CERN-EP/2016-125
2017/04/04

CMS-HIG-15-010

Measurement of the transverse momentum spectrum of the Higgs boson produced in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV using $H \rightarrow WW$ decays

The CMS Collaboration*

Abstract

The cross section for Higgs boson production in pp collisions is studied using the $H \rightarrow W^+W^-$ decay mode, followed by leptonic decays of the W bosons to an oppositely charged electron-muon pair in the final state. The measurements are performed using data collected by the CMS experiment at the LHC at a centre-of-mass energy of 8 TeV, corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 19.4 fb^{-1} . The Higgs boson transverse momentum (p_T) is reconstructed using the lepton pair p_T and missing p_T . The differential cross section times branching fraction is measured as a function of the Higgs boson p_T in a fiducial phase space defined to match the experimental acceptance in terms of the lepton kinematics and event topology. The production cross section times branching fraction in the fiducial phase space is measured to be $39 \pm 8 \text{ (stat)} \pm 9 \text{ (syst) fb}$. The measurements are found to agree, within experimental uncertainties, with theoretical calculations based on the standard model.

Published in the Journal of High Energy Physics as doi:10.1007/JHEP03(2017)032.

1 Introduction

The discovery of a new boson at the CERN LHC reported by the ATLAS and CMS collaborations [1–3] has been followed by a comprehensive set of measurements aimed at establishing the properties of the new boson. Results reported by ATLAS and CMS [4–22], so far, are consistent with the standard model (SM) expectations for the Higgs boson (H).

Measurements of the production cross section of the Higgs boson times branching fraction in a restricted part of the phase space (fiducial phase space) and its kinematic properties represent an important test for possible deviations from the SM predictions. In particular, it has been shown that the Higgs boson transverse momentum (p_T^H) spectrum can be significantly affected by the presence of interactions not predicted by the SM [23–27]. In addition, these measurements allow accurate tests of the theoretical calculations in the SM Higgs sector, which offer up to next-to-next-to-leading-order (NNLO) accuracy in perturbative Quantum Chromodynamics (pQCD), up to next-to-next-to-leading-logarithmic (NNLL) accuracy in the resummation of soft-gluon effects at small p_T , and up to next-to-leading-order (NLO) accuracy in perturbative electroweak corrections [28–30].

Measurements of the fiducial cross sections and of several differential distributions, using the $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV LHC data, have been reported by ATLAS [31–33] and CMS [34, 35] for the $H \rightarrow ZZ \rightarrow 4\ell$ ($\ell = e, \mu$) and $H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ decay channels, and recently by ATLAS [36] for the $H \rightarrow W^+W^- \rightarrow e^\pm\mu^\mp\nu\nu$ decay channel. In this paper we report a measurement of the fiducial cross section times branching fraction ($\sigma \times \mathcal{B}$) and p_T spectrum for Higgs boson production in $H \rightarrow W^+W^- \rightarrow e^\pm\mu^\mp\nu\nu$ decays, based on $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV LHC data. The analysis is performed looking at different flavour leptons in the final state in order to suppress the sizeable contribution of backgrounds containing a same-flavour lepton pair originating from Z boson decay. Although the $H \rightarrow W^+W^- \rightarrow 2\ell 2\nu$ channel has lower resolution in the p_T^H measurement compared to the $H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ and $H \rightarrow ZZ \rightarrow 4\ell$ channels because of neutrinos in the final state, the channel has a significantly larger $\sigma \mathcal{B}$, exceeding those for $H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ by a factor of 10 and $H \rightarrow ZZ \rightarrow 4\ell$ by a factor of 85 for a Higgs boson mass of 125 GeV [37], and is characterized by good signal sensitivity. Such sensitivity allowed the observation of a Higgs boson at the level of 4.3 (5.8 expected) standard deviations for a mass hypothesis of 125.6 GeV using the full LHC data set at 7 and 8 TeV [7].

The measurement is performed in a fiducial phase space defined by kinematic requirements on the leptons that closely match the experimental event selection. The effect of the limited detector resolution, as well as the selection efficiency with respect to the fiducial phase space are corrected to particle level with an unfolding procedure [38]. This procedure is based on the knowledge of the detector response matrix, derived from the simulation of the CMS response to signal events, and consists of an inversion of the response matrix with a regularization prescription to tame unphysical statistical fluctuations in the unfolded result.

The analysis presented here is based on the previously published $H \rightarrow W^+W^- \rightarrow 2\ell 2\nu$ measurements by CMS [7]. A notable difference from those measurements is that this analysis is inclusive in the number of jets, which allows the uncertainties related to the theoretical modelling of additional jets produced in association with the Higgs boson to be reduced. There are two important backgrounds: for p_T^H values below approximately 50 GeV the dominant background is WW production, while above 50 GeV the production of top–anti-top (tt) quarks dominates.

This paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 a brief description of the CMS detector is given. The data sets and Monte Carlo (MC) simulated samples are described in Section 3. The strategy adopted in the analysis is described in Section 4, including the definition of the fiducial phase

space. The event selection and a description of all relevant backgrounds are given in Section 5, followed by an overview of the systematic uncertainties important for the analysis in Section 6. The technique used for the extraction of the Higgs boson signal contribution is described in Section 7, together with the signal and background yields and the reconstructed p_T^H spectrum. The unfolding procedure used to extrapolate the reconstructed spectrum to the fiducial phase space is described in Section 8, including a detailed description of the treatment of systematic uncertainties in the unfolding. Finally, Section 9 presents the result of the measurement of the fiducial σB and p_T^H spectrum, and their comparison with the theoretical predictions.

2 The CMS experiment

The central feature of the CMS apparatus is a superconducting solenoid of 6 m internal diameter providing a magnetic field of 3.8 T. Within the solenoid volume are a silicon pixel and strip tracker, which cover a pseudorapidity (η) region of $|\eta| < 2.5$, a lead tungstate crystal electromagnetic calorimeter (ECAL), and a brass and scintillator hadron calorimeter (HCAL), each composed of a barrel and two endcap sections, covering $|\eta| < 3$. Forward calorimetry extends the η coverage provided by the barrel and endcap detectors from $\eta > 3$ to $\eta < 5.2$. Muons are measured in gas-ionization detectors embedded in the steel flux-return yoke outside the solenoid. A more detailed description of the CMS detector, together with a definition of the coordinate system used and the relevant kinematic variables, can be found in Ref. [39].

The particle-flow event algorithm reconstructs and identifies each individual particle with an optimized combination of information from the various elements of the CMS detector [40–44]. The energy of photons is obtained from the ECAL measurement, corrected for instrumental effects. The energy of electrons is determined from a combination of the electron momentum at the primary interaction vertex as determined by the tracker, the energy of the corresponding ECAL cluster, and the energy sum of all bremsstrahlung photons spatially compatible with originating from the electron track [45]. The momentum of muons is obtained from the curvature of the corresponding track. The energy of charged hadrons is determined from a combination of their momentum measured in the tracker and the matching ECAL and HCAL energy deposits, corrected for zero-suppression effects and for the response function of the calorimeters to hadronic showers. Finally, the energy of neutral hadrons is obtained from the corresponding corrected ECAL and HCAL energy. Jets are reconstructed from the individual particles using the anti- k_t clustering algorithm with a distance parameter of 0.5, as implemented in the FASTJET package [46, 47].

The missing transverse momentum vector $\vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}}$ is defined as the projection of the negative vector sum of the momenta of all reconstructed particles in an event on the plane perpendicular to the beams. Its magnitude is referred to as the missing transverse energy E_T^{miss} .

Details on the experimental techniques for the reconstruction, identification, and isolation of electrons, muons and jets, as well as on the efficiencies of these techniques can be found in Refs. [44, 45, 48–52]. Details on the procedure used to calibrate the leptons and jets in this analysis can be found in Ref. [7].

3 Data and simulated samples

This analysis makes use of the same data and MC simulated samples as those used in the previous $H \rightarrow W^+W^-$ study [7]. Data were recorded by the CMS experiment during 2012 and correspond to an integrated luminosity of 19.4 fb^{-1} at a centre-of-mass energy of 8 TeV.

The events are triggered by requiring the presence of either one or a combination of electron and muon with high p_T and tight identification and isolation criteria. Single-lepton triggers are characterized by p_T thresholds varying from 17 to 27 GeV for electrons and from 17 to 24 GeV for muons. Dilepton $e\mu$ triggers are required to have one electron or one muon with $p_T > 17$ GeV and the other muon or electron with $p_T > 8$ GeV. The average combined trigger efficiency for signal events that pass the full event selection is measured to be about 96% in the $e\mu$ final state for a Higgs boson mass of 125 GeV.

The signal and background processes relevant for this analysis are simulated using several MC programs. Simulations of the Higgs boson production through the gluon fusion (ggH) and vector boson fusion (VBF) mechanisms are performed using the first version of the POWHEG generator (POWHEG V1) [53–57] with NLO accuracy in pQCD, while PYTHIA 6.426 [58] is used to simulate associated Higgs boson production with vector bosons (VH). The $t\bar{t}H$ production mechanism contributes less than 1% to the Higgs boson production process and has not been included among the signal processes.

The main background processes, nonresonant $q\bar{q} \rightarrow W^+W^-$ and $t\bar{t}$ +jets, are simulated using the MADGRAPH 5.1.3 [59] and POWHEG V1 [60] event generators respectively. The $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow W^+W^-$ process is simulated using the GG2WW 3.1 generator [61] and the cross section is scaled to the approximate NLO prediction [62, 63]. The tW process is simulated using the POWHEG V1 generator. Other background processes, such as $Z/\gamma^* \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$, ZZ , WZ , $W\gamma$, $W\gamma^*$, tri-bosons (VVV), and W +jets are generated using MADGRAPH.

All signal and background generators are interfaced to PYTHIA 6 to simulate the effects of the parton shower, multiple parton interactions, and hadronization.

The default parton distribution function (PDF) sets used are CTEQ6L [64] for LO generators and CT10 [65] for NLO generators. The $H \rightarrow W^+W^-$ process simulation is reweighted so that the p_T^H spectrum and inclusive production cross section closely match the SM calculations that have NNLO+NNLL pQCD accuracy in the description of the Higgs boson inclusive production, in accordance with the LHC Higgs Cross Section Working Group recommendations [37]. The reweighting of the p_T^H spectrum is achieved by tuning the POWHEG generator, as described in detail in Ref. [66]. Cross sections computed with NLO pQCD accuracy [37] are used for the background processes.

The samples are processed using a simulation of the CMS detector response, as modeled by GEANT4 [67]. Minimum bias events are superimposed on the simulated events to emulate the additional pp interactions per bunch crossing (pileup). The events are reweighted to correct for observed differences between data and simulation in the number of pileup events, trigger efficiency, and lepton reconstruction and identification efficiencies [7].

For the comparison of the measured unfolded spectrum with the theoretical predictions, two additional MC generators are used for simulating the SM Higgs boson production in the ggH process: HRES 2.3 [29, 30] and the second version of the POWHEG generator (POWHEG V2) [68]. HRES is a partonic level MC generator that computes the SM Higgs boson cross section at NNLO accuracy in pQCD and performs the NNLL resummation of soft-gluon effects at small p_T . The central predictions of HRES are obtained including the exact top and bottom quark mass contribution to the gluon fusion loop, fixing the renormalization and factorization scale central values at a Higgs boson mass of 125 GeV. The cross section normalization is scaled, to take into account electroweak corrections, by a factor of 1.05 and the effects of threshold resummation by a factor of 1.06 [69, 70]. The upper and lower bounds of the uncertainties are obtained by scaling up and down both the renormalization and the factorization scales by a

factor of two. The POWHEG V2 generator is a matrix element based generator that provides a NLO description of the ggH process in association with zero jets, taking into account the finite mass of the bottom and top quarks. The POWHEG prediction is tuned using the POWHEG damping factor $hdump$ of 104.17 GeV, in order to match the p_T^H spectrum predicted by HRES in the full phase space. This factor reduces the emission of additional jets in the high p_T regime, and enhances the contribution from the Sudakov form factor in the limit of low p_T . The POWHEG generator is interfaced to the JHUGEN generator version 5.2.5 [71–73] for the decay of the Higgs boson to a W boson pair and interfaced with PYTHIA 8 [74] for the simulation of parton shower and hadronization effects.

4 Analysis strategy

The analysis presented here is based on that used in the previously published $H \rightarrow W^+W^- \rightarrow 2\ell 2\nu$ measurements by CMS [7], modified to be inclusive in the number of jets. This modification significantly reduces the uncertainties related to the modelling of the number of jets produced in association with the Higgs boson because the number of jets is strongly correlated with p_T^H .

Events are selected requiring the presence of two isolated leptons with opposite charge, an electron and a muon, with $p_T > 20(10)$ GeV for the leading (subleading) lepton, and with $|\eta| < 2.5$ for electrons and $|\eta| < 2.4$ for muons. No additional electron or muon with $p_T > 10$ GeV is allowed. The two leptons are required to originate from a single primary vertex. Among the vertices identified in the event, the vertex with the largest $\sum p_T^2$, where the sum runs over all tracks associated with that vertex, is chosen as the primary vertex. The invariant mass of the two leptons, $m_{\ell\ell}$, is required to be greater than 12 GeV. A *projected* E_T^{miss} variable is defined as the component of $\vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}}$ transverse to the nearest lepton if the lepton is situated within the azimuthal angular window of $\pm\pi/2$ from the $\vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}}$ direction, or the E_T^{miss} itself otherwise [7]. Since the E_T^{miss} resolution is degraded by pileup, the minimum of two projected E_T^{miss} variables is used: one constructed from all identified particles (full projected E_T^{miss}), and another constructed from the charged particles only (track projected E_T^{miss}). Events must have both E_T^{miss} and the minimum projected E_T^{miss} above 20 GeV. In order to suppress $Z/\gamma^* \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$ events, the vector p_T sum of the two leptons, $p_T^{\ell\ell}$, is required to be greater than 30 GeV and a minimum transverse mass of the lepton plus E_T^{miss} vector of 60 GeV is required. The transverse mass is defined as $m_T = \sqrt{2p_T^{\ell\ell}E_T^{\text{miss}}[1 - \cos \Delta\phi(\ell\ell, \vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}})]}$, where $\Delta\phi(\ell\ell, \vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}})$ is the azimuthal angle between the dilepton momentum and $\vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}}$.

Events surviving the requirements on leptons are dominantly those where a top quark-antiquark pair is produced and both W bosons, which are part of the top quark decay chain, decay leptonically (dileptonic $t\bar{t}$). These events are identified using a b-jet tagging method based on two algorithms: one is the track counting high-efficiency (TCHE) [75], an algorithm based on the impact parameter of the tracks inside the jet, i.e. the distance to the primary vertex at the point of closest approach in the transverse plane; and another is Jet B Probability (JBP), an algorithm that assigns a per track probability of originating from the primary vertex [76]. In addition, soft-muon tagging algorithms are used, which remove events with a nonisolated soft muon, that is likely coming from a b quark decay.

No jet with $p_T > 30$ GeV may pass a threshold on the JBP b tagging discriminant corresponding to a b tagging efficiency of 76% and a mistagging efficiency around 10%. No jet with p_T between 15 and 30 GeV may pass a TCHE b tagging discriminant threshold chosen to have a high top quark background rejection efficiency [7]. In addition, for events with no reconstructed jets

above 30 GeV, a soft-muon veto is applied. Soft muon candidates are defined without isolation requirements and have $p_T > 3$ GeV. The efficiency for a b jet with p_T between 15 and 30 GeV to be identified both by the TCHE and soft-muon algorithms is 32%.

Fiducial phase space requirements are chosen in order to minimize the dependence of the measurements on the underlying model of the Higgs boson properties and its production mechanism. The exact requirements are determined by considering the two following correlated quantities: the reconstruction efficiency for signal events originating from within the fiducial phase space (fiducial signal efficiency ϵ_{fid}), and the ratio of the number of reconstructed signal events that are from outside the fiducial phase space (“out-of-fiducial” signal events) to the number from within the fiducial phase space. The requirement of having a small fraction of out-of-fiducial signal events, while at the same time preserving a high value of the fiducial signal efficiency ϵ_{fid} , leads to fiducial requirements at the generator level on the low-resolution variables, E_T^{miss} and m_T , that are looser with respect to those applied in the reconstructed event selection.

The fiducial phase space used for the cross section measurements is defined at the particle level by the requirements given in Table 1. The leptons are defined as Born-level leptons, i.e. before the emission of final-state radiation (FSR), and are required not to originate from leptonic τ decays. The effect of including FSR is evaluated to be of the order of 5% in each p_T^H bin. For the VH signal process the two leptons are required to originate from the $H \rightarrow W^+W^- \rightarrow 2\ell\nu$ decays in order to avoid including leptons coming from the associated W or Z boson.

Table 1: Summary of requirements used in the definition of the fiducial phase space. The leptons are defined at the Born-level.

Physics quantity	Requirement
Leading lepton p_T	$p_T > 20$ GeV
Subleading lepton p_T	$p_T > 10$ GeV
Pseudorapidity of electrons and muons	$ \eta < 2.5$
Invariant mass of the two charged leptons	$m_{\ell\ell} > 12$ GeV
Charged lepton pair p_T	$p_T^{\ell\ell} > 30$ GeV
Invariant mass of the leptonic system in the transverse plane	$m_T^{\ell\ell\nu} > 50$ GeV
E_T^{miss}	$E_T^{\text{miss}} > 0$

Experimentally, the Higgs boson p_T is reconstructed as the vector sum of the lepton momenta in the transverse plane and $\vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}}$:

$$\vec{p}_T^H = \vec{p}_T^{\ell\ell} + \vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}}. \quad (1)$$

Compared to other differential analyses of the Higgs boson $\sigma\mathcal{B}$, such as those in the $H \rightarrow ZZ \rightarrow 4\ell$ and $H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ decay channels, this analysis has to cope with limited resolution due to the E_T^{miss} entering the p_T^H measurement. The effect of the limited E_T^{miss} resolution has two main implications for the analysis strategy. The first one is that the choice of the binning in the p_T^H spectrum needs to take into account the detector resolution. The binning in p_T^H is built in such a way as to ensure that at least 60% of the signal events generated in a given p_T^H bin are also reconstructed in that bin. This procedure yields the following bin boundaries: [0, 15], [15, 45], [45, 85], [85, 125], [125, 165], and [165, ∞] GeV. The second implication is that migrations of events across bins are significant.

The signal yield is extracted in each p_T^H bin with a template fit to a two dimensional distribution of $m_{\ell\ell}$ and m_T . These two observables are chosen for the template fit because they are weakly correlated with p_T^H . The level of correlation is checked using simulation.

5 Background estimation

The signal extraction procedure requires the determination of the normalization and $(m_{\ell\ell}, m_T)$ shape for each background source. After the event selection is applied, one of the dominant contributions to the background processes arises from the top quark production, including the dileptonic $t\bar{t}$ and tW processes. The top quark background is divided into two categories with different jet multiplicity: the first category requires events without jets with p_T above 30 GeV and the second one requires at least one jet with $p_T > 30$ GeV. For the estimation of the top quark background in the first category, the same estimate from control samples in data as in Ref. [7] is used. The contribution of the background in the second category is estimated independently in each p_T^H bin, by normalizing it in a control region defined by requiring at least one jet with a JBP b tagging discriminator value above a given threshold, chosen to have a pure control region enriched in b jets. In addition, the quality of the Monte Carlo description of $(m_{\ell\ell}, m_T)$ kinematics is verified for this background by looking at the shapes of these variables in the b jets enriched control region and is found to be satisfactory.

The nonresonant $q\bar{q} \rightarrow W^+W^-$ is determined independently in each p_T^H bin. The shape of the $(m_{\ell\ell}, m_T)$ distribution for this background is taken from the simulation, and its normalization in each p_T^H bin is obtained from the template fit of the $(m_{\ell\ell}, m_T)$ distribution, together with the signal yield. Approximately 5% of the $W^+W^- \rightarrow 2\ell 2\nu$ originates from a gluon-gluon initial state via a quark box diagram. This background is treated separately and both normalization and shape are taken from simulation.

Backgrounds containing one or two misidentified leptons are estimated from events selected with relaxed lepton quality criteria, using the techniques described in Ref. [7].

The $Z/\gamma^* \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$ background process is estimated using $Z/\gamma^* \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ events selected in data, in which the muons are replaced with simulated τ decays, thus providing a more accurate description of the experimental conditions than the full simulation [7]. The TAUOLA package [77] is used in the simulation of τ decays to account for τ -polarization effects.

Contributions from $W\gamma^*$ and $W\gamma$ production processes are estimated partly from simulated samples. The $W\gamma^*$ cross section is measured from data and the discriminant variables used in the signal extraction for the $W\gamma$ process are obtained from data as explained in Ref. [7]. The shape of the discriminant variables for the $W\gamma^*$ process and the $W\gamma$ cross section are taken from simulation.

A summary of the processes used to estimate backgrounds is reported in Table 2. The normalization and shape of the backgrounds are estimated using data control samples whenever possible. The remaining minor background contributions are estimated using simulation. The yield of each background process after the analysis requirements is given in Section 7.

6 Systematic uncertainties

Systematic uncertainties in this analysis arise from three sources: background predictions, experimental measurements, and theoretical uncertainties.

The estimates of most of the systematic uncertainties use the same methods as the published $H \rightarrow W^+W^- \rightarrow 2\ell 2\nu$ analysis [7]. One notable difference is in the uncertainties related to the prediction of the contributions from $t\bar{t}$ and tW processes. The shapes of these backgrounds are corrected for different b tagging efficiency in data and MC simulation, and the normalization is taken from data in a top quark enriched control region independently in each p_T^H bin, as

Table 2: Summary of the processes used to estimate backgrounds in cases where data events are used to estimate either the normalization or the shape of the discriminant variable. A brief description of the control/template samples is given.

Process	Normalization	Shape	Control/template sample
WW	data	simulation	events at high $m_{\ell\ell}$ and m_T
Top	data	simulation	≥ 2 jets with at least one passing b tagging criteria
W+jets	data	data	events with loosely identified leptons
$W\gamma$	simulation	data	events with an identified γ
$W\gamma^*$	data	simulation	$W\gamma^* \rightarrow 3\mu$ sample
$Z/\gamma^* \rightarrow \tau\tau$	data	data	τ embedded sample

explained in Section 5. The uncertainties related to this procedure arise from the sample size in the control regions for each p_T^H bin, and are embedded in the scale factors used to extrapolate the top quark background normalization from the control region to the signal region. They vary from 20% to 50% depending on the p_T^H bin.

This analysis takes into account the theoretical uncertainties that affect the normalization and shape of all backgrounds and the signal distribution shape. These uncertainties arise from missing higher-order corrections in pQCD and PDF uncertainties, and are predicted using MC simulations. The effect due to the variations in the choice of PDFs and the value of the QCD coupling constant is considered following the PDF4LHC [78, 79] prescription, using CT10, NNPDF2.1 [80] and MSTW2008 [81] PDF sets.

The uncertainties in the signal yield associated with the uncertainty in the $(m_{\ell\ell}, m_T)$ shapes due to the missing higher-order corrections are evaluated independently by varying up and down the factorization and renormalization scales by a factor of two, and then using the Stewart-Tackman formulae [82]. Due to the presence of the b-veto, the uncertainty on jet multiplicity must be evaluated. However, this uncertainty is diluted since the b-veto efficiency is weakly dependent on the number of jets in the event.

Since the shapes of the WW background templates used in the fit are taken from MC simulation, a corresponding shape uncertainty must be accounted for. This uncertainty is estimated in each bin of p_T^H from the comparisons of the two estimates obtained using the sample produced with MADGRAPH 5.1.3, and another sample produced using MC@NLO 4.0 [83]. These uncertainties include shape differences originating from the renormalization and factorization scale choice. The scale dependence is estimated with MC@NLO.

A summary of the main sources of systematic uncertainty and the corresponding estimate is reported in Table 3.

The systematic uncertainties related to the unfolding procedure are described separately in Section 8.

7 Signal extraction

The signal, including ggH, VBF, and VH production mechanisms, is extracted in each bin of p_T^H by performing a binned maximum likelihood fit simultaneously in all p_T^H bins to a two-dimensional template for signals and backgrounds in the $m_{\ell\ell}$ - m_T plane. Six different signal strength parameters are extracted from the fit, one for each p_T^H bin. The relative contributions

Table 3: Main sources of systematic uncertainties and their estimate. The first category reports the uncertainties in the normalization of background contributions. The experimental and theoretical uncertainties refer to the effect on signal yields. A range is specified if the uncertainty varies across the p_T^H bins.

Uncertainties in backgrounds contributions	
Source	Uncertainty
$t\bar{t}$, tW	20–50%
W +jets	40%
WZ , ZZ	4%
$W\gamma^{(*)}$	30%
Effect of the experimental uncertainties on the signal and background yields	
Source	Uncertainty
Integrated luminosity	2.6%
Trigger efficiency	1–2%
Lepton reconstruction and identification	3–4%
Lepton energy scale	2–4%
E_T^{miss} modelling	2%
Jet energy scale	10%
Pileup multiplicity	2%
b mistag modelling	3%
Effect of the theoretical uncertainties on signal yield	
Source	Uncertainty
b jet veto scale factor	1–2%
PDF	1%
WW background shape	1%

of the different Higgs production mechanisms in the signal template are taken to be the same as in the SM. The systematic uncertainty sources are considered as nuisance parameters in the fit.

Because of detector resolution effects, some of the reconstructed $H \rightarrow W^+W^-$ signal events might originate from outside the fiducial phase space. These out-of-fiducial signal events cannot be precisely handled by the unfolding procedure and must be subtracted from the measured spectrum. The p_T^H distribution of the out-of-fiducial signal events is taken from simulation, and each bin is multiplied by the corresponding measured signal strength before performing the subtraction.

A comparison of data and background prediction is shown in Fig. 1, where the $m_{\ell\ell}$ distribution is shown for each of the six p_T^H bins. Distributions correspond to the m_T window of [60, 110] GeV, in order to emphasize the Higgs boson signal [7]. The corresponding m_T distributions are shown in Fig. 2 for events in an $m_{\ell\ell}$ window of [12, 75] GeV.

The signal prediction and background estimates after the analysis selection are reported in Table 4. Background normalizations correspond to the values obtained from the fit.

The spectrum shown in Fig. 3 is obtained after having performed the fit and after the subtraction of the out-of-fiducial signal events, but before undergoing the unfolding procedure. The




Figure 1: Distributions of the $m_{\ell\ell}$ variable in each of the six p_T^H bins. Background normalizations correspond to the values obtained from the fit. Signal normalization is fixed to the SM expectation. The distributions are shown in an m_T window of [60,110] GeV in order to emphasize the Higgs boson (H) signal. The signal contribution is shown both stacked on top of the background and superimposed on it. Ratios of the expected and observed event yields in individual bins are shown in the panels below the plots. The uncertainty band shown in the ratio plot corresponds to the envelope of systematic uncertainties after performing the fit to the data.




Figure 2: Distributions of the m_T variable in each of the six p_T^H bins. Background normalizations correspond to the values obtained from the fit. Signal normalization is fixed to the SM expectation. The distributions are shown in an $m_{\ell\ell}$ window of [12,75] GeV in order to emphasize the Higgs boson (H) signal. The signal contribution is shown both stacked on top of the background and superimposed on it. Ratios of the expected and observed event yields in individual bins are shown in the panels below the plots. The uncertainty band shown in the ratio plot corresponds to the envelope of systematic uncertainties after performing the fit to the data.

Table 4: Signal prediction, background estimates and observed number of events in data are shown in each p_T^H bin for the signal after applying the analysis selection requirements. The total uncertainty on the number of events is reported. For signal processes, the yield related to the ggH are shown, separated with respect to the contribution of the other production mechanisms (XH=VBF+VH). The WW process includes both quark and gluon induced contribution, while the Top process takes into account both $t\bar{t}$ and tW.

p_T^H [GeV]	0–15	15–45	45–85	85–125	125–165	165– ∞
ggH	73 ± 3	175 ± 5	59 ± 3	15 ± 2	5.1 ± 1.5	4.9 ± 1.4
XH=VBF+VH	4 ± 2	15 ± 4	16 ± 4	8 ± 2	3.8 ± 1.1	3.0 ± 0.8
Out-of-fiducial	9.2 ± 0.5	19.9 ± 0.7	11.4 ± 0.6	4.4 ± 0.3	1.6 ± 0.2	2.4 ± 0.2
Data	2182	5305	3042	1263	431	343
Total background	2124 ± 128	5170 ± 321	2947 ± 293	1266 ± 175	420 ± 80	336 ± 74
WW	1616 ± 107	3172 ± 249	865 ± 217	421 ± 120	125 ± 60	161 ± 54
Top	184 ± 38	1199 ± 165	1741 ± 192	735 ± 125	243 ± 51	139 ± 49
W+jets	134 ± 5	455 ± 10	174 ± 6	48 ± 4	14 ± 3	9 ± 3
WZ+ZZ+VVV	34 ± 4	107 ± 10	71 ± 7	29 ± 5	14 ± 3	13 ± 4
$Z/\gamma^* \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$	23 ± 3	67 ± 5	47 ± 4	22 ± 3	12 ± 2	10 ± 2
$W\gamma^{(*)}$	132 ± 49	170 ± 58	48 ± 30	12 ± 9	3 ± 3	5 ± 10

theoretical distribution after the detector simulation and event reconstruction is also shown for comparison.




Figure 3: Differential Higgs boson production cross section as a function of the reconstructed p_T^H , before applying the unfolding procedure. Data values after the background subtraction are shown together with the statistical and the systematic uncertainties, determined propagating the sources of uncertainty through the fit procedure. The line and dashed area represent the SM theoretical estimates in which the acceptance of the dominant ggH contribution is modelled by POWHEG V1. The sub-dominant component of the signal is denoted as XH=VBF+VH, and is shown with the cross filled area separately.

8 Unfolding and treatment of systematic uncertainties

To facilitate comparisons with theoretical predictions or other experimental results, the signal extracted performing the fit has to be corrected for detector resolution and efficiency effects and for the efficiency of the selection defined in the analysis. An unfolding procedure is used relying on the ROOUNFOLD package [84], which provides the tools to run various unfolding algorithms.

For every variable of interest, simulated samples are used to compare the distribution of that variable before and after the simulated events are processed through CMS detector simulation and events reconstruction. The detector response matrix M is built according to the following equation:

$$R_i^{\text{MC}} = \sum_{j=1}^n M_{ij} T_j^{\text{MC}}, \quad (2)$$

where T^{MC} and R^{MC} are two n -dimensional vectors representing the distribution before and after event processing through CMS simulation and reconstruction, respectively. The dimension n of the two vectors corresponds to the number of bins in the distributions, equal to six in this analysis. The response matrix M includes all the effects related to the detector and analysis selection that affect the R^{MC} distribution. To avoid the large variance and strong negative correlation between the neighbouring bins [38], the unfolding procedure in this analysis relies on the singular value decomposition [85] method based on the Tikhonov regularization function. The regularization parameter is chosen to obtain results that are robust against numerical instabilities and statistical fluctuations, following the prescription described in Ref. [85]. It has been verified using a large number of simulated pseudo-experiments that the coverage of the unfolded uncertainties obtained with this procedure is as expected.

The response matrix is built as a two-dimensional histogram, with the generator-level p_{T}^{H} on the y axis and the same variable after the reconstruction on the x axis, using the same binning for both distributions. The resulting detector response matrix, including all signal sources and normalized by row, is shown in Fig. 4(left). The diagonal bins correspond to the purity P , defined as the ratio of the number of events generated and reconstructed in a given bin, to the number of events generated in that bin. The same matrix, normalized by column, is shown in Fig. 4(right). In this case the diagonal bins correspond to the stability S , defined as the ratio of the number of events generated and reconstructed in a given bin, and the number of events reconstructed in that bin. The P and S parameters provide an estimate of the p_{T}^{H} resolution and migration effects. The main source of bin migrations effects in the response matrix is the limited resolution in the measurement of $E_{\text{T}}^{\text{miss}}$.

Several closure tests are performed in order to validate the unfolding procedure. To estimate the uncertainty in the unfolding procedure due to the particular model adopted for building the response matrix, two independent gluon fusion samples are used, corresponding to two different generators: POWHEG V1 and JHUGEN generators, both interfaced to PYTHIA 6.4. The JHUGEN generator sample is used to build the response matrix while the POWHEG V1 sample is used for the measured and the MC distributions at generator level. The result of this test shows good agreement between the unfolded and the distribution from MC simulation.

An important aspect of this analysis is the treatment of the systematic uncertainties and the error propagation through the unfolding procedure. The sources of uncertainty are divided into three categories, depending on whether the uncertainty affects only the signal yield (type A), both the signal yield and the response matrix (type B), or only the response matrix (type C). These three classes propagate differently through the unfolding procedure.




Figure 4: Response matrix normalized by row (left) and by column (right) including all signal processes. The matrices are normalized either by row (left) or by column (right) in order to show the purity or stability respectively in diagonal bins.

Type A uncertainties are extracted directly from the fit in the form of a covariance matrix, which is passed to the unfolding tool as the covariance matrix of the measured distribution. The nuisance parameters belonging to this category are the background shape and normalization uncertainties. To extract the effect of type A uncertainties a dedicated fit is performed, fixing to constant all the nuisance parameters in the model, but type A nuisance parameters.

The nuisance parameters falling in the type B class are:

- the b veto scale factor. It affects the signal and background templates by varying the number of events with jets that enter the selection. It also affects the response matrix because the reconstructed spectrum is harder or softer depending on the number of jets, which in turn depends on the veto.
- the lepton efficiency scale factor. It affects the signal and background template shape and normalization. It affects the response matrix by varying the reconstructed spectrum;
- the E_T^{miss} scale and resolution, which have an effect similar to the above;
- lepton scale and resolution. The effect is similar to the above;
- jet energy scale. It affects the signal and background template shape and normalization. It also affects the response matrix because, by varying the fraction of events with jets, the b veto can reject more or fewer events, thus making the reconstructed spectrum harder or softer.

The effect of each type B uncertainty is evaluated separately, since each one changes the response matrix in a different way. In order to evaluate their effect on the signal strengths parameters, two additional fits are performed, each time fixing the nuisance parameter value to ± 1 standard deviation with respect to its nominal value. The results of the fits are then compared to the results of the full fit obtained by floating all the nuisance parameters, thus determining the relative uncertainty on the signal strengths due to each nuisance parameter. Using these uncertainties, the measured spectra for each type B source are built. The effects are propagated through the unfolding by building the corresponding variations of the response matrix and unfolding the measured spectra with the appropriate matrix.

Type C uncertainties are related to the underlying assumption on the Higgs boson production mechanism used to extract the fiducial cross sections. These are evaluated using an alternative shape for the true distribution at generator level. Since the reconstructed spectrum observed in data is consistent with a spectrum that falls to zero in the last three bins of the distribution, a true spectrum in accordance with this assumption is used to generate a large number of pseudo-experiments. The pseudo-experiments undergo the fitting and unfolding procedures described in the previous sections and are used to estimate the bias of the unfolding method with respect to the true spectrum. The observed bias is used as an estimate of the type C uncertainty. As an additional check, the model dependence uncertainty is evaluated using alternative response matrices that are obtained by varying the relative fraction of the VBF and ggH components within the experimental uncertainty, as given by the CMS combined measurement [17]. The bias observed using this approach is found to lie within the uncertainty obtained with the method described before.

Type A and B uncertainties are finally combined together after the unfolding summing in quadrature positive and negative contributions separately for each bin. Type C uncertainties, also referred to as “model dependence”, are instead quoted separately. The effect of each source of the uncertainty is quoted for each bin of p_T^H in Table 5.

9 Results

The unfolded p_T^H spectrum is shown in Fig. 5. Statistical, systematic, and theoretical uncertainties are shown as separate error bands in the plot. The unfolded spectrum is compared with the SM-based theoretical predictions where the ggH contribution is modelled using the HRES and POWHEG V2 programs. The comparison shows good agreement between data and theoretical predictions within the uncertainties. The measured values for the differential cross section in each bin of p_T^H are reported together with the total uncertainty in Table 5.

Table 5: Differential cross section in each p_T^H bin, together with the total uncertainty and the separate components of the various sources of uncertainty.

p_T^H [GeV]	$d\sigma/dp_T^H$ [fb/GeV]	Total uncertainty [fb/GeV]	Statistical uncertainty [fb/GeV]	Type A uncertainty [fb/GeV]	Type B uncertainty [fb/GeV]	Type C uncertainty [fb/GeV]
0–15	0.615	+0.370/−0.307	±0.246	±0.179	+0.211/−0.038	±0.140
15–45	0.561	+0.210/−0.157	±0.120	±0.093	+0.146/−0.041	±0.070
45–85	0.215	+0.084/−0.078	±0.059	±0.037	+0.047/−0.034	±0.030
85–125	0.071	+0.038/−0.038	±0.029	±0.017	+0.018/−0.017	±0.016
125–165	0.027	+0.020/−0.019	±0.016	±0.009	+0.007/−0.007	±0.008
165–∞	0.028	+0.027/−0.027	±0.023	±0.012	+0.008/−0.007	±0.012

Figure 6 shows the correlation matrix for the six bins of the differential spectrum. The correlation $\text{cor}(i, j)$ of bins i and j is defined as:

$$\text{cor}(i, j) = \frac{\text{cov}(i, j)}{s_i s_j}, \quad (3)$$

where $\text{cov}(i, j)$ is the covariance of bins i and j , and (s_i, s_j) are the standard deviations of bins i and j , respectively.

To measure the inclusive cross section in the fiducial phase space, the differential measured spectrum is integrated over p_T^H . In order to compute the contributions of the bin uncertainties of the differential spectrum to the inclusive uncertainty, error propagation is performed




Figure 5: Higgs boson production cross section as a function of p_T^H , after applying the unfolding procedure. Data points are shown, together with statistical and systematic uncertainties. The vertical bars on the data points correspond to the sum in quadrature of the statistical and systematic uncertainties. The model dependence uncertainty is also shown. The pink (and back-slash filling) and green (and slash filling) lines and areas represent the SM theoretical estimates in which the acceptance of the dominant ggH contribution is modelled by HRES and POWHEG V2, respectively. The subdominant component of the signal is denoted as $XH=VBF+VH$ and it is shown with the cross filled area separately. The bottom panel shows the ratio of data and POWHEG V2 theoretical estimate to the HRES theoretical prediction.

taking into account the covariance matrix of the six signal strengths. For the extrapolation of this result to the fiducial phase space, the unfolding procedure is not needed, and the inclusive measurement has only to be corrected for the fiducial phase space selection efficiency ϵ_{fid} . Dividing the measured number of events by the integrated luminosity and correcting for the overall selection efficiency, which is estimated in simulation to be $\epsilon_{\text{fid}} = 36.2\%$, the inclusive fiducial $\sigma \mathcal{B}$, σ_{fid} , is computed to be:

$$\sigma_{\text{fid}} = 39 \pm 8 (\text{stat}) \pm 9 (\text{syst}) \text{ fb}, \quad (4)$$

in agreement within the uncertainties with the theoretical estimate of $48 \pm 8 \text{ fb}$, computed integrating the spectrum obtained with the POWHEG V2 program for the ggH process and including the XH contribution.

10 Summary

The cross section for Higgs boson production in pp collisions has been studied using the $H \rightarrow W^+W^-$ decay mode, followed by leptonic decays of the W bosons to an oppositely charged




Figure 6: Correlation matrix among the p_T^H bins of the differential spectrum.

electron-muon pair in the final state. Measurements have been performed using data from pp collisions at a centre-of-mass energy of 8 TeV collected by the CMS experiment at the LHC and corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 19.4 fb^{-1} . The differential cross section has been measured as a function of the Higgs boson transverse momentum in a fiducial phase space, defined to match the experimental kinematic acceptance, and summarized in Table 1. An unfolding procedure has been used to extrapolate the measured results to the fiducial phase space and to correct for the detector effects. The measurements have been compared to SM theoretical estimations provided by the HRES and POWHEG V2 generators, showing good agreement within the experimental uncertainties. The inclusive production $\sigma \mathcal{B}$ in the fiducial phase space has been measured to be $39 \pm 8 \text{ (stat)} \pm 9 \text{ (syst)} \text{ fb}$, consistent with the SM expectation.

Acknowledgments

We congratulate our colleagues in the CERN accelerator departments for the excellent performance of the LHC and thank the technical and administrative staffs at CERN and at other CMS institutes for their contributions to the success of the CMS effort. In addition, we gratefully acknowledge the computing centres and personnel of the Worldwide LHC Computing Grid for delivering so effectively the computing infrastructure essential to our analyses. Finally, we acknowledge the enduring support for the construction and operation of the LHC and the CMS detector provided by the following funding agencies: BMWFW and FWF (Austria); FNRS and FWO (Belgium); CNPq, CAPES, FAPERJ, and FAPESP (Brazil); MES (Bulgaria); CERN; CAS, MoST, and NSFC (China); COLCIENCIAS (Colombia); MSES and CSF (Croatia); RPF (Cyprus); SENESCYT (Ecuador); MoER, ERC IUT and ERDF (Estonia); Academy of Finland, MEC, and HIP (Finland); CEA and CNRS/IN2P3 (France); BMBF, DFG, and HGF (Germany); GSRT (Greece); OTKA and NIH (Hungary); DAE and DST (India); IPM (Iran); SFI (Ireland); INFN (Italy); MSIP and NRF (Republic of Korea); LAS (Lithuania); MOE and UM (Malaysia); BUAP, CINVESTAV, CONACYT, LNS, SEP, and UASLP-FAI (Mexico); MBIE (New Zealand); PAEC (Pakistan); MSHE and NSC (Poland); FCT (Portugal); JINR (Dubna); MON, RosAtom, RAS and RFBR (Russia); MESTD (Serbia); SEIDI and CPAN (Spain); Swiss Funding Agencies

(Switzerland); MST (Taipei); ThEPCenter, IPST, STAR and NSTDA (Thailand); TUBITAK and TAEK (Turkey); NASU and SFFR (Ukraine); STFC (United Kingdom); DOE and NSF (USA).

Individuals have received support from the Marie-Curie programme and the European Research Council and EPLANET (European Union); the Leventis Foundation; the A. P. Sloan Foundation; the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation; the Belgian Federal Science Policy Office; the Fonds pour la Formation à la Recherche dans l'Industrie et dans l'Agriculture (FRIA-Belgium); the Agentschap voor Innovatie door Wetenschap en Technologie (IWT-Belgium); the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (MEYS) of the Czech Republic; the Council of Science and Industrial Research, India; the HOMING PLUS programme of the Foundation for Polish Science, cofinanced from European Union, Regional Development Fund; the Mobility Plus programme of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education (Poland); the OPUS programme, contract Sonata-bis DEC-2012/07/E/ST2/01406 of the National Science Center (Poland); the Thalís and Aristeia programmes cofinanced by EU-ESF and the Greek NSRF; the National Priorities Research Program by Qatar National Research Fund; the Programa Clarín-COFUND del Principado de Asturias; the Rachadapisek Sompot Fund for Postdoctoral Fellowship, Chulalongkorn University (Thailand); the Chulalongkorn Academic into Its 2nd Century Project Advancement Project (Thailand); and the Welch Foundation, contract C-1845.

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] CMS Collaboration, “Observation of a new boson with mass near 125 GeV in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ and 8 TeV”, *JHEP* **06** (2013) 081, doi:10.1007/JHEP06(2013)081, arXiv:1303.4571.
- [4] ATLAS Collaboration, “Measurements of Higgs boson production and couplings in diboson final states with the ATLAS detector at the LHC”, *Phys. Lett. B* **726** (2013) 88, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2013.08.010, arXiv:1307.1427. [Erratum: doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2014.05.011].
- [5] ATLAS Collaboration, “Evidence for the spin-0 nature of the Higgs boson using ATLAS data”, *Phys. Lett. B* **726** (2013) 120, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2013.08.026, arXiv:1307.1432.
- [6] CMS Collaboration, “Search for the standard model Higgs boson produced in association with a W or a Z boson and decaying to bottom quarks”, *Phys. Rev. D* **89** (2014) 012003, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.89.012003, arXiv:1310.3687.
- [7] CMS Collaboration, “Measurement of Higgs boson production and properties in the WW decay channel with leptonic final states”, *JHEP* **01** (2014) 096, doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2014)096, arXiv:1312.1129.
- [8] CMS Collaboration, “Measurement of the properties of a Higgs boson in the four-lepton final state”, *Phys. Rev. D* **89** (2014) 092007, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.89.092007, arXiv:1312.5353.
- [9] CMS Collaboration, “Evidence for the 125 GeV Higgs boson decaying to a pair of τ leptons”, *JHEP* **05** (2014) 104, doi:10.1007/JHEP05(2014)104, arXiv:1401.5041.
- [10] CMS Collaboration, “Evidence for the direct decay of the 125 GeV Higgs boson to fermions”, *Nature Phys.* **10** (2014) 557, doi:10.1038/nphys3005, arXiv:1401.6527.
- [11] CMS Collaboration, “Observation of the diphoton decay of the Higgs boson and measurement of its properties”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74** (2014) 3076, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-014-3076-z, arXiv:1407.0558.
- [12] ATLAS Collaboration, “Measurement of Higgs boson production in the diphoton decay channel in pp collisions at center-of-mass energies of 7 and 8 TeV with the ATLAS detector”, *Phys. Rev. D* **90** (2014) 112015, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.90.112015, arXiv:1408.7084.
- [13] ATLAS Collaboration, “Measurements of Higgs boson production and couplings in the four-lepton channel in pp collisions at center-of-mass energies of 7 and 8 TeV with the ATLAS detector”, *Phys. Rev. D* **91** (2015) 012006, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.91.012006, arXiv:1408.5191.

- [14] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for the $b\bar{b}$ decay of the Standard Model Higgs boson in associated (W/Z)H production with the ATLAS detector”, *JHEP* **01** (2015) 069, doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2015)069, arXiv:1409.6212.
- [15] CMS Collaboration, “Constraints on the spin-parity and anomalous HVV couplings of the Higgs boson in proton collisions at 7 and 8 TeV”, *Phys. Rev. D* **92** (2015) 012004, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.012004, arXiv:1411.3441.
- [16] ATLAS Collaboration, “Observation and measurement of Higgs boson decays to WW^* with the ATLAS detector”, *Phys. Rev. D* **92** (2015) 012006, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.012006, arXiv:1412.2641.
- [17] CMS Collaboration, “Precise determination of the mass of the Higgs boson and tests of compatibility of its couplings with the standard model predictions using proton collisions at 7 and 8 TeV”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **75** (2015) 212, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-015-3351-7, arXiv:1412.8662.
- [18] ATLAS Collaboration, “Evidence for the Higgs-boson Yukawa coupling to tau leptons with the ATLAS detector”, *JHEP* **04** (2015) 117, doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2015)117, arXiv:1501.04943.
- [19] ATLAS Collaboration, “Determination of spin and parity of the Higgs boson in the $WW^* \rightarrow e\nu\mu\nu$ decay channel with the ATLAS detector”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **75** (2015) 231, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-015-3436-3, arXiv:1503.03643.
- [20] ATLAS and CMS Collaborations, “Combined measurement of the Higgs boson mass in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ and 8 TeV with the ATLAS and CMS experiments”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114** (2015) 191803, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.114.191803, arXiv:1503.07589.
- [21] ATLAS Collaboration, “Measurements of the Higgs boson production and decay rates and coupling strengths using pp collision data at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ and 8 TeV in the ATLAS experiment”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76** (2016) 6, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-015-3769-y, arXiv:1507.04548.
- [22] CMS Collaboration, “Search for Higgs boson off-shell production in proton-proton collisions at 7 and 8 TeV and derivation of constraints on its total decay width”, (2016). arXiv:1605.02329. Submitted to *JHEP*.
- [23] R. V. Harlander and T. Neumann, “Probing the nature of the Higgs-gluon coupling”, *Phys. Rev. D* **88** (2013) 074015, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.88.074015, arXiv:1308.2225.
- [24] A. Banfi, A. Martin, and V. Sanz, “Probing top-partners in Higgs+jets”, *JHEP* **08** (2014) 053, doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2014)053, arXiv:1308.4771.
- [25] A. Azatov and A. Paul, “Probing Higgs couplings with high p_T Higgs production”, *JHEP* **01** (2014) 014, doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2014)014, arXiv:1309.5273.
- [26] C. Grojean, E. Salvioni, M. Schlaffer, and A. Weiler, “Very boosted Higgs in gluon fusion”, *JHEP* **05** (2014) 022, doi:10.1007/JHEP05(2014)022, arXiv:1312.3317.
- [27] S. Dawson, I. M. Lewis, and M. Zeng, “Effective field theory for Higgs boson plus jet production”, *Phys. Rev. D* **90** (2014) 093007, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.90.093007, arXiv:1409.6299.

- [28] G. Bozzi, S. Catani, D. de Florian, and M. Grazzini, “Transverse-momentum resummation and the spectrum of the Higgs boson at the LHC”, *Nucl. Phys. B* **737** (2006) 73, doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2005.12.022, arXiv:hep-ph/0508068.
- [29] D. de Florian, G. Ferrera, M. Grazzini, and D. Tommasini, “Higgs boson production at the LHC: transverse momentum resummation effects in the $H \rightarrow 2\gamma$, $H \rightarrow WW \rightarrow \ell\nu\ell\nu$ and $H \rightarrow ZZ \rightarrow 4\ell$ decay modes”, *JHEP* **06** (2012) 132, doi:10.1007/JHEP06(2012)132, arXiv:1203.6321.
- [30] M. Grazzini and H. Sargsyan, “Heavy-quark mass effects in Higgs boson production at the LHC”, *JHEP* **09** (2013) 129, doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2013)129, arXiv:1306.4581.
- [31] ATLAS Collaboration, “Fiducial and differential cross sections of Higgs boson production measured in the four-lepton decay channel in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV with the ATLAS detector”, *Phys. Lett. B* **738** (2014) 234, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2014.09.054, arXiv:1408.3226.
- [32] ATLAS Collaboration, “Measurements of fiducial and differential cross sections for Higgs boson production in the diphoton decay channel at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV with ATLAS”, *JHEP* **09** (2014) 112, doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2014)112, arXiv:1407.4222.
- [33] ATLAS Collaboration, “Measurements of the total and differential Higgs boson production cross sections combining the $H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ and $H \rightarrow ZZ^* \rightarrow 4\ell$ decay channels at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV with the ATLAS detector”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115** (2015) 091801, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.091801, arXiv:1504.05833.
- [34] CMS Collaboration, “Measurement of differential cross sections for Higgs boson production in the diphoton decay channel in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76** (2016) 13, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-015-3853-3, arXiv:1508.07819.
- [35] CMS Collaboration, “Measurement of differential and integrated fiducial cross sections for Higgs boson production in the four-lepton decay channel in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ and 8 TeV”, *JHEP* **04** (2016) 005, doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2016)005, arXiv:1512.08377.
- [36] ATLAS Collaboration, “Measurement of fiducial differential cross sections of gluon-fusion production of Higgs bosons decaying to $WW^* \rightarrow e\nu\mu\nu$ with the ATLAS detector at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV”, *JHEP* **08** (2016) 104, arXiv:1604.02997.
- [37] S. Heinemeyer et al., “Handbook of LHC Higgs cross sections: 3. Higgs properties”, CERN Report CERN-2013-004, 2013. doi:10.5170/CERN-2013-004, arXiv:1307.1347.
- [38] G. Cowan, “A survey of unfolding methods for particle physics”, in *Proceedings of the conference on advanced statistical techniques in particle physics: University of Durham, UK, March 18-22, 2002*, p. 248. Institute of Particle Physics Phenomenology: Durham, UK, 2002. Conference C02-03-18.1.
- [39] CMS Collaboration, “The CMS experiment at the CERN LHC”, *JINST* **3** (2008) S08004, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08004.
- [40] CMS Collaboration, “Particle-flow event reconstruction in CMS and performance for jets, taus, and E_T^{miss} ”, CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-PFT-09-001, 2009.

- [41] CMS Collaboration, “Commissioning of the particle-flow event reconstruction with the first LHC collisions recorded in the CMS detector”, CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-PFT-10-001, 2010.
- [42] CMS Collaboration, “Commissioning of the particle-flow reconstruction in minimum-bias and jet events from pp collisions at 7 TeV”, CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-PFT-10-002, 2010.
- [43] CMS Collaboration, “Particle-flow commissioning with muons and electrons from J/ ψ and W events at 7 TeV”, CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-PFT-10-003, 2010.
- [44] CMS Collaboration, “Determination of jet energy calibration and transverse momentum resolution in CMS”, *JINST* **6** (2011) P11002, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/6/11/P11002, arXiv:1107.4277.
- [45] CMS Collaboration, “Performance of electron reconstruction and selection with the CMS detector in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV”, *JINST* **10** (2015), no. 06, P06005, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/10/06/P06005, arXiv:1502.02701.
- [46] M. Cacciari, G. P. Salam, and G. Soyez, “The anti- k_t jet clustering algorithm”, *JHEP* **04** (2008) 063, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2008/04/063, arXiv:0802.1189.
- [47] M. Cacciari, G. P. Salam, and G. Soyez, “FastJet user manual”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **72** (2012) 1896, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-012-1896-2, arXiv:1111.6097.
- [48] CMS Collaboration, “Measurement of the inclusive W and Z production cross sections in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV”, *JHEP* **10** (2011) 132, doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2011)132, arXiv:1107.4789.
- [49] 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.
- [50] CMS Collaboration, “The performance of the CMS muon detector in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV at the LHC”, *JINST* **8** (2013) P11002, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/8/11/P11002, arXiv:1306.6905.
- [51] CMS Collaboration, “Performance of photon reconstruction and identification with the CMS detector in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV”, *JINST* **10** (2015) P08010, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/10/08/P08010, arXiv:1502.02702.
- [52] CMS Collaboration, “Performance of the CMS missing transverse momentum reconstruction in pp data at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV”, *JINST* **10** (2015), no. 02, P02006, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/10/02/P02006, arXiv:1411.0511.
- [53] M. Krämer, S. Mrenna, and D. E. Soper, “Next-to-leading order QCD jet production with parton showers and hadronization”, *Phys. Rev. D* **73** (2006) 014022, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.73.014022, arXiv:hep-ph/0509127.
- [54] S. Frixione, P. Nason, and C. Oleari, “Matching NLO QCD computations with Parton Shower simulations: the POWHEG method”, *JHEP* **11** (2007) 070, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2007/11/070, arXiv:0709.2092.
- [55] N. Lavesson and L. Lonnblad, “Extending CKKW-merging to one-loop matrix elements”, *JHEP* **12** (2008) 070, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2008/12/070, arXiv:0811.2912.

- [56] S. Alioli, P. Nason, C. Oleari, and E. Re, “NLO Higgs boson production via gluon fusion matched with shower in POWHEG”, *JHEP* **04** (2009) 002, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2009/04/002, arXiv:0812.0578.
- [57] P. Nason and C. Oleari, “NLO Higgs boson production via vector-boson fusion matched with shower in POWHEG”, *JHEP* **02** (2010) 037, doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2010)037, arXiv:0911.5299.
- [58] T. Sjöstrand, S. Mrenna, and P. Skands, “PYTHIA 6.4 physics and manual”, *JHEP* **05** (2006) 026, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2006/05/026, arXiv:hep-ph/0603175.
- [59] J. Alwall et al., “The automated computation of tree-level and next-to-leading order differential cross sections, and their matching to parton shower simulations”, *JHEP* **07** (2014) 079, doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2014)079, arXiv:1405.0301.
- [60] S. Alioli, S.-O. Moch, and P. Uwer, “Hadronic top-quark pair-production with one jet and parton showering”, *JHEP* **01** (2012) 137, doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2012)137, arXiv:1110.5251.
- [61] T. Binoth, M. Ciccolini, N. Kauer, and M. Krämer, “Gluon-induced W-boson pair production at the LHC”, *JHEP* **12** (2006) 046, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2006/12/046, arXiv:hep-ph/0611170.
- [62] M. Bonvini et al., “Signal-background interference effects for $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow H \rightarrow W^+W^-$ beyond leading order”, *Phys. Rev. D* **88** (2013) 034032, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.88.034032, arXiv:1304.3053.
- [63] G. Passarino, “Higgs CAT”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74** (2014) 2866, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-014-2866-7, arXiv:1312.2397.
- [64] H.-L. Lai et al., “Uncertainty induced by QCD coupling in the CTEQ global analysis of parton distributions”, *Phys. Rev. D* **82** (2010) 054021, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.82.054021, arXiv:1004.4624.
- [65] H.-L. Lai et al., “New parton distributions for collider physics”, *Phys. Rev. D* **82** (2010) 074024, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.82.074024, arXiv:1007.2241.
- [66] S. Alioli, P. Nason, C. Oleari, and E. Re, “A general framework for implementing NLO calculations in shower Monte Carlo programs: the POWHEG BOX”, *JHEP* **06** (2010) 043, doi:10.1007/JHEP06(2010)043, arXiv:1002.2581.
- [67] GEANT4 Collaboration, “GEANT4—a simulation toolkit”, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **506** (2003) 250, doi:10.1016/S0168-9002(03)01368-8.
- [68] E. Bagnaschi, G. Degrossi, P. Slavich, and A. Vicini, “Higgs production via gluon fusion in the POWHEG approach in the SM and in the MSSM”, *JHEP* **02** (2012) 088, doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2012)088, arXiv:1111.2854.
- [69] S. Actis, G. Passarino, C. Sturm, and S. Uccirati, “NLO electroweak corrections to Higgs boson production at hadron colliders”, *Phys. Lett. B* **670** (2008) 12, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2008.10.018, arXiv:0809.1301.
- [70] S. Catani, D. de Florian, M. Grazzini, and P. Nason, “Soft gluon resummation for Higgs boson production at hadron colliders”, *JHEP* **07** (2003) 028, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2003/07/028, arXiv:hep-ph/0306211.

- [71] Y. Gao et al., “Spin determination of single-produced resonances at hadron colliders”, *Phys. Rev. D* **81** (2010) 075022, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.81.075022, arXiv:1001.3396.
- [72] S. Bolognesi et al., “Spin and parity of a single-produced resonance at the LHC”, *Phys. Rev. D* **86** (2012) 095031, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.86.095031, arXiv:1208.4018.
- [73] I. Anderson et al., “Constraining anomalous HVV interactions at proton and lepton colliders”, *Phys. Rev. D* **89** (2014) 035007, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.89.035007, arXiv:1309.4819.
- [74] T. Sjöstrand, S. Mrenna, and P. Z. Skands, “A brief introduction to PYTHIA 8.1”, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **178** (2008) 852, doi:10.1016/j.cpc.2008.01.036, arXiv:0710.3820.
- [75] CMS Collaboration, “Identification of b-quark jets with the CMS experiment”, *JINST* **8** (2013) P04013, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/8/04/P04013, arXiv:1211.4462.
- [76] CMS Collaboration, “Performance of b tagging at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV in multijet, $t\bar{t}$ and boosted topology events”, CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-BTV-13-001, 2013.
- [77] S. Jadach, J. H. Kuhn, and Z. Was, “TAUOLA: a library of Monte Carlo programs to simulate decays of polarized tau leptons”, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **64** (1990) 275, doi:10.1016/0010-4655(91)90038-M.
- [78] S. Alekhin et al., “The PDF4LHC Working Group interim report”, (2011). arXiv:1101.0536.
- [79] M. Botje et al., “The PDF4LHC Working Group interim recommendations”, (2011). arXiv:1101.0538.
- [80] R. D. Ball et al., “Impact of heavy quark masses on parton distributions and LHC phenomenology”, *Nucl. Phys. B* **849** (2011) 296, doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2011.03.021, arXiv:1101.1300.
- [81] 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.
- [82] I. W. Stewart and F. J. Tackmann, “Theory uncertainties for Higgs and other searches using jet bins”, *Phys. Rev. D* **85** (2012) 034011, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.85.034011, arXiv:1107.2117.
- [83] S. Frixione et al., “The MC@NLO 4.0 event generator”, (2010). arXiv:1010.0819.
- [84] T. Adye, “Unfolding algorithms and tests using RooUnfold”, in *PHYSTAT 2011 Workshop on Statistical Issues Related to Discovery Claims in Search Experiments and Unfolding*, H. Prosper and L. Lyons, eds., p. 313. Geneva, Switzerland, 2011. arXiv:1105.1160. doi:10.5170/CERN-2011-006.313.
- [85] A. Hocker and V. Kartvelishvili, “SVD approach to data unfolding”, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **372** (1996) 469, doi:10.1016/0168-9002(95)01478-0, arXiv:hep-ph/9509307.

A The CMS Collaboration

Yerevan Physics Institute, Yerevan, Armenia

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

Institut für Hochenergiephysik der OeAW, Wien, Austria

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

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

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

Universiteit Antwerpen, Antwerpen, Belgium

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

Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussel, Belgium

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

Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium

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

Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

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

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

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

Université de Mons, Mons, Belgium

N. Bely

Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Fisicas, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

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

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

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

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

S. Ahuja^a, C.A. Bernardes^b, S. Dogra^a, T.R. Fernandez Perez Tomei^a, E.M. Gregores^b,

P.G. Mercadante^b, C.S. Moon^a, S.F. Novaes^a, Sandra S. Padula^a, D. Romero Abad^b, J.C. Ruiz Vargas

Institute for Nuclear Research and Nuclear Energy, Sofia, Bulgaria

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

University of Sofia, Sofia, Bulgaria

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

Beihang University, Beijing, China

W. Fang⁵

Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing, China

M. Ahmad, J.G. Bian, G.M. Chen, H.S. Chen, M. Chen, Y. Chen⁶, T. Cheng, C.H. Jiang, D. Leggat, Z. Liu, F. Romeo, S.M. Shaheen, A. Spiezia, J. Tao, C. Wang, Z. Wang, H. Zhang, J. Zhao

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

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

Universidad de Los Andes, Bogota, Colombia

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

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

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

University of Split, Faculty of Science, Split, Croatia

Z. Antunovic, M. Kovac

Institute Rudjer Boskovic, Zagreb, Croatia

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

University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus

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

Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

M. Finger⁷, M. Finger Jr.⁷

Universidad San Francisco de Quito, Quito, Ecuador

E. Carrera Jarrin

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

Y. Assran^{8,9}, T. Elkafrawy¹⁰, A. Ellithi Kamel¹¹, A. Mahrous¹²

National Institute of Chemical Physics and Biophysics, Tallinn, Estonia

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

Department of Physics, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

P. Eerola, J. Pekkanen, M. Voutilainen

Helsinki Institute of Physics, Helsinki, Finland

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

Lappeenranta University of Technology, Lappeenranta, Finland

J. Talvitie, T. Tuuva

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

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

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

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

Institut Pluridisciplinaire Hubert Curien, Université de Strasbourg, Université de Haute Alsace Mulhouse, CNRS/IN2P3, Strasbourg, FranceJ.-L. Agram¹³, J. Andrea, A. Aubin, D. Bloch, J.-M. Brom, M. Buttignol, E.C. Chabert, N. Chanon, C. Collard, E. Conte¹³, X. Coubez, J.-C. Fontaine¹³, D. Gelé, U. Goerlach, A.-C. Le Bihan, J.A. Merlin¹⁴, K. Skovpen, P. Van Hove**Centre de Calcul de l'Institut National de Physique Nucleaire et de Physique des Particules, CNRS/IN2P3, Villeurbanne, France**

S. Gadrat

Université de Lyon, Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, CNRS-IN2P3, Institut de Physique Nucléaire de Lyon, Villeurbanne, FranceS. Beauceron, C. Bernet, G. Boudoul, E. Bouvier, C.A. Carrillo Montoya, R. Chierici, D. Contardo, B. Courbon, P. Depasse, H. El Mamouni, J. Fan, J. Fay, S. Gascon, M. Gouzevitch, G. Grenier, B. Ille, F. Lagarde, I.B. Laktineh, M. Lethuillier, L. Mirabito, A.L. Pequegnot, S. Perries, A. Popov¹⁵, D. Sabes, V. Sordini, M. Vander Donckt, P. Verdier, S. Viret**Georgian Technical University, Tbilisi, Georgia**T. Toriashvili¹⁶**Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia**Z. Tsamalaidze⁷**RWTH Aachen University, I. Physikalisches Institut, Aachen, Germany**C. Autermann, S. Beranek, L. Feld, A. Heister, M.K. Kiesel, K. Klein, M. Lipinski, A. Ostapchuk, M. Preuten, F. Raupach, S. Schael, C. Schomakers, J.F. Schulte, J. Schulz, T. Verlage, H. Weber, V. Zhukov¹⁵**RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut A, Aachen, Germany**

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

RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut B, Aachen, GermanyV. Cherepanov, Y. Erdogan, G. Flügge, F. Hoehle, B. Kargoll, T. Kress, A. Künsken, J. Lingemann, A. Nehr Korn, A. Nowack, I.M. Nugent, C. Pistone, O. Pooth, A. Stahl¹⁴**Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Hamburg, Germany**M. Aldaya Martin, C. Asawatangtrakuldee, I. Asin, K. Beernaert, O. Behnke, U. Behrens, A.A. Bin Anuar, K. Borras¹⁷, A. Campbell, P. Connor, C. Contreras-Campana, F. Costanza,

C. Diez Pardos, G. Dolinska, G. Eckerlin, D. Eckstein, E. Gallo¹⁸, J. Garay Garcia, A. Geiser, A. Gizhko, J.M. Grados Luyando, P. Gunnellini, A. Harb, J. Hauk, M. Hempel¹⁹, H. Jung, A. Kalogeropoulos, O. Karacheban¹⁹, M. Kasemann, J. Keaveney, J. Kieseler, C. Kleinwort, I. Korol, W. Lange, A. Lelek, J. Leonard, K. Lipka, A. Lobanov, W. Lohmann¹⁹, R. Mankel, I.-A. Melzer-Pellmann, A.B. Meyer, G. Mittag, J. Mnich, A. Mussgiller, E. Ntomari, D. Pitzl, R. Placakyte, A. Raspereza, B. Roland, M.Ö. Sahin, P. Saxena, T. Schoerner-Sadenius, C. Seitz, S. Spannagel, N. Stefaniuk, K.D. Trippkewitz, G.P. Van Onsem, R. Walsh, C. Wissing

University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany

V. Blobel, M. Centis Vignali, A.R. Draeger, T. Dreyer, E. Garutti, K. Goebel, D. Gonzalez, J. Haller, M. Hoffmann, A. Junkes, R. Klanner, R. Kogler, N. Kovalchuk, T. Lapsien, T. Lenz, I. Marchesini, D. Marconi, M. Meyer, M. Niedziela, D. Nowatschin, J. Ott, F. Pantaleo¹⁴, T. Peiffer, A. Perieanu, J. Poehlsen, C. Sander, C. Scharf, P. Schleper, A. Schmidt, S. Schumann, J. Schwandt, H. Stadie, G. Steinbrück, F.M. Stober, M. Stöver, H. Tholen, D. Troendle, E. Usai, L. Vanelderen, A. Vanhoefer, B. Vormwald

Institut für Experimentelle Kernphysik, Karlsruhe, Germany

C. Barth, C. Baus, J. Berger, E. Butz, T. Chwalek, F. Colombo, W. De Boer, A. Dierlamm, S. Fink, R. Friese, M. Giffels, A. Gilbert, D. Haitz, F. Hartmann¹⁴, S.M. Heindl, U. Husemann, I. Katkov¹⁵, P. Lobelle Pardo, B. Maier, H. Mildner, M.U. Mozer, T. Müller, Th. Müller, M. Plagge, G. Quast, K. Rabbertz, S. Röcker, F. Roscher, M. Schröder, G. Sieber, H.J. Simonis, R. Ulrich, J. Wagner-Kuhr, S. Wayand, M. Weber, T. Weiler, S. Williamson, C. Wöhrmann, R. Wolf

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

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

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece

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

University of Ioánnina, Ioánnina, Greece

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

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

N. Filipovic

Wigner Research Centre for Physics, Budapest, Hungary

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

Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary

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

University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary

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

National Institute of Science Education and Research, Bhubaneswar, India

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

Panjab University, Chandigarh, India

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

University of Delhi, Delhi, India

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

Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, Kolkata, India

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

Indian Institute of Technology Madras, Madras, India

P.K. Behera

Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, Mumbai, India

R. Chudasama, D. Dutta, V. Jha, V. Kumar, A.K. Mohanty¹⁴, P.K. Netrakanti, L.M. Pant, P. Shukla, A. Topkar

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Mumbai, India

S. Bhowmik²⁵, R.K. Dewanjee, S. Ganguly, S. Kumar, M. Maity²⁵, B. Parida, T. Sarkar²⁵

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-A, Mumbai, India

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

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-B, Mumbai, India

S. Banerjee, M. Guchait, Sa. Jain, G. Majumder, K. Mazumdar, N. Wickramage²⁶

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

S. Chauhan, S. Dube, A. Kapoor, K. Kothekar, A. Rane, S. Sharma

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

H. Behnamian, S. Chenarani²⁷, E. Eskandari Tadavani, S.M. Etesami²⁷, A. Fahim²⁸, M. Khakzad, M. Mohammadi Najafabadi, M. Naseri, S. Paktinat Mehdiabadi, F. Rezaei Hosseinabadi, B. Safarzadeh²⁹, M. Zeinali

University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland

M. Felcini, M. Grunewald

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

M. Abbrescia^{a,b}, C. Calabria^{a,b}, C. Caputo^{a,b}, A. Colaleo^a, D. Creanza^{a,c}, L. Cristella^{a,b}, N. De Filippis^{a,c}, M. De Palma^{a,b}, L. Fiore^a, G. Iaselli^{a,c}, G. Maggi^{a,c}, M. Maggi^a, G. Miniello^{a,b}, S. My^{a,b}, S. Nuzzo^{a,b}, A. Pompili^{a,b}, G. Pugliese^{a,c}, R. Radogna^{a,b}, A. Ranieri^a, G. Selvaggi^{a,b}, L. Silvestris^{a,14}, R. Venditti^{a,b}, P. Verwilligen^a

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

G. Abbiendi^a, C. Battilana, D. Bonacorsi^{a,b}, S. Braibant-Giacomelli^{a,b}, L. Brigliadori^{a,b}, R. Campanini^{a,b}, P. Capiluppi^{a,b}, A. Castro^{a,b}, F.R. Cavallo^a, S.S. Chhibra^{a,b}, G. Codispoti^{a,b}, M. Cuffiani^{a,b}, G.M. Dallavalle^a, F. Fabbri^a, A. Fanfani^{a,b}, D. Fasanella^{a,b}, P. Giacomelli^a, C. Grandi^a, L. Guiducci^{a,b}, S. Marcellini^a, G. Masetti^a, A. Montanari^a, F.L. Navarria^{a,b}, A. Perrotta^a, A.M. Rossi^{a,b}, T. Rovelli^{a,b}, G.P. Siroli^{a,b}, N. Tosi^{a,b,14}

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

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

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

G. Barbagli^a, V. Ciulli^{a,b}, C. Civinini^a, R. D'Alessandro^{a,b}, E. Focardi^{a,b}, V. Gori^{a,b}, P. Lenzi^{a,b}, M. Meschini^a, S. Paoletti^a, L. Redapi, L. Russo^{a,30}, G. Sguazzoni^a, L. Viliani^{a,b,14}

INFN Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, Frascati, Italy

L. Benussi, S. Bianco, F. Fabbri, D. Piccolo, F. Primavera¹⁴

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

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

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

L. Brianza, M.E. Dinardo^{a,b}, S. Fiorendi^{a,b}, S. Gennai^a, A. Ghezzi^{a,b}, P. Govoni^{a,b}, S. Malvezzi^a, R.A. Manzoni^{a,b,14}, B. Marzocchi^{a,b}, D. Menasce^a, L. Moroni^a, M. Paganoni^{a,b}, D. Pedrini^a, S. Pigazzini, S. Ragazzi^{a,b}, T. Tabarelli de Fatis^{a,b}

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

S. Buontempo^a, N. Cavallo^{a,c}, G. De Nardo, S. Di Guida^{a,d,14}, M. Esposito^{a,b}, F. Fabozzi^{a,c}, A.O.M. Iorio^{a,b}, G. Lanza^a, L. Lista^a, S. Meola^{a,d,14}, P. Paolucci^{a,14}, C. Sciacca^{a,b}, F. Thyssen

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

P. Azzi^{a,14}, N. Bacchetta^a, L. Benato^{a,b}, D. Bisello^{a,b}, A. Boletti^{a,b}, R. Carlin^{a,b}, A. Carvalho Antunes De Oliveira^{a,b}, P. Checchia^a, M. Dall'Osso^{a,b}, P. De Castro Manzano^a, T. Dorigo^a, U. Dosselli^a, F. Gasparini^{a,b}, U. Gasparini^{a,b}, A. Gozzelino^a, S. Lacaprara^a, M. Margoni^{a,b}, A.T. Meneguzzo^{a,b}, J. Pazzini^{a,b,14}, N. Pozzobon^{a,b}, P. Ronchese^{a,b}, F. Simonetto^{a,b}, E. Torassa^a, M. Zanetti, P. Zotto^{a,b}, A. Zucchetta^{a,b}, G. Zumerle^{a,b}

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

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

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

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

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

K. Androsov^{a,30}, P. Azzurri^{a,14}, G. Bagliesi^a, J. Bernardini^a, T. Boccali^a, R. Castaldi^a, M.A. Ciocci^{a,30}, R. Dell'Orso^a, S. Donato^{a,c}, G. Fedi, A. Giassi^a, M.T. Grippo^{a,30}, F. Ligabue^{a,c}, T. Lomtadze^a, L. Martini^{a,b}, A. Messineo^{a,b}, F. Palla^a, A. Rizzi^{a,b}, A. Savoy-Navarro^{a,31}, P. Spagnolo^a, R. Tenchini^a, G. Tonelli^{a,b}, A. Venturi^a, P.G. Verdini^a

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

L. Barone^{a,b}, F. Cavallari^a, M. Cipriani^{a,b}, G. D'imperio^{a,b,14}, D. Del Re^{a,b,14}, M. Diemoz^a, S. Gelli^{a,b}, C. Jorda^a, E. Longo^{a,b}, F. Margaroli^{a,b}, P. Meridiani^a, G. Organtini^{a,b}, R. Paramatti^a, F. Preiato^{a,b}, S. Rahatlou^{a,b}, C. Rovelli^a, F. Santanastasio^{a,b}

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

N. Amapane^{a,b}, R. Arcidiacono^{a,c,14}, S. Argiro^{a,b}, M. Arneodo^{a,c}, N. Bartosik^a, R. Bellan^{a,b}, C. Biino^a, N. Cartiglia^a, F. Cenna^{a,b}, M. Costa^{a,b}, R. Covarelli^{a,b}, A. Degano^{a,b}, N. Demaria^a, L. Finco^{a,b}, B. Kiani^{a,b}, C. Mariotti^a, S. Maselli^a, E. Migliore^{a,b}, V. Monaco^{a,b}, E. Monteil^{a,b}, M.M. Obertino^{a,b}, L. Pacher^{a,b}, N. Pastrone^a, M. Pelliccioni^a, G.L. Pinna Angioni^{a,b}, F. Ravera^{a,b}, A. Romero^{a,b}, M. Ruspa^{a,c}, R. Sacchi^{a,b}, K. Shchelina^{a,b}, V. Sola^a, A. Solano^{a,b}, A. Staiano^a, P. Traczyk^{a,b}

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

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

Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea

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

Chonbuk National University, Jeonju, Korea

A. Lee

Hanyang University, Seoul, Korea

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

Korea University, Seoul, Korea

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

Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea

J. Almond, J. Kim, S.B. Oh, S.h. Seo, U.K. Yang, H.D. Yoo, G.B. Yu

University of Seoul, Seoul, Korea

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

Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon, Korea

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

Vilnius University, Vilnius, Lithuania

V. Dudenas, A. Juodagalvis, J. Vaitkus

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

I. Ahmed, Z.A. Ibrahim, J.R. Komaragiri, M.A.B. Md Ali³², F. Mohamad Idris³³, W.A.T. Wan Abdullah, M.N. Yusli, Z. Zolkapli

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

H. Castilla-Valdez, E. De La Cruz-Burelo, I. Heredia-De La Cruz³⁴, A. Hernandez-Almada, R. Lopez-Fernandez, J. Mejia Guisao, A. Sanchez-Hernandez

Universidad Iberoamericana, Mexico City, Mexico

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

Benemerita Universidad Autonoma de Puebla, Puebla, Mexico

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

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

A. Morelos Pineda

University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

D. Krofcheck

University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand

P.H. Butler

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

A. Ahmad, M. Ahmad, Q. Hassan, H.R. Hoorani, W.A. Khan, S. Qazi, M.A. Shah, M. Waqas

National Centre for Nuclear Research, Swierk, Poland

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

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

K. Bunkowski, A. Byszuk³⁵, K. Doroba, A. Kalinowski, M. Konecki, J. Krolikowski, M. Misiura, M. Olszewski, M. Walczak

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

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

Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia

S. Afanasiev, P. Bunin, M. Gavrilenko, I. Golutvin, I. Gorbunov, A. Kamenev, V. Karjavin, A. Lanev, A. Malakhov, V. Matveev^{36,37}, P. Moisezenz, V. Palichik, V. Perelygin, S. Shmatov, S. Shulha, N. Skatchkov, V. Smirnov, N. Voytishin, A. Zarubin

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

L. Chtchipoounov, V. Golovtsov, Y. Ivanov, V. Kim³⁸, E. Kuznetsova³⁹, V. Murzin, V. Oreshkin, V. Sulimov, A. Vorobyev

Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia

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

Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia

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

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

R. Chistov⁴⁰, V. Rusinov, E. Tarkovskii

P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia

V. Andreev, M. Azarkin³⁷, I. Dremin³⁷, M. Kirakosyan, A. Leonidov³⁷, S.V. Rusakov, A. Terkulov

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

A. Baskakov, A. Belyaev, E. Boos, V. Bunichev, M. Dubinin⁴¹, L. Dudko, A. Ershov, A. Gribushin, V. Klyukhin, O. Kodolova, I. Lokhtin, I. Miagkov, S. Obraztsov, S. Petrushanko, V. Savrin

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

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

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

P. Adzic⁴², P. Cirkovic, D. Devetak, J. Milosevic, V. Rekovic

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

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

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain

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

Universidad de Oviedo, Oviedo, Spain

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

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

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

CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland

D. Abbaneo, E. Auffray, G. Auzinger, M. Bachtis, P. Baillon, A.H. Ball, D. Barney, P. Bloch, A. Bocci, A. Bonato, C. Botta, T. Camporesi, R. Castello, M. Cepeda, G. Cerminara, M. D'Alfonso, D. d'Enterria, A. Dabrowski, V. Daponte, A. David, M. De Gruttola, F. De Guio, A. De Roeck, E. Di Marco⁴³, M. Dobson, M. Dordevic, B. Dorney, T. du Pree, D. Duggan, M. Dünser, N. Dupont, A. Elliott-Peisert, S. Fartoukh, G. Franzoni, J. Fulcher, W. Funk, D. Gigi, K. Gill, M. Girone, F. Glege, D. Gulhan, S. Gundacker, M. Guthoff, J. Hammer, P. Harris, J. Hegeman, V. Innocente, P. Janot, H. Kirschenmann, V. Knünz, A. Kornmayer¹⁴, M.J. Kortelainen, K. Kousouris, M. Krammer¹, P. Lecoq, C. Lourenço, M.T. Lucchini, L. Malgeri, M. Mannelli, A. Martelli, F. Meijers, S. Mersi, E. Meschi, F. Moortgat, S. Morovic, M. Mulders, H. Neugebauer, S. Orfanelli⁴⁴, L. Orsini, L. Pape, E. Perez, M. Peruzzi, A. Petrilli, G. Petrucciani, A. Pfeiffer, M. Pierini, A. Racz, T. Reis, G. Rolandi⁴⁵, M. Rovere, M. Ruan, H. Sakulin, J.B. Sauvan, C. Schäfer, C. Schwick, M. Seidel, A. Sharma, P. Silva, M. Simon, P. Sphicas⁴⁶, J. Steggemann, M. Stoye, Y. Takahashi, M. Tosi, D. Treille, A. Triossi, A. Tsiros, V. Veckalns⁴⁷, G.I. Veres²¹, N. Wardle, A. Zagozdinska³⁵, W.D. Zeuner

Paul Scherrer Institut, Villigen, Switzerland

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

Institute for Particle Physics, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

F. Bachmair, L. Bäni, L. Bianchini, B. Casal, G. Dissertori, M. Dittmar, M. Donegà, P. Eller, C. Grab, C. Heidegger, D. Hits, J. Hoss, G. Kasieczka, P. Lecomte[†], W. Lustermann, B. Mangano, M. Marionneau, P. Martinez Ruiz del Arbol, M. Masciovecchio, M.T. Meinhard, D. Meister, F. Micheli, P. Musella, F. Nessi-Tedaldi, F. Pandolfi, J. Pata, F. Pauss, G. Perrin, L. Perrozzi, M. Quittnat, M. Rossini, M. Schönenberger, A. Starodumov⁴⁸, M. Takahashi, V.R. Tavolaro, K. Theofilatos, R. Wallny

Universität Zürich, Zurich, Switzerland

T.K. Aarrestad, C. AMSler⁴⁹, L. Caminada, M.F. Canelli, V. Chiochia, A. De Cosa, C. Galloni, A. Hinzmann, T. Hreus, B. Kilminster, C. Lange, J. Ngadiuba, D. Pinna, G. Rauco, P. Robmann, D. Salerno, Y. Yang

National Central University, Chung-Li, Taiwan

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

National Taiwan University (NTU), Taipei, Taiwan

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

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

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

Cukurova University, Adana, Turkey

A. Adiguzel, M.N. Bakirci⁵⁰, S. Damarseckin, Z.S. Demiroglu, C. Dozen, E. Eskut, S. Girgis, G. Gokbulut, Y. Guler, E. Gurpinar, I. Hos, E.E. Kangal⁵¹, O. Kara, U. Kiminsu, M. Oglakci, G. Onengut⁵², K. Ozdemir⁵³, S. Ozturk⁵⁰, A. Polatoz, D. Sunar Cerci⁵⁴, S. Turkcapar, I.S. Zorbakir, C. Zorbilmez

Middle East Technical University, Physics Department, Ankara, Turkey

B. Bilin, S. Bilmis, B. Isildak⁵⁵, G. Karapinar⁵⁶, M. Yalvac, M. Zeyrek

Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey

E. Gülmez, M. Kaya⁵⁷, O. Kaya⁵⁸, E.A. Yetkin⁵⁹, T. Yetkin⁶⁰

Istanbul Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey

A. Cakir, K. Cankocak, S. Sen⁶¹

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

B. Grynyov

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

L. Levchuk, P. Sorokin

University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom

R. Aggleton, F. Ball, L. Beck, J.J. Brooke, D. Burns, E. Clement, D. Cussans, H. Flacher, J. Goldstein, M. Grimes, G.P. Heath, H.F. Heath, J. Jacob, L. Kreczko, C. Lucas, D.M. Newbold⁶², S. Paramesvaran, A. Poll, T. Sakuma, S. Seif El Nasr-storey, D. Smith, V.J. Smith

Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom

K.W. Bell, A. Belyaev⁶³, C. Brew, R.M. Brown, L. Calligaris, D. Cieri, D.J.A. Cockerill, J.A. Coughlan, K. Harder, S. Harper, E. Olaiya, D. Petyt, C.H. Shepherd-Themistocleous, A. Thea, I.R. Tomalin, T. Williams

Imperial College, London, United Kingdom

M. Baber, R. Bainbridge, O. Buchmuller, A. Bundock, D. Burton, S. Casasso, M. Citron, D. Colling, L. Corpe, P. Dauncey, G. Davies, A. De Wit, M. Della Negra, P. Dunne, A. Elwood, D. Futyan, Y. Haddad, G. Hall, G. Iles, R. Lane, C. Laner, R. Lucas⁶², L. Lyons, A.-M. Magnan, S. Malik, L. Mastrolorenzo, J. Nash, A. Nikitenko⁴⁸, J. Pela, B. Penning, M. Pesaresi, D.M. Raymond, A. Richards, A. Rose, C. Seez, A. Tapper, K. Uchida, M. Vazquez Acosta⁶⁴, T. Virdee¹⁴, S.C. Zenz

Brunel University, Uxbridge, United Kingdom

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

Baylor University, Waco, USA

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

The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, USA

O. Charaf, S.I. Cooper, C. Henderson, P. Rumerio

Boston University, Boston, USA

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

Brown University, Providence, USA

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

University of California, Davis, Davis, USA

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

University of California, Los Angeles, USA

R. Cousins, P. Everaerts, A. Florent, J. Hauser, M. Ignatenko, D. Saltzberg, E. Takasugi, V. Valuev, M. Weber

University of California, Riverside, Riverside, USA

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

University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, USA

J.G. Branson, G.B. Cerati, S. Cittolin, M. Derdzinski, R. Gerosa, A. Holzner, D. Klein, J. Letts, I. Macneill, D. Olivito, S. Padhi, M. Pieri, M. Sani, V. Sharma, S. Simon, M. Tadel, A. Vartak, S. Wasserbaech⁶⁵, C. Welke, J. Wood, F. Würthwein, A. Yagil, G. Zevi Della Porta

University of California, Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, USA

R. Bhandari, J. Bradmiller-Feld, C. Campagnari, A. Dishaw, V. Dutta, K. Flowers, M. Franco Sevilla, P. Geffert, C. George, F. Golf, L. Gouskos, J. Gran, R. Heller, J. Incandela, N. Mccoll, S.D. Mullin, A. Ovcharova, J. Richman, D. Stuart, I. Suarez, C. West, J. Yoo

California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA

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

Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, USA

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

University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, USA

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

Cornell University, Ithaca, USA

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

Fairfield University, Fairfield, USA

D. Winn

Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, USA

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

S. Stoynev, N. Strobbe, L. Taylor, S. Tkaczyk, N.V. Tran, L. Uplegger, E.W. Vaandering, C. Vernieri, M. Verzocchi, R. Vidal, M. Wang, H.A. Weber, A. Whitbeck

University of Florida, Gainesville, USA

D. Acosta, P. Avery, P. Bortignon, D. Bourilkov, A. Brinkerhoff, A. Carnes, M. Carver, D. Curry, S. Das, R.D. Field, I.K. Furic, J. Konigsberg, A. Korytov, P. Ma, K. Matchev, H. Mei, P. Milenovic⁶⁶, G. Mitselmakher, D. Rank, L. Shchutska, D. Sperka, L. Thomas, J. Wang, S. Wang, J. Yelton

Florida International University, Miami, USA

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

Florida State University, Tallahassee, USA

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

Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, USA

M.M. Baarmand, V. Bhopatkar, S. Colafranceschi⁶⁷, M. Hohlmann, D. Noonan, T. Roy, F. Yumiceva

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

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

The University of Iowa, Iowa City, USA

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

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA

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

The University of Kansas, Lawrence, USA

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

Kansas State University, Manhattan, USA

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

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, USA

D. Lange, F. Rebassoo, D. Wright

University of Maryland, College Park, USA

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

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, USA

D. Abercrombie, B. Allen, A. Apyan, R. Barbieri, A. Baty, R. Bi, K. Bierwagen, S. Brandt, W. Busza, I.A. Cali, Z. Demiragli, L. Di Matteo, G. Gomez Ceballos, M. Goncharov, D. Hsu, Y. Iiyama, G.M. Innocenti, M. Klute, D. Kovalskyi, K. Krajczar, Y.S. Lai, Y.-J. Lee, A. Levin,

P.D. Luckey, A.C. Marini, C. McGinn, C. Mironov, S. Narayanan, X. Niu, C. Paus, C. Roland, G. Roland, J. Salfeld-Nebgen, G.S.F. Stephans, K. Sumorok, K. Tatar, M. Varma, D. Velicanu, J. Veverka, J. Wang, T.W. Wang, B. Wyslouch, M. Yang, V. Zhukova

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, USA

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

University of Mississippi, Oxford, USA

J.G. Acosta, S. Oliveros

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, USA

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

State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, USA

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

Northeastern University, Boston, USA

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

Northwestern University, Evanston, USA

S. Bhattacharya, K.A. Hahn, A. Kubik, J.F. Low, N. Mucia, N. Odell, B. Pollack, M.H. Schmitt, K. Sung, M. Trovato, M. Velasco

University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, USA

N. Dev, M. Hildreth, K. Hurtado Anampa, C. Jessop, D.J. Karmgard, N. Kellams, K. Lannon, N. Marinelli, F. Meng, C. Mueller, Y. Musienko³⁶, M. Planer, A. Reinsvold, R. Ruchti, G. Smith, S. Taroni, N. Valls, M. Wayne, M. Wolf, A. Woodard

The Ohio State University, Columbus, USA

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

Princeton University, Princeton, USA

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

University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez, USA

S. Malik

Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA

A. Barker, V.E. Barnes, D. Benedetti, S. Folgueras, L. Gutay, M.K. Jha, M. Jones, A.W. Jung, K. Jung, D.H. Miller, N. Neumeister, B.C. Radburn-Smith, X. Shi, J. Sun, A. Svyatkovskiy, F. Wang, W. Xie, L. Xu

Purdue University Calumet, Hammond, USA

N. Parashar, J. Stupak

Rice University, Houston, USA

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

University of Rochester, Rochester, USA

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

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

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

University of Tennessee, Knoxville, USA

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

Texas A&M University, College Station, USA

O. Bouhali⁷¹, A. Celik, M. Dalchenko, M. De Mattia, A. Delgado, S. Dildick, R. Eusebi, J. Gilmore, T. Huang, E. Jaska, T. Kamon⁷², V. Krutelyov, R. Mueller, Y. Pakhotin, R. Patel, A. Perloff, L. Perniè, D. Rathjens, A. Rose, A. Safonov, A. Tatarinov, K.A. Ulmer

Texas Tech University, Lubbock, USA

N. Akchurin, C. Cowden, J. Damgov, C. Dragoiu, P.R. Dundero, J. Faulkner, S. Kunori, K. Lamichhane, S.W. Lee, T. Libeiro, S. Undleeb, I. Volobouev, Z. Wang

Vanderbilt University, Nashville, USA

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

University of Virginia, Charlottesville, USA

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

Wayne State University, Detroit, USA

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

University of Wisconsin - Madison, Madison, WI, USA

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

†: Deceased

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

2: Also at State Key Laboratory of Nuclear Physics and Technology, Peking University, Beijing, China

3: Also at Institut Pluridisciplinaire Hubert Curien, Université de Strasbourg, Université de Haute Alsace Mulhouse, CNRS/IN2P3, Strasbourg, France

4: Also at Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, Brazil

5: Also at Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium

6: Also at Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Hamburg, Germany

7: Also at Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia

8: Also at Suez University, Suez, Egypt

9: Now at British University in Egypt, Cairo, Egypt

10: Also at Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt

11: Also at Cairo University, Cairo, Egypt

12: Now at Helwan University, Cairo, Egypt

13: Also at Université de Haute Alsace, Mulhouse, France

-
- 14: Also at CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland
 - 15: Also at Skobeltsyn Institute of Nuclear Physics, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia
 - 16: Also at Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia
 - 17: Also at RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut A, Aachen, Germany
 - 18: Also at University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany
 - 19: Also at Brandenburg University of Technology, Cottbus, Germany
 - 20: Also at Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary
 - 21: Also at MTA-ELTE Lendület CMS Particle and Nuclear Physics Group, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary
 - 22: Also at University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary
 - 23: Also at Indian Institute of Science Education and Research, Bhopal, India
 - 24: Also at Institute of Physics, Bhubaneswar, India
 - 25: Also at University of Visva-Bharati, Santiniketan, India
 - 26: Also at University of Ruhuna, Matara, Sri Lanka
 - 27: Also at Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, Iran
 - 28: Also at University of Tehran, Department of Engineering Science, Tehran, Iran
 - 29: Also at Plasma Physics Research Center, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
 - 30: Also at Università degli Studi di Siena, Siena, Italy
 - 31: Also at Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA
 - 32: Also at International Islamic University of Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
 - 33: Also at Malaysian Nuclear Agency, MOSTI, Kajang, Malaysia
 - 34: Also at Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología, Mexico city, Mexico
 - 35: Also at Warsaw University of Technology, Institute of Electronic Systems, Warsaw, Poland
 - 36: Also at Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia
 - 37: Now at National Research Nuclear University 'Moscow Engineering Physics Institute' (MEPhI), Moscow, Russia
 - 38: Also at St. Petersburg State Polytechnical University, St. Petersburg, Russia
 - 39: Also at University of Florida, Gainesville, USA
 - 40: Also at P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia
 - 41: Also at California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA
 - 42: Also at Faculty of Physics, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia
 - 43: Also at INFN Sezione di Roma; Università di Roma, Roma, Italy
 - 44: Also at National Technical University of Athens, Athens, Greece
 - 45: Also at Scuola Normale e Sezione dell'INFN, Pisa, Italy
 - 46: Also at National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece
 - 47: Also at Riga Technical University, Riga, Latvia
 - 48: Also at Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia
 - 49: Also at Albert Einstein Center for Fundamental Physics, Bern, Switzerland
 - 50: Also at Gaziosmanpasa University, Tokat, Turkey
 - 51: Also at Mersin University, Mersin, Turkey
 - 52: Also at Cag University, Mersin, Turkey
 - 53: Also at Piri Reis University, Istanbul, Turkey
 - 54: Also at Adiyaman University, Adiyaman, Turkey
 - 55: Also at Ozyegin University, Istanbul, Turkey
 - 56: Also at Izmir Institute of Technology, Izmir, Turkey
 - 57: Also at Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey
 - 58: Also at Kafkas University, Kars, Turkey

- 59: Also at Istanbul Bilgi University, Istanbul, Turkey
- 60: Also at Yildiz Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey
- 61: Also at Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey
- 62: Also at Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom
- 63: Also at School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southampton, Southampton, United Kingdom
- 64: Also at Instituto de Astrofísica de Canarias, La Laguna, Spain
- 65: Also at Utah Valley University, Orem, USA
- 66: Also at University of Belgrade, Faculty of Physics and Vinca Institute of Nuclear Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia
- 67: Also at Facoltà Ingegneria, Università di Roma, Roma, Italy
- 68: Also at Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, USA
- 69: Also at Erzincan University, Erzincan, Turkey
- 70: Also at Mimar Sinan University, Istanbul, Istanbul, Turkey
- 71: Also at Texas A&M University at Qatar, Doha, Qatar
- 72: Also at Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea