b}

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

P. Azzurri^{a,c}, G. Bagliesi^a, J. Bernardini^a, T. Boccali^a, G. Broccolo^{a,c}, R. Castaldi^a, R.T. D'Agnolo^{a,c,5}, R. Dell'Orso^a, F. Fiori^{a,b,5}, L. Foà^{a,c}, A. Giassi^a, A. Kraan^a, F. Ligabue^{a,c}, T. Lomtadze^a, L. Martini^{a,29}, A. Messineo^{a,b}, F. Palla^a, A. Rizzi^{a,b}, A.T. Serban^{a,30}, P. Spagnolo^a, P. Squillacioti^{a,5}, 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, D. Del Re^{a,b}, M. Diemoz^a, C. Fanelli^{a,b}, M. Grassi^{a,b,5}, E. Longo^{a,b},

P. Meridiani^{a,5}, F. Micheli^{a,b}, S. Nourbakhsh^{a,b}, G. Organtini^{a,b}, R. Paramatti^a, S. Rahatlou^{a,b}, M. Sigamani^a, L. Soffi^{a,b}

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

N. Amapane^{a,b}, R. Arcidiacono^{a,c}, S. Argiro^{a,b}, M. Arneodo^{a,c}, C. Biino^a, N. Cartiglia^a, M. Costa^{a,b}, N. Demaria^a, C. Mariotti^{a,5}, S. Maselli^a, E. Migliore^{a,b}, V. Monaco^{a,b}, M. Musich^{a,5}, M.M. Obertino^{a,c}, N. Pastrone^a, M. Pelliccioni^a, A. Potenza^{a,b}, A. Romero^{a,b}, M. Ruspa^{a,c}, R. Sacchi^{a,b}, A. Solano^{a,b}, A. Staiano^a, A. Vilela Pereira^a

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

S. Belforte^a, V. Candellise^{a,b}, M. Casarsa^a, F. Cossutti^a, G. Della Ricca^{a,b}, B. Gobbo^a, M. Marone^{a,b,5}, D. Montanino^{a,b,5}, A. Penzo^a, A. Schizzi^{a,b}

Kangwon National University, Chuncheon, Korea

S.G. Heo, T.Y. Kim, S.K. Nam

Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea

S. Chang, D.H. Kim, G.N. Kim, D.J. Kong, H. Park, S.R. Ro, D.C. Son, T. Son

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

J.Y. Kim, Zero J. Kim, S. Song

Korea University, Seoul, Korea

S. Choi, D. Gyun, B. Hong, M. Jo, H. Kim, T.J. Kim, K.S. Lee, D.H. Moon, S.K. Park

University of Seoul, Seoul, Korea

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

Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon, Korea

Y. Cho, Y. Choi, Y.K. Choi, J. Goh, M.S. Kim, E. Kwon, B. Lee, J. Lee, S. Lee, H. Seo, I. Yu

Vilnius University, Vilnius, Lithuania

M.J. Bilinskas, I. Grigelionis, M. Janulis, A. Juodagalvis

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, R. Lopez-Fernandez, R. Magaña Villalba, J. Martínez-Ortega, A. Sánchez-Hernández, L.M. Villasenor-Cendejas

Universidad Iberoamericana, Mexico City, Mexico

S. Carrillo Moreno, F. Vazquez Valencia

Benemerita Universidad Autonoma de Puebla, Puebla, Mexico

H.A. Salazar Ibarguen

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

E. Casimiro Linares, A. Morelos Pineda, M.A. Reyes-Santos

University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

D. Krofcheck

University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand

A.J. Bell, P.H. Butler, R. Doesburg, S. Reucroft, H. Silverwood

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

M. Ahmad, M.H. Ansari, M.I. Asghar, J. Butt, H.R. Hoorani, S. Khalid, W.A. Khan, T. Khurshid, S. Qazi, M.A. Shah, M. Shoaib

National Centre for Nuclear Research, Swierk, Poland

H. Bialkowska, B. Boimska, T. Frueboes, R. Gokieli, M. Górski, M. Kazana, K. Nawrocki, K. Romanowska-Rybinska, M. Szleper, G. Wrochna, P. Zalewski

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

G. Brona, K. Bunkowski, M. Cwiok, W. Dominik, K. Doroba, A. Kalinowski, M. Konecki, J. Krolikowski

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

N. Almeida, P. Bargassa, A. David, P. Faccioli, P.G. Ferreira Parracho, M. Gallinaro, J. Seixas, J. Varela, P. Vischia

Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia

I. Belotelov, P. Bunin, I. Golutvin, I. Gorbunov, A. Kamenev, V. Karjavin, G. Kozlov, A. Lanev, A. Malakhov, P. Moisenz, V. Palichik, V. Perelygin, M. Savina, S. Shmatov, V. Smirnov, A. Volodko, A. Zarubin

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

S. Evstyukhin, V. Golovtsov, Y. Ivanov, V. Kim, P. Levchenko, V. Murzin, V. Oreshkin, I. Smirnov, V. Sulimov, L. Uvarov, S. Vavilov, A. Vorobyev, An. Vorobyev

Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia

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

Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia

V. Epshteyn, M. Erofeeva, V. Gavrilov, M. Kossov, N. Lychkovskaya, V. Popov, G. Safronov, S. Semenov, V. Stolin, E. Vlasov, A. Zhokin

Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia

A. Belyaev, E. Boos, M. Dubinin⁴, L. Dudko, A. Ershov, A. Gribushin, V. Klyukhin, O. Kodolova, I. Lokhtin, A. Markina, S. Obraztsov, M. Perfilov, S. Petrushanko, A. Popov, L. Sarycheva[†], V. Savrin, A. Snigirev

P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia

V. Andreev, M. Azarkin, I. Dremin, M. Kirakosyan, A. Leonidov, G. Mesyats, S.V. Rusakov, A. Vinogradov

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

I. Azhgirey, I. Bayshev, S. Bitioukov, V. Grishin⁵, V. Kachanov, D. Konstantinov, V. Krychkin, V. Petrov, R. Ryutin, A. Sobol, L. Tourtchanovitch, S. Troshin, N. Tyurin, A. Uzunian, A. Volkov

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

P. Adzic³¹, M. Djordjevic, M. Ekmedzic, D. Krpic³¹, J. Milosevic

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

M. Aguilar-Benitez, J. Alcaraz Maestre, P. Arce, C. Battilana, E. Calvo, M. Cerrada, M. Chamizo Llatas, N. Colino, B. De La Cruz, A. Delgado Peris, D. Domínguez Vázquez, C. Fernandez

Bedoya, J.P. Fernández Ramos, A. Ferrando, J. Flix, M.C. Fouz, P. Garcia-Abia, O. Gonzalez Lopez, S. Goy Lopez, J.M. Hernandez, M.I. Josa, G. Merino, J. Puerta Pelayo, A. Quintario Olmeda, I. Redondo, L. Romero, J. Santaolalla, M.S. Soares, C. Willmott

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain

C. Albajar, G. Codispoti, J.F. de Trocóniz

Universidad de Oviedo, Oviedo, Spain

H. Brun, J. Cuevas, J. Fernandez Menendez, S. Folgueras, I. Gonzalez Caballero, L. Lloret Iglesias, J. Piedra Gomez

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

J.A. Brochero Cifuentes, I.J. Cabrillo, A. Calderon, S.H. Chuang, J. Duarte Campderros, M. Felcini³², M. Fernandez, G. Gomez, J. Gonzalez Sanchez, A. Graziano, C. Jorda, A. Lopez Virto, J. Marco, R. Marco, C. Martinez Rivero, F. Matorras, F.J. Munoz Sanchez, T. Rodrigo, A.Y. Rodríguez-Marrero, A. Ruiz-Jimeno, L. Scodellaro, I. Vila, R. Vilar Cortabitarte

CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland

D. Abbaneo, E. Auffray, G. Auzinger, M. Bachtis, P. Baillon, A.H. Ball, D. Barney, J.F. Benitez, C. Bernet⁶, G. Bianchi, P. Bloch, A. Bocci, A. Bonato, C. Botta, H. Breuker, T. Camporesi, G. Cerminara, T. Christiansen, J.A. Coarasa Perez, D. D'Enterria, A. Dabrowski, A. De Roeck, S. Di Guida, M. Dobson, N. Dupont-Sagorin, A. Elliott-Peisert, B. Frisch, W. Funk, G. Georgiou, M. Giffels, D. Gigi, K. Gill, D. Giordano, M. Girone, M. Giunta, F. Glege, R. Gomez-Reino Garrido, P. Govoni, S. Gowdy, R. Guida, M. Hansen, P. Harris, C. Hartl, J. Harvey, B. Hegner, A. Hinzmann, V. Innocente, P. Janot, K. Kaadze, E. Karavakis, K. Kousouris, P. Lecoq, Y.-J. Lee, P. Lenzi, C. Lourenço, N. Magini, T. Mäki, M. Malberti, L. Malgeri, M. Mannelli, L. Masetti, F. Meijers, S. Mersi, E. Meschi, R. Moser, M.U. Mozer, M. Mulders, P. Musella, E. Nesvold, T. Orimoto, L. Orsini, E. Palencia Cortezon, E. Perez, L. Perrozzi, A. Petrilli, A. Pfeiffer, M. Pierini, M. Pimiä, D. Piparo, G. Polese, L. Quertenmont, A. Racz, W. Reece, J. Rodrigues Antunes, G. Rolandi³³, C. Rovelli³⁴, M. Rovere, H. Sakulin, F. Santanastasio, C. Schäfer, C. Schwick, I. Segoni, S. Sekmen, A. Sharma, P. Siegrist, P. Silva, M. Simon, P. Sphicas³⁵, D. Spiga, A. Tsiros, G.I. Veres²⁰, J.R. Vlimant, H.K. Wöhri, S.D. Worm³⁶, W.D. Zeuner

Paul Scherrer Institut, Villigen, Switzerland

W. Bertl, K. Deiters, W. Erdmann, K. Gabathuler, R. Horisberger, Q. Ingram, H.C. Kaestli, S. König, D. Kotlinski, U. Langenegger, F. Meier, D. Renker, T. Rohe

Institute for Particle Physics, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

L. Bäni, P. Bortignon, M.A. Buchmann, B. Casal, N. Chanon, A. Deisher, G. Dissertori, M. Dittmar, M. Donegà, M. Dünser, J. Eugster, K. Freudenreich, C. Grab, D. Hits, P. Lecomte, W. Lustermann, A.C. Marini, P. Martinez Ruiz del Arbol, N. Mohr, F. Moortgat, C. Nägeli³⁷, P. Nef, F. Nessi-Tedaldi, F. Pandolfi, L. Pape, F. Pauss, M. Peruzzi, F.J. Ronga, M. Rossini, L. Sala, A.K. Sanchez, A. Starodumov³⁸, B. Stieger, M. Takahashi, L. Tauscher[†], A. Thea, K. Theofilatos, D. Treille, C. Urscheler, R. Wallny, H.A. Weber, L. Wehrli

Universität Zürich, Zurich, Switzerland

C. AMSLER³⁹, V. Chiochia, S. De Visscher, C. Favaro, M. Ivova Rikova, B. Millan Mejias, P. Otiougova, P. Robmann, H. Snoek, S. Tuppiti, M. Verzetti

National Central University, Chung-Li, Taiwan

Y.H. Chang, K.H. Chen, C.M. Kuo, S.W. Li, W. Lin, Z.K. Liu, Y.J. Lu, D. Mekterovic, A.P. Singh, R. Volpe, S.S. Yu

National Taiwan University (NTU), Taipei, Taiwan

P. Bartalini, P. Chang, Y.H. Chang, Y.W. Chang, Y. Chao, K.F. Chen, C. Dietz, U. Grundler, W.-S. Hou, Y. Hsiung, K.Y. Kao, Y.J. Lei, R.-S. Lu, D. Majumder, E. Petrakou, X. Shi, J.G. Shiu, Y.M. Tzeng, X. Wan, M. Wang

Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand

B. Asavapibhop, N. Srimanobhas

Cukurova University, Adana, Turkey

A. Adiguzel, M.N. Bakirci⁴⁰, S. Cerci⁴¹, C. Dozen, I. Dumanoglu, E. Eskut, S. Girgis, G. Gokbulut, E. Gurpinar, I. Hos, E.E. Kangal, T. Karaman, G. Karapinar⁴², A. Kayis Topaksu, G. Onengut, K. Ozdemir, S. Ozturk⁴³, A. Polatoz, K. Sogut⁴⁴, D. Sunar Cerci⁴¹, B. Tali⁴¹, H. Topakli⁴⁰, L.N. Vergili, M. Vergili

Middle East Technical University, Physics Department, Ankara, Turkey

I.V. Akin, T. Aliev, B. Bilin, S. Bilmis, M. Deniz, H. Gamsizkan, A.M. Guler, K. Ocalan, A. Ozpineci, M. Serin, R. Sever, U.E. Surat, M. Yalvac, E. Yildirim, M. Zeyrek

Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey

E. Gülmez, B. Isildak⁴⁵, M. Kaya⁴⁶, O. Kaya⁴⁶, S. Ozkorucuklu⁴⁷, N. Sonmez⁴⁸

Istanbul Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey

K. Cankocak

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

L. Levchuk

University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom

J.J. Brooke, E. Clement, D. Cussans, H. Flacher, R. Frazier, J. Goldstein, M. Grimes, G.P. Heath, H.F. Heath, L. Kreczko, S. Metson, D.M. Newbold³⁶, K. Nirunpong, A. Poll, S. Senkin, V.J. Smith, T. Williams

Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom

L. Basso⁴⁹, K.W. Bell, A. Belyaev⁴⁹, C. Brew, R.M. Brown, D.J.A. Cockerill, J.A. Coughlan, K. Harder, S. Harper, J. Jackson, B.W. Kennedy, E. Olaiya, D. Petyt, B.C. Radburn-Smith, C.H. Shepherd-Themistocleous, I.R. Tomalin, W.J. Womersley

Imperial College, London, United Kingdom

R. Bainbridge, G. Ball, R. Beuselinck, O. Buchmuller, D. Colling, N. Cripps, M. Cutajar, P. Dauncey, G. Davies, M. Della Negra, W. Ferguson, J. Fulcher, D. Futyan, A. Gilbert, A. Guneratne Bryer, G. Hall, Z. Hatherell, J. Hays, G. Iles, M. Jarvis, G. Karapostoli, L. Lyons, A.-M. Magnan, J. Marrouche, B. Mathias, R. Nandi, J. Nash, A. Nikitenko³⁸, A. Papageorgiou, J. Pela, M. Pesaresi, K. Petridis, M. Pioppi⁵⁰, D.M. Raymond, S. Rogerson, A. Rose, M.J. Ryan, C. Seez, P. Sharp[†], A. Sparrow, M. Stoye, A. Tapper, M. Vazquez Acosta, T. Virdee, S. Wakefield, N. Wardle, T. Whyntie

Brunel University, Uxbridge, United Kingdom

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

Baylor University, Waco, USA

K. Hatakeyama, H. Liu, T. Scarborough

The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, USA

O. Charaf, C. Henderson, P. Rumerio

Boston University, Boston, USA

A. Avetisyan, T. Bose, C. Fantasia, A. Heister, J. St. John, P. Lawson, D. Lazic, J. Rohlf, D. Sperka, L. Sulak

Brown University, Providence, USA

J. Alimena, S. Bhattacharya, D. Cutts, Z. Demiragli, A. Ferapontov, A. Garabedian, U. Heintz, S. Jabeen, G. Kukartsev, E. Laird, G. Landsberg, M. Luk, M. Narain, D. Nguyen, M. Segala, T. Sinthuprasith, T. Speer, K.V. Tsang

University of California, Davis, Davis, USA

R. Breedon, G. Breto, M. Calderon De La Barca Sanchez, S. Chauhan, M. Chertok, J. Conway, R. Conway, P.T. Cox, J. Dolen, R. Erbacher, M. Gardner, R. Houtz, W. Ko, A. Kopecky, R. Lander, O. Mall, T. Miceli, D. Pellett, F. Ricci-Tam, B. Rutherford, M. Searle, J. Smith, M. Squires, M. Tripathi, R. Vasquez Sierra, R. Yohay

University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, USA

V. Andreev, D. Cline, R. Cousins, J. Duris, S. Erhan, P. Everaerts, C. Farrell, J. Hauser, M. Ignatenko, C. Jarvis, C. Plager, G. Rakness, P. Schlein[†], P. Traczyk, V. Valuev, M. Weber

University of California, Riverside, Riverside, USA

J. Babb, R. Clare, M.E. Dinardo, J. Ellison, J.W. Gary, F. Giordano, G. Hanson, G.Y. Jeng⁵¹, H. Liu, O.R. Long, A. Luthra, H. Nguyen, S. Paramesvaran, J. Sturdy, S. Sumowidagdo, R. Wilken, S. Wimpenny

University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, USA

W. Andrews, J.G. Branson, G.B. Cerati, S. Cittolin, D. Evans, F. Golf, A. Holzner, R. Kelley, M. Lebourgeois, J. Letts, I. Macneill, B. Mangano, S. Padhi, C. Palmer, G. Petrucciani, M. Pieri, M. Sani, V. Sharma, S. Simon, E. Sudano, M. Tadel, Y. Tu, A. Vartak, S. Wasserbaech⁵², F. Würthwein, A. Yagil, J. Yoo

University of California, Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, USA

D. Barge, R. Bellan, C. Campagnari, M. D'Alfonso, T. Danielson, K. Flowers, P. Geffert, J. Incandela, C. Justus, P. Kalavase, S.A. Koay, D. Kovalskyi, V. Krutelyov, S. Lowette, N. Mccoll, V. Pavlunin, F. Rebassoo, J. Ribnik, J. Richman, R. Rossin, D. Stuart, W. To, C. West

California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA

A. Apresyan, A. Bornheim, Y. Chen, E. Di Marco, J. Duarte, M. Gataullin, Y. Ma, A. Mott, H.B. Newman, C. Rogan, M. Spiropulu, V. Timciuc, J. Veverka, R. Wilkinson, S. Xie, Y. Yang, R.Y. Zhu

Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, USA

B. Akgun, V. Azzolini, A. Calamba, R. Carroll, T. Ferguson, Y. Iiyama, D.W. Jang, Y.F. Liu, M. Paulini, H. Vogel, I. Vorobiev

University of Colorado at Boulder, Boulder, USA

J.P. Cumalat, B.R. Drell, W.T. Ford, A. Gaz, E. Luiggi Lopez, J.G. Smith, K. Stenson, K.A. Ulmer, S.R. Wagner

Cornell University, Ithaca, USA

J. Alexander, A. Chatterjee, N. Eggert, L.K. Gibbons, B. Heltsley, A. Khukhunaishvili, B. Kreis, N. Mirman, G. Nicolas Kaufman, J.R. Patterson, A. Ryd, E. Salvati, W. Sun, W.D. Teo, J. Thom, J. Thompson, J. Tucker, J. Vaughan, Y. Weng, L. Winstrom, P. Wittich

Fairfield University, Fairfield, USA

D. Winn

Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, USA

S. Abdullin, M. Albrow, J. Anderson, L.A.T. Bauerdick, A. Beretvas, J. Berryhill, P.C. Bhat, I. Bloch, K. Burkett, J.N. Butler, V. Chetluru, H.W.K. Cheung, F. Chlebana, V.D. Elvira, I. Fisk, J. Freeman, Y. Gao, D. Green, O. Gutsche, J. Hanlon, R.M. Harris, J. Hirschauer, B. Hooberman, S. Jindariani, M. Johnson, U. Joshi, B. Kilminster, B. Klima, S. Kunori, S. Kwan, C. Leonidopoulos, J. Linacre, D. Lincoln, R. Lipton, J. Lykken, K. Maeshima, J.M. Marraffino, S. Maruyama, D. Mason, P. McBride, K. Mishra, S. Mrenna, Y. Musienko⁵³, C. Newman-Holmes, V. O'Dell, O. Prokofyev, E. Sexton-Kennedy, S. Sharma, W.J. Spalding, L. Spiegel, L. Taylor, S. Tkaczyk, N.V. Tran, L. Uplegger, E.W. Vaandering, R. Vidal, J. Whitmore, W. Wu, F. Yang, F. Yumiceva, J.C. Yun

University of Florida, Gainesville, USA

D. Acosta, P. Avery, D. Bourilkov, M. Chen, T. Cheng, S. Das, M. De Gruttola, G.P. Di Giovanni, D. Dobur, A. Drozdetskiy, R.D. Field, M. Fisher, Y. Fu, I.K. Furic, J. Gartner, J. Hugon, B. Kim, J. Konigsberg, A. Korytov, A. Kropivnitskaya, T. Kypreos, J.F. Low, K. Matchev, P. Milenovic⁵⁴, G. Mitselmakher, L. Muniz, M. Park, R. Remington, A. Rinkevicius, P. Sellers, N. Skhirtladze, M. Snowball, J. Yelton, M. Zakaria

Florida International University, Miami, USA

V. Gaultney, S. Hewamanage, L.M. Lebolo, S. Linn, P. Markowitz, G. Martinez, J.L. Rodriguez

Florida State University, Tallahassee, USA

T. Adams, A. Askew, J. Bochenek, J. Chen, B. Diamond, S.V. Gleyzer, J. Haas, S. Hagopian, V. Hagopian, M. Jenkins, K.F. Johnson, H. Prosper, V. Veeraraghavan, M. Weinberg

Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, USA

M.M. Baarmand, B. Dorney, M. Hohlmann, H. Kalakhety, I. Vodopiyanov

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

M.R. Adams, I.M. Anghel, L. Apanasevich, Y. Bai, V.E. Bazterra, R.R. Betts, I. Bucinskaite, J. Callner, R. Cavanaugh, O. Evdokimov, L. Gauthier, C.E. Gerber, D.J. Hofman, S. Khalatyan, F. Lacroix, M. Malek, C. O'Brien, C. Silkworth, D. Strom, P. Turner, N. Varelas

The University of Iowa, Iowa City, USA

U. Akgun, E.A. Albayrak, B. Bilki⁵⁵, W. Clarida, F. Duru, J.-P. Merlo, H. Mermerkaya⁵⁶, A. Mestvirishvili, A. Moeller, J. Nachtman, C.R. Newsom, E. Norbeck, Y. Onel, F. Ozok⁵⁷, S. Sen, P. Tan, E. Tiras, J. Wetzel, T. Yetkin, K. Yi

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA

B.A. Barnett, B. Blumenfeld, S. Bolognesi, D. Fehling, G. Giurgiu, A.V. Gritsan, Z.J. Guo, G. Hu, P. Maksimovic, S. Rappoccio, M. Swartz, A. Whitbeck

The University of Kansas, Lawrence, USA

P. Baringer, A. Bean, G. Benelli, R.P. Kenny Iii, M. Murray, D. Noonan, S. Sanders, R. Stringer, G. Tinti, J.S. Wood, V. Zhukova

Kansas State University, Manhattan, USA

A.F. Barfuss, T. Bolton, I. Chakaberia, A. Ivanov, S. Khalil, M. Makouski, Y. Maravin, S. Shrestha, I. Svintradze

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, USA

J. Gronberg, D. Lange, D. Wright

University of Maryland, College Park, USA

A. Baden, M. Boutemeur, B. Calvert, S.C. Eno, J.A. Gomez, N.J. Hadley, R.G. Kellogg, M. Kirn,

T. Kolberg, Y. Lu, M. Marionneau, A.C. Mignerey, K. Pedro, A. Skuja, J. Temple, M.B. Tonjes, S.C. Tonwar, E. Twedt

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, USA

A. Apyan, G. Bauer, J. Bendavid, W. Busza, E. Butz, I.A. Cali, M. Chan, V. Dutta, G. Gomez Ceballos, M. Goncharov, K.A. Hahn, Y. Kim, M. Klute, K. Krajczar⁵⁸, P.D. Luckey, T. Ma, S. Nahn, C. Paus, D. Ralph, C. Roland, G. Roland, M. Rudolph, G.S.F. Stephans, F. Stöckli, K. Sumorok, K. Sung, D. Velicanu, E.A. Wenger, R. Wolf, B. Wyslouch, M. Yang, Y. Yilmaz, A.S. Yoon, M. Zanetti

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, USA

S.I. Cooper, B. Dahmes, A. De Benedetti, G. Franzoni, A. Gude, S.C. Kao, K. Klapoetke, Y. Kubota, J. Mans, N. Pastika, R. Rusack, M. Sasseville, A. Singovsky, N. Tambe, J. Turkewitz

University of Mississippi, Oxford, USA

L.M. Cremaldi, R. Kroeger, L. Perera, R. Rahmat, D.A. Sanders

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, USA

E. Avdeeva, K. Bloom, S. Bose, D.R. Claes, A. Dominguez, M. Eads, J. Keller, I. Kravchenko, J. Lazo-Flores, H. Malbouisson, S. Malik, G.R. Snow

State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, USA

A. Godshalk, I. Iashvili, S. Jain, A. Kharchilava, A. Kumar

Northeastern University, Boston, USA

G. Alverson, E. Barberis, D. Baumgartel, M. Chasco, J. Haley, D. Nash, D. Trocino, D. Wood, J. Zhang

Northwestern University, Evanston, USA

A. Anastassov, A. Kubik, L. Lusito, N. Mucia, N. Odell, R.A. Ofierzynski, B. Pollack, A. Pozdnyakov, M. Schmitt, S. Stoynev, M. Velasco, S. Won

University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, USA

L. Antonelli, D. Berry, A. Brinkerhoff, K.M. Chan, M. Hildreth, C. Jessop, D.J. Karmgard, J. Kolb, K. Lannon, W. Luo, S. Lynch, N. Marinelli, D.M. Morse, T. Pearson, M. Planer, R. Ruchti, J. Slaunwhite, N. Valls, M. Wayne, M. Wolf

The Ohio State University, Columbus, USA

B. Bylsma, L.S. Durkin, C. Hill, R. Hughes, K. Kotov, T.Y. Ling, D. Puigh, M. Rodenburg, C. Vuosalo, G. Williams, B.L. Winer

Princeton University, Princeton, USA

N. Adam, E. Berry, P. Elmer, D. Gerbaudo, V. Halyo, P. Hebda, J. Hegeman, A. Hunt, P. Jindal, D. Lopes Pegna, P. Lujan, D. Marlow, T. Medvedeva, M. Mooney, J. Olsen, P. Piroué, X. Quan, A. Raval, B. Safdi, H. Saka, D. Stickland, C. Tully, J.S. Werner, A. Zuranski

University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez, USA

E. Brownson, A. Lopez, H. Mendez, J.E. Ramirez Vargas

Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA

E. Alagoz, V.E. Barnes, D. Benedetti, G. Bolla, D. Bortoletto, M. De Mattia, A. Everett, Z. Hu, M. Jones, O. Koybasi, M. Kress, A.T. Laasanen, N. Leonardo, V. Maroussov, P. Merkel, D.H. Miller, N. Neumeister, I. Shipsey, D. Silvers, A. Svyatkovskiy, M. Vidal Marono, H.D. Yoo, J. Zablocki, Y. Zheng

Purdue University Calumet, Hammond, USA

S. Guragain, N. Parashar

Rice University, Houston, USA

A. Adair, C. Boulahouache, K.M. Ecklund, F.J.M. Geurts, W. Li, B.P. Padley, R. Redjimi, J. Roberts, J. Zabel

University of Rochester, Rochester, USA

B. Betchart, A. Bodek, Y.S. Chung, R. Covarelli, P. de Barbaro, R. Demina, Y. Eshaq, T. Ferbel, A. Garcia-Bellido, P. Goldenzweig, J. Han, A. Harel, D.C. Miner, D. Vishnevskiy, M. Zielinski

The Rockefeller University, New York, USA

A. Bhatti, R. Ciesielski, L. Demortier, K. Goulianos, G. Lungu, S. Malik, C. Mesropian

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

S. Arora, A. Barker, J.P. Chou, C. Contreras-Campana, E. Contreras-Campana, D. Duggan, D. Ferencek, Y. Gershtein, R. Gray, E. Halkiadakis, D. Hidas, A. Lath, S. Panwalkar, M. Park, R. Patel, V. Rekovic, J. Robles, K. Rose, S. Salur, S. Schnetzer, C. Seitz, S. Somalwar, R. Stone, S. Thomas, M. Walker

University of Tennessee, Knoxville, USA

G. Cerizza, M. Hollingsworth, S. Spanier, Z.C. Yang, A. York

Texas A&M University, College Station, USA

R. Eusebi, W. Flanagan, J. Gilmore, T. Kamon⁵⁹, V. Khotilovich, R. Montalvo, I. Osipenkov, Y. Pakhotin, A. Perloff, J. Roe, A. Safonov, T. Sakuma, S. Sengupta, I. Suarez, A. Tatarinov, D. Toback

Texas Tech University, Lubbock, USA

N. Akchurin, J. Damgov, C. Dragoiu, P.R. Duderod, C. Jeong, K. Kovitanggoon, S.W. Lee, T. Libeiro, Y. Roh, I. Volobouev

Vanderbilt University, Nashville, USA

E. Appelt, A.G. Delannoy, C. Florez, S. Greene, A. Gurrola, W. Johns, P. Kurt, C. Maguire, A. Melo, M. Sharma, P. Sheldon, B. Snook, S. Tuo, J. Velkovska

University of Virginia, Charlottesville, USA

M.W. Arenton, M. Balazs, S. Boutle, B. Cox, B. Francis, J. Goodell, R. Hirosky, A. Ledovskoy, C. Lin, C. Neu, J. Wood

Wayne State University, Detroit, USA

S. Gollapinni, R. Harr, P.E. Karchin, C. Kottachchi Kankanamge Don, P. Lamichhane, A. Sakharov

University of Wisconsin, Madison, USA

M. Anderson, D. Belknap, L. Borrello, D. Carlsmith, M. Cepeda, S. Dasu, E. Friis, L. Gray, K.S. Grogg, M. Grothe, R. Hall-Wilton, M. Herndon, A. Hervé, P. Klabbers, J. Klukas, A. Lanaro, C. Lazaridis, J. Leonard, R. Loveless, A. Mohapatra, I. Ojalvo, F. Palmonari, G.A. Pierro, I. Ross, A. Savin, W.H. Smith, J. Swanson

†: Deceased

1: Also at Vienna University of Technology, Vienna, Austria

2: Also at National Institute of Chemical Physics and Biophysics, Tallinn, Estonia

3: Also at Universidade Federal do ABC, Santo Andre, Brazil

4: Also at California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA

- 5: Also at CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland
- 6: Also at Laboratoire Leprince-Ringuet, Ecole Polytechnique, IN2P3-CNRS, Palaiseau, France
- 7: Also at Suez Canal University, Suez, Egypt
- 8: Also at Zewail City of Science and Technology, Zewail, Egypt
- 9: Also at Cairo University, Cairo, Egypt
- 10: Also at Fayoum University, El-Fayoum, Egypt
- 11: Also at British University in Egypt, Cairo, Egypt
- 12: Now at Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt
- 13: Also at National Centre for Nuclear Research, Swierk, Poland
- 14: Also at Université de Haute-Alsace, Mulhouse, France
- 15: Also at Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia
- 16: Also at Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia
- 17: Also at Brandenburg University of Technology, Cottbus, Germany
- 18: Also at The University of Kansas, Lawrence, USA
- 19: Also at Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary
- 20: Also at Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary
- 21: Also at Tata Institute of Fundamental Research - HECR, Mumbai, India
- 22: Also at University of Visva-Bharati, Santiniketan, India
- 23: Also at Sharif University of Technology, Tehran, Iran
- 24: Also at Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, Iran
- 25: Also at Plasma Physics Research Center, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
- 26: Also at Facoltà Ingegneria, Università di Roma, Roma, Italy
- 27: Also at Università della Basilicata, Potenza, Italy
- 28: Also at Università degli Studi Guglielmo Marconi, Roma, Italy
- 29: Also at Università degli Studi di Siena, Siena, Italy
- 30: Also at University of Bucharest, Faculty of Physics, Bucuresti-Magurele, Romania
- 31: Also at Faculty of Physics of University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia
- 32: Also at University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, USA
- 33: Also at Scuola Normale e Sezione dell'INFN, Pisa, Italy
- 34: Also at INFN Sezione di Roma; Università di Roma, Roma, Italy
- 35: Also at University of Athens, Athens, Greece
- 36: Also at Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom
- 37: Also at Paul Scherrer Institut, Villigen, Switzerland
- 38: Also at Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia
- 39: Also at Albert Einstein Center for Fundamental Physics, Bern, Switzerland
- 40: Also at Gaziosmanpasa University, Tokat, Turkey
- 41: Also at Adiyaman University, Adiyaman, Turkey
- 42: Also at Izmir Institute of Technology, Izmir, Turkey
- 43: Also at The University of Iowa, Iowa City, USA
- 44: Also at Mersin University, Mersin, Turkey
- 45: Also at Ozyegin University, Istanbul, Turkey
- 46: Also at Kafkas University, Kars, Turkey
- 47: Also at Suleyman Demirel University, Isparta, Turkey
- 48: Also at Ege University, Izmir, Turkey
- 49: Also at School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southampton, Southampton, United Kingdom
- 50: Also at INFN Sezione di Perugia; Università di Perugia, Perugia, Italy
- 51: Also at University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia

- 52: Also at Utah Valley University, Orem, USA
- 53: Also at Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia
- 54: Also at University of Belgrade, Faculty of Physics and Vinca Institute of Nuclear Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia
- 55: Also at Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, USA
- 56: Also at Erzincan University, Erzincan, Turkey
- 57: Also at Mimar Sinan University, Istanbul, Istanbul, Turkey
- 58: Also at KFKI Research Institute for Particle and Nuclear Physics, Budapest, Hungary
- 59: Also at Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea