

CERN-EP-2018-278
2018/11/27

CMS-EXO-17-015

Search for dark matter in events with a leptoquark and missing transverse momentum in proton-proton collisions at 13 TeV

The CMS Collaboration*

Abstract

A search is presented for dark matter in proton-proton collisions at a center-of-mass energy of $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV using events with at least one high transverse momentum (p_T) muon, at least one high- p_T jet, and large missing transverse momentum. The data were collected with the CMS detector at the CERN LHC in 2016 and 2017, and correspond to an integrated luminosity of 77.4 fb^{-1} . In the examined scenario, a pair of scalar leptoquarks is assumed to be produced. One leptoquark decays to a muon and a jet while the other decays to dark matter and low- p_T standard model particles. The signature for signal events would be significant missing transverse momentum from the dark matter in conjunction with a peak at the leptoquark mass in the invariant mass distribution of the highest p_T muon and jet. The data are observed to be consistent with the background predicted by the standard model. For a first benchmark scenario, dark matter masses up to 430 GeV are excluded for leptoquark masses $m_{LQ} \approx 1000$ GeV, and up to 300 GeV for $m_{LQ} \approx 1170$ GeV. For a second benchmark scenario, dark matter masses up to around 480 GeV are excluded for $m_{LQ} \approx 1100$ GeV.

Submitted to Physics Letters B

1 Introduction

Dark matter (DM) has been a subject of intense interest for decades. Extensive astrophysical evidence for DM exists [1–3], such as from observations of the dynamics of galaxy clusters and measurements of anisotropies in the cosmic microwave background. Nonetheless, the nature of DM remains unknown and it has not been observed outside the astrophysical context. Its relic density is determined to be $\Omega_{\text{DM}} = (0.1186 \pm 0.0020)/h^2$ [4, 5], where h is the Hubble constant.

Dark matter could potentially be created in high-energy proton-proton (pp) collisions, such as at the CERN LHC. Because of its presumed weakly interacting nature, a DM particle produced at the LHC would escape unobserved, manifesting itself as missing transverse momentum $\vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}}$ in the reconstructed events. The most generic signal for DM at the LHC thus consists of an excess, relative to the standard model (SM) expectation, of events with sizable $\vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}}$ recoiling against a visible SM object such as a jet, a photon, or an electroweak boson. Such searches have been conducted at the LHC by the ATLAS and CMS Collaborations [6–11] but with no evidence, to date, for DM [12]. The absence of a signal in these generic searches suggests that alternative strategies should be pursued.

In this Letter, we present a search for DM at the LHC using a new approach, based on the coannihilation paradigm introduced in Ref. [13]. The data, corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 77.4 fb^{-1} of pp collisions, were collected by the CMS Collaboration in 2016 (35.9 fb^{-1}) and 2017 (41.5 fb^{-1}) at a center-of-mass energy of $\sqrt{s} = 13 \text{ TeV}$. The coannihilation process considered arises within a general class of simplified models in which a DM particle is either annihilated or produced in conjunction with a so-called coannihilation partner, denoted “X”. At the LHC, DM could thus be produced through a reaction like $M \rightarrow \text{DM} + X$, where M is a mediator representing either an SM or a beyond-the-SM particle. To be consistent with the observed value of Ω_{DM} , the fractional mass difference $\Delta_{X,\text{DM}} \equiv (m_X - m_{\text{DM}})/m_{\text{DM}}$ between the X and DM particles should be less than ≈ 0.2 [13].

The considered coannihilation paradigm introduces many DM signatures that are not covered by current searches. Here, we consider the principal case-study scenario of Ref. [13], in which the mediator M is a scalar leptoquark (LQ) and the particle X is a new Dirac fermion. An LQ is a hypothetical color-triplet, fractionally charged boson that carries both lepton and baryon quantum numbers. Leptoquarks appear in many extensions of the SM, such as grand unification theories [14–17] and models with composite quarks and leptons [18]. To be consistent with experimental constraints on flavor changing neutral currents, we assume the LQ to couple to a single SM flavor generation only [19], taken to be the second generation for this study. We choose the second generation because muons provide a clear experimental signature. We further assume pair production of LQs, as is predominantly expected in pp collisions. In the examined scenario, one LQ decays to a muon and a charm (c) quark while the other decays, through the coannihilation paradigm, to DM and X . We assume that LQs can decay only through these two channels. The X particle subsequently decays through a crossed coannihilation process to a DM particle and an off-shell LQ, where the decay products of this latter particle, also a muon and a c quark, have low transverse momentum (p_T) because of the smallness of $\Delta_{X,\text{DM}}$ and are potentially undetected.

An example Feynman diagram is shown in Fig. 1. The final state consists of a high- p_T muon and a high- p_T jet from the decay of the on-shell LQ, $\vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}}$ from the DM particles, and low- p_T SM objects from the decay of the off-shell LQ. Note that, in the analysis, we do not employ c quark tagging criteria but rather—to improve the signal event selection efficiency—utilize generic untagged jets as the c quark jet candidates. The existence of the signal process is inferred by a




Figure 1: An example Feynman diagram for the signal process considered in this study, where g is a gluon, LQ a leptoquark, DM a dark matter particle, and X a new Dirac fermion. The superscript “*” indicates an off-shell particle.

peak at the LQ mass m_{LQ} , in the invariant mass $m_{\mu j}$ distribution of the high- p_T muon and jet, in conjunction with significant $\vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}}$ from the DM . This peak at the LQ mass provides a unique signature in the search for signal processes containing DM . In contrast, generic searches for DM , in which there are no new particles other than DM and intermediate mediator states, mostly rely on a mere enhancement in the tail of the $\vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}}$ distribution.

The most restrictive lower limit on the mass of a pair-produced second-generation LQ , assuming an LQ branching fraction $\mathcal{B}(LQ \rightarrow c\mu) = 100\%$, is currently 1530 GeV [20]. However, when the decay to DM and X is allowed, the $LQ \rightarrow c\mu$ branching fraction is reduced and the limit on m_{LQ} becomes weaker. The branching fraction then also depends on m_{DM} , $\Delta_{X,DM}$, and B_0 , where B_0 is defined as the $\mathcal{B}(LQ \rightarrow c\mu)$ in the limit of massless X and DM particles and is related to the LQ coupling strengths $y_{\ell q}$ (to the lepton and quark) and y_D (to the DM and X particles) with the following formula:

$$B_0 = \mathcal{B}(LQ \rightarrow c\mu)|_{m_{DM}=m_X=0} = \frac{y_{\ell q}^2}{y_{\ell q}^2 + 2y_D^2}. \quad (1)$$

Following Ref. [13], we set $y_D = 0.1$ and $\Delta_{X,DM} = 0.1$. We consider two values for B_0 : 0.5 and 0.1. Recasting the results of Ref. [20] in terms of the scenario of Fig. 1, and taking $m_{DM} = 300$ GeV as a representative value, the lower limit on a second-generation LQ is reduced to 1340 GeV for $B_0 = 0.5$ and to 960 GeV for $B_0 = 0.1$.

Again following Ref. [13], the DM particle is assumed to be a Majorana fermion with the gauge group structure $(1, 1, 0)$, where the numbers in parentheses indicate the color $SU(3)_C$, weak isospin $SU(2)_L$, and weak hypercharge $U(1)_Y$ multiplet dimensions, respectively. We use the convention $Q = T_3 + Y/2$ for the electric charge Q of the particle, with T_3 the third component of weak isospin and Y the weak hypercharge. The corresponding assignments for both the X and LQ particles are $(3, 2, 7/3)$. For the LQ , $T_3 = 1/2$ and $Q = 5/3$.

The principal SM backgrounds in this search arise from events with a W boson and jets (W +jets) or with a top quark-antiquark ($t\bar{t}$) pair: in both cases, the leptonic decay of a W boson can yield a high- p_T muon and neutrino, where the neutrino can lead to significant $\vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}}$. Events with single top quark or diboson (WW , WZ , and ZZ) production similarly can enter the background, al-

though at a lower level. Other smaller sources of SM background arise from quantum chromodynamics (QCD) events, namely events with a multijet final state produced exclusively through the strong interaction, and from events with a Z boson and jets (Z+jets). A QCD event can enter the background if a muon and a neutrino are produced through the semileptonic decay of a quark, or if a jet is erroneously identified as a muon in conjunction with spurious $\vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}}$ arising from the mismeasurement of jet p_T . Events with Z+jets production can enter the background if one of the leptons in $Z \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ decays is not reconstructed or lies outside the acceptance of the detector, leading to $\vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}}$, or if $\vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}}$ arises because of misreconstructed jet p_T .

2 The CMS detector and trigger

The central feature of the CMS detector 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 inner tracker, a lead tungstate crystal electromagnetic calorimeter, and a brass and scintillator hadron calorimeter, each composed of a barrel and two endcap sections. Extensive forward calorimetry complements the coverage provided by the barrel and endcap detectors. Muons are detected in gas-ionization chambers embedded in the steel flux-return yoke outside the solenoid. A detailed description of the CMS detector, together with a definition of the coordinate system and the relevant kinematic variables, is given in Ref. [21].

Events of interest are selected using a two-tiered trigger system [22]. The first level, composed of custom hardware processors, uses information from the calorimeters and muon detectors to select events at a rate of around 100 kHz. The second level, based on an array of microprocessors running a version of the full event reconstruction software optimized for fast processing, reduces the event rate to around 1 kHz before data storage. The set of triggers used for this analysis requires events to contain a muon with $p_T > 50$ GeV.

3 Event reconstruction and selection

Individual particles are reconstructed with the CMS particle-flow (PF) algorithm [23], which identifies them as charged hadrons, neutral hadrons, muons, electrons, or photons. Muon reconstruction is performed by matching a track segment reconstructed in the inner tracker with a track segment reconstructed in the muon detector and performing a global fit of the hits from the two track segments. The candidate muons are required to satisfy the tight selection criteria of Ref. [24], to pass within 2 mm of the primary event vertex in the direction along the beam axis and within 0.45 mm in the plane perpendicular to that axis, and to have $p_T > 60$ GeV and $|\eta| < 2.4$, where η is the pseudorapidity. Electrons are reconstructed by matching energy deposits in the electromagnetic calorimeter with track segments in the inner tracker [25] and are required to have $p_T > 15$ GeV and $|\eta| < 2.5$. Hadronically decaying τ leptons (τ_h) are reconstructed using the hadrons-plus-strips algorithm described in Ref. [26] and are required to have $p_T > 20$ GeV and $|\eta| < 2.3$. The electron and τ_h candidates are used to veto events, as described below, and are selected using loose [25, 26] identification criteria.

The primary event vertex is defined to be the reconstructed interaction vertex with the largest value of summed physics-object p_T^2 . The physics objects considered for this purpose are the jets found by clustering the charged-particle tracks assigned to the vertex, using the anti- k_T jet finding algorithm [27, 28] with a distance parameter 0.4, and the associated missing transverse momentum, taken as the negative of the vector p_T sum of those jets. The transverse momentum imbalance $\vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}}$ in an event is calculated as the negative of the vector p_T sum of all PF candidates. Its magnitude is denoted p_T^{miss} . Events are required to have $p_T^{\text{miss}} > 100$ GeV.

To suppress the contributions of muons that arise from hadron decays, muon candidates are subjected to an isolation requirement. The scalar p_T sum of charged hadron, neutral hadron, and photon PF candidates within a cone of radius $\Delta R \equiv \sqrt{(\Delta\eta)^2 + (\Delta\phi)^2} = 0.4$ around the muon direction, where ϕ is the azimuthal angle, is calculated. The expected contributions of neutral particles from additional pp interactions in the same or neighboring bunch crossings (pileup) are subtracted [29]. An isolation variable I is defined by dividing this sum by the muon p_T . The isolation requirement is $I < 0.15$. At least one isolated muon candidate is required to be present in the event.

The reconstruction of jets is performed by clustering PF candidates using the anti- k_T algorithm with a distance parameter of 0.4, excluding charged-particle tracks not associated with the primary vertex. The jet energies are corrected for the combined response function of the calorimeters [30] and to account for the expected contributions of neutral particles from pileup [29, 31]. Jets are required to appear within $|\eta| < 2.4$. Bottom (b) quark jets are identified (b tagged) from this sample using the combined secondary vertex (CSVv2) algorithm at the tight working point [32], which yields a b quark jet identification efficiency of approximately 60% and a misidentification probability for gluon and light-flavored quark jets of about 0.5%. Jets tagged as b jets are required to have $p_T > 30$ GeV.

The leading (highest p_T) jet in an event is required to have $p_T > 100$ GeV and to be separated by $\Delta R > 0.5$ from the leading muon candidate. The leading muon and leading jet are then combined to form the LQ candidate. Studies with simulated signal events establish that, for the values of model parameters used in the present study, this matching identifies the correct combination over 98% of the time.

To suppress background from $t\bar{t}$ production, events are rejected if they contain a b-tagged jet, an electron candidate, or a τ_h candidate. The veto on events with a b-tagged jet reduces the background from events with a top quark by more than a factor of 2 while reducing the signal efficiency by only around 10%. The vetoes on electron and τ_h candidates also suppress the W+jets and Z+jets background. The W+jets background is further suppressed by requiring the transverse mass m_T [33] formed from the p_T vector of the leading muon and $\vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}}$ to exceed 100 GeV. The Z+jets background is further reduced by eliminating events with a loosely identified and isolated ($I < 0.25$) muon candidate if that muon candidate has $p_T > 10$ GeV, an opposite charge to the leading muon, and forms a dimuon mass with the leading muon within 10 GeV of the Z boson mass.

Background from QCD events mostly arises when the p_T of one of the highest p_T jets is underestimated or when a hadron in a jet undergoes a semileptonic decay, introducing $\vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}}$ that is aligned with that jet. To suppress this background, the angular difference $\Delta\phi$ between the leading jet and $\vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}}$, and between the leading muon and $\vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}}$, is required to exceed 0.5.

The above requirements are referred to as the “preselection” criteria, and form the basis for the definition of several control regions used to evaluate background, as described in Section 5. The final selection criteria, corresponding to the signal region, are the same as the preselection criteria except for a more stringent requirement on m_T , $m_T > 500$ GeV. This condition is determined from optimization studies utilizing simulated signal and SM event samples. For $m_{\text{LQ}} > 800$ GeV, the signal efficiency for events satisfying the preselection criteria is around 73%, essentially independent of m_{LQ} . For the signal region criteria, the signal efficiency varies from 47 to 63% as m_{LQ} increases from 800 to 1500 GeV.

4 Event simulation

Monte Carlo (MC) simulation of signal and background processes is used to validate the analysis procedures, evaluate background, and determine the signal efficiency. Simulation of $t\bar{t}$ and single top quark events is performed at next-to-leading-order (NLO) accuracy with the POWHEG 2.0 [34–39] event generator. To describe W+jets and Z+jets production, the MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO 2.2.2 [40, 41] program at leading order (LO) is used. A K factor, calculated as described in Ref. [42], is applied as a function of boson p_T to account for next-to-NLO (NNLO) corrections. The statistical precision of our available MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO W+jets sample is low for off-shell W boson masses above around 100 GeV. Therefore, to describe W+jets production for W boson masses above 100 GeV, we use the LO PYTHIA 8.212 [43] program with the CUETP8M1 tune [44], rather than MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO, with a K factor to account for NNLO corrections applied as a function of the W boson mass. This K factor is determined using the FEWZ 3.1 [45, 46] program. Diboson production is simulated at NLO using a combination of the POWHEG [47] and MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO 2.2.2 generators.

Signal events are simulated at LO using MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO 2.2.2. The signal samples are generated for LQ and DM masses in the ranges $800 < m_{LQ} < 1500$ GeV and $300 < m_{DM} < 700$ GeV, respectively, with cross sections normalized to NLO [48, 49] accuracy.

For simulated samples at LO (NLO), the NNPDF3.0LO (NNPDF3.0NLO) [50] parton distribution functions (PDFs) are used. All samples are interfaced to PYTHIA 8.212 to describe parton showering and hadronization. Pileup interactions are modeled using simulated minimum bias event samples generated with PYTHIA, with the distribution of pp interactions per bunch crossing adjusted to reproduce the observed spectrum.

The response of the CMS detector is modeled, for both the signal and background samples, using the GEANT4 [51] suite of programs. Small differences between the data and simulation in the trigger, particle identification, and muon isolation efficiencies, and in the jet p_T resolution and p_T^{miss} , are accounted for through the application of scale factor corrections.

5 Background estimation

Background from $t\bar{t}$ production is evaluated from simulation, with the events reweighted to reproduce the observed distribution of the top quark p_T [52, 53]. The normalization is determined using a data-to-simulation scale factor derived from a $t\bar{t}$ -enhanced control sample. The control sample is defined using the preselection criteria of Section 3 except that events are required to contain at least one b-tagged jet. The purity of $t\bar{t}$ events in the control sample is estimated to be 85%. The remaining 15% of the sample is composed primarily of events with W+jets and single top quark production. The scale factor is defined as the ratio of the number of events in the control sample from data, after subtraction of the non- $t\bar{t}$ components, estimated from simulation, to the number in the corresponding simulated $t\bar{t}$ control sample scaled to the same integrated luminosity. The scale factor is found to be 0.95 ± 0.01 (stat) for the 2016 data and 1.16 ± 0.01 (stat) for the 2017 data and is essentially independent of the m_T selection requirement. The difference in the scale factors between 2016 and 2017 arises from changes in the running conditions, the reconstruction procedures, and the tuning of the simulation programs. Figure 2 (left) shows the distribution of $m_{\mu j}$ in the combined 2016+2017 $t\bar{t}$ control sample for data and simulation.

The systematic uncertainty in the scale factor is derived using an orthogonal $t\bar{t}$ -enhanced control sample, selected with the preselection criteria except that events must contain at least one




Figure 2: The $m_{\mu\mu}$ distributions in data and simulation for the (left) $t\bar{t}$ - and (right) W +jets-enriched control samples for the combined 2016 and 2017 data sets. The respective data-to-simulation normalization scale factors have been applied to the simulated distributions. The lower panels show the ratio of the observed to the simulated results. The vertical error bars on the data points are statistical. The gray band shows the total uncertainty in the background prediction, including both statistical and systematic terms.

electron candidate, in addition to the existing muon candidate, and the veto on the presence of a b -tagged jet is removed. The purity of $t\bar{t}$ events in this control sample is around 90%, with the remainder of the events arising primarily from single top quark production. The scale factor obtained is 0.85 ± 0.01 (stat) for the 2016 data and 1.00 ± 0.01 (stat) for the 2017 data. On the basis of these results, a systematic uncertainty of 10% is assigned to both the 2016 and 2017 scale factors discussed in the previous paragraph.

The background from W +jets production is similarly estimated from simulation, with a correction to the normalization obtained from a W +jets-dominated control sample. The control sample is defined using the preselection criteria except with the additional requirement $50 < m_T < 150$ GeV. The purity of W +jets events in this sample is about 80%. The main remaining contribution is from $t\bar{t}$ production. A data-to-simulation normalization scale factor is obtained by subtracting the non- W +jets contribution, estimated from simulation, from the control sample in data, and dividing the resulting number of events by the number of events in the simulated control region normalized to the same integrated luminosity. The scale factor is found to be 1.02 ± 0.01 (stat) and 1.11 ± 0.01 (stat) for the 2016 and 2017 data, respectively. The distribution of $m_{\mu\mu}$ in the combined 2016+2017 W +jets control sample, for data and simulation, is shown in Fig. 2 (right).

To evaluate a systematic uncertainty in the W +jets background prediction, we examine the level of agreement between the data and simulation for the normalization of the $m_{\mu\mu}$ distribution in a $Z(\rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-)$ +jets control sample for which one of the two muons in each event is removed to emulate a sample of W +jets events. This control sample is selected by requiring two oppositely charged isolated muons with $p_T > 30$ GeV, with a dimuon invariant mass between 80 and 100 GeV, but with otherwise similar selection criteria to those of the preselection. The Z boson candidate is boosted to its rest frame, the dimuon mass is scaled to the mass of the W boson, and the system is then boosted back to the original laboratory frame. One of the two

muons is randomly removed to simulate a neutrino from W boson decay. The resulting missing momentum is added to the $\vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}}$ of the event and the value of m_T recalculated before applying the signal region selection criteria. On the basis of the level of agreement in the resulting distribution of $m_{\mu j}$ between data and simulation, a 20% uncertainty is assigned to the W+jets background prediction. Additional checks are performed through comparison of the simulated and observed $m_{\mu j}$ distributions as the requirement on m_T is tightened. These checks validate the assignment of a 20% uncertainty, also for large values of the off-shell W boson mass.

The background from QCD processes is expected to be small. However, since the QCD background primarily arises as a consequence of jet mismeasurement, it is not well modeled by simulation. Thus, we evaluate the QCD background using a method based primarily on data. A control sample is defined using the signal region criteria of Section 3 except that muon candidates are required to fail the isolation condition. To estimate the QCD background in the signal region, the events in the control sample are weighted as a function of muon p_T by a muon misidentification probability, called the jet-to-muon misidentification rate, determined in a QCD-enriched event sample denoted the “low- $\Delta\phi$ ” sample. The low- $\Delta\phi$ sample is defined in the same manner as the signal region except the angle $\Delta\phi$ between $\vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}}$ and the leading jet is required to be $\Delta\phi < 0.5$ rather than $\Delta\phi > 0.5$ and we require $m_T > 100$ GeV rather than $m_T > 500$ GeV. The jet-to-muon misidentification rate is defined, from this sample, as the ratio of the number of events that satisfy the muon relative isolation criterion $I < 0.15$ to the number of events with no requirement on the isolation, after subtracting the non-QCD components, evaluated with simulation, from both the numerator and denominator. The purity of QCD events in the numerator is about 25%, while that in the denominator is approximately 70%. The jet-to-muon misidentification rate is parameterized in terms of the muon p_T using an analytical function and varies from 5% for muon $p_T = 60$ GeV to 50% for $p_T > 300$ GeV.

A 50% uncertainty is assigned to the QCD background prediction to account for the uncertainty in the jet-to-muon misidentification rate. This uncertainty primarily arises from the uncertainties in the normalization of the non-QCD processes subtracted from the numerator and denominator in calculating the misidentification rate. This uncertainty is sufficiently large to account for uncertainties from non-QCD background processes. Other sources of uncertainty, such as the choice of the analytic function used to parameterize the jet-to-muon misidentification rate, or the uncertainties in the values of the fit parameters, are negligible in comparison.

The backgrounds from events with diboson, single top quark, and Z+jets production are estimated from simulation. An uncertainty of 15% is assigned to the diboson background prediction based on the level of agreement between data and simulation in a diboson-enhanced control sample selected by requiring events to contain three leptons (e or μ), two of which are consistent with arising from Z boson decay. Uncertainties of 15 and 10% are assigned to the single top quark and Z+jets backgrounds, respectively, based on the results of Refs. [54] and [55].

6 Systematic uncertainties

We evaluate systematic uncertainties that affect the normalization or shape of the $m_{\mu j}$ spectrum, either in the signal or background predictions. Uncertainties specific to individual background components were presented in Section 5.

The uncertainty in the trigger efficiency is 5%. Those in the muon reconstruction and isolation efficiency [56], the electron reconstruction efficiency [56], and the τ_h reconstruction efficiency [57, 58] are 5, 2, and 2%, respectively. The uncertainty related to the b-tagging misiden-

tification is 1% [32]. The uncertainty in the pileup description in simulation is assessed by varying the total inelastic cross section by 4.6% [59], and is found to be 1%. Statistical uncertainties related to the limited number of events in the data control samples are accounted for as described in Ref. [60], while those related to the limited number of events in simulation are accounted for by allowing the content in each bin of the simulated distributions to vary within its statistical uncertainty. The uncertainty in the integrated luminosity is 2.5% [61] for the 2016 data and 2.3% [61] for the 2017 data. Uncertainties associated with the jet energy scale, the jet energy resolution, and p_T^{miss} are also evaluated [62, 63]. These uncertainties affect both the shape and normalization of the simulated signal and background distributions. Uncertainties related to the top quark p_T reweighting in simulated $t\bar{t}$ events are evaluated by varying the reweighting parameters between zero and twice their nominal values [52, 53].

Uncertainties related to the PDFs, evaluated for the signal acceptance, are determined following the PDF4LHC prescription [64] and are found to be 3%. Those related to the renormalization and factorization scales, evaluated for the signal yields and for the $t\bar{t}$ and W+jets backgrounds, are estimated by varying each scale independently, and also coherently, by a factor of 2.0 and 0.5. The largest upward and downward variations in the results are used to define an uncertainty envelope. The uncertainty associated with the method chosen to determine the K factor for the W+jets background evaluation is estimated to be 5%.

Table 1: Systematic uncertainties affecting the normalization of signal and background distributions.

Item	Relative uncertainty (%)
Trigger efficiency	5.0
Muon identification efficiency	5.0
Electron identification (veto) efficiency	2.0
τ_h lepton identification (veto) efficiency	2.0
b jet identification (veto) efficiency	1.0
Pileup modeling	1.0
Integrated luminosity	2.3–2.5
PDF	3.0
Renormalization and factorization scales	1.0

Table 1 summarizes the systematic uncertainties affecting the normalization of distributions.

7 Results

The observed distribution of $m_{\mu j}$ is presented in Fig. 3. The results are shown in comparison to the predictions for the SM background. For purposes of illustration, the predictions of two signal models with $m_{\text{LQ}} = 1000$ GeV and $m_{\text{DM}} = 400$ GeV are also shown: one with $B_0 = 0.5$ and the other with $B_0 = 0.1$. Numerical values are given in Table 2.

The data are found to be consistent with the SM predictions within the uncertainties. There is a small excess of events above the SM prediction in the $m_{\mu j}$ region between 1600 and 1900 GeV, consistent with a statistical fluctuation. This excess corresponds to a statistical significance of around 1.5 standard deviations. Thus, we do not obtain evidence for DM or LQ production.

A binned maximum likelihood fit is applied to the $m_{\mu j}$ distribution in the signal region. The fitted parameters are the yields of the individual background components listed in Table 2, the signal yield, and various nuisance parameters. The nuisance parameters are introduced to treat systematic uncertainties. Log-normal probability distributions are used for nuisance param-




Figure 3: The observed distribution of $m_{\mu j}$ in comparison to the post-fit SM background predictions for the combined 2016 and 2017 data sets. “Post-fit” means that the constraints from the maximum likelihood fit are incorporated. The unstacked predictions for two signal models with $m_{LQ} = 1000$ GeV and $m_{DM} = 400$ GeV are also shown: one with $B_0 = 0.5$ and the other with $B_0 = 0.1$. The ratio of the observed results to the total SM prediction is shown in the lower panel. The vertical error bars on the data points are statistical. The gray band shows the total uncertainty in the background prediction, including both statistical and systematic terms.

ters that affect the normalizations of the signal and background yields. Gaussian probability distributions are used for nuisance parameters that affect the shape of the $m_{\mu j}$ distribution. All uncertainties are assumed to be fully correlated across bins except those that are statistical in origin, which are assumed to be uncorrelated.

Upper limits at 95% confidence level (CL) are determined on the product of the signal production cross section and branching fraction. These limits are calculated using a modified frequentist approach with the CL_s criterion [65, 66] and an asymptotic approximation for the test statistic [67, 68]. The limits are determined as a function of m_{LQ} and m_{DM} .

Figure 4 (left) presents the results for $B_0 = 0.5$. The region to the right and below the diagonal line is where LQ decay to DM and X is allowed. The solid and dashed (black) curves show the observed and expected exclusion limits, respectively. Combinations of m_{LQ} and m_{DM} to the left and below the solid curve are excluded. The dotted (blue) curve shows the corresponding observed limits from the recast, mentioned in the Introduction, of the results from our search for pair produced second-generation LQs [20]. For the recasted results, the regions to the left and above the dotted curves are excluded. The results of the present analysis exclude the signal scenario of Fig. 1 for values of m_{DM} up to 430 GeV for $m_{LQ} \approx 1000$ GeV and up to 300 GeV for $m_{LQ} \approx 1170$ GeV. The recasted results from Ref. [20] are seen to be even more restrictive, excluding most of the m_{DM} – m_{LQ} combinations in Fig. 4 (left).

The results of the present analysis are of particular interest in the region of model parameter space corresponding to smaller values of B_0 . The results for $B_0 = 0.1$ are shown in Fig. 4 (right). In this case, the present analysis is more restrictive than the recast of Ref. [20] for DM masses in the range from 300 and 430 GeV. In this interval, the signal scenario of Fig. 1 is excluded for m_{LQ} values up to 1140 GeV. More generally, the maximum value of dark matter mass that can be excluded is 480 GeV, corresponding to an LQ mass of ≈ 1100 GeV.

Table 2: Observed number of events and post-fit SM background predictions for the combined 2016 and 2017 data sets. “Electroweak” refers to the sum of expected events from the single top quark, Z boson, and diboson background processes. The predictions for two signal models with $m_{LQ} = 1000$ GeV and $m_{DM} = 400$ GeV are also shown: one with $B_0 = 0.5$ and the other with $B_0 = 0.1$. The uncertainties represent the statistical and systematic terms added in quadrature.

Process	Events
W+jets	911 ± 55
$t\bar{t}$	185 ± 25
Electroweak	241 ± 26
QCD	63 ± 26
Total SM background	1401 ± 40
Signal; $B_0 = 0.5$, $m_{LQ} = 1000$ GeV, $m_{DM} = 400$ GeV	47.8 ± 4.1
Signal; $B_0 = 0.1$, $m_{LQ} = 1000$ GeV, $m_{DM} = 400$ GeV	97.5 ± 5.8
Observed	1390




Figure 4: Observed 95% CL upper limits on the product of cross section and branching fraction for the signal model of Fig. 1 assuming $\mathcal{B}(LQ \rightarrow c\mu)$ to be (left) 0.5 or (right) 0.1. The solid and dashed (black) curves show the observed and expected 95% CL exclusion curves. The dotted (blue) curve shows the corresponding observed limits from the recast of the results from a search for pair produced second-generation LQs [20].

Thus the main strength of the present analysis lies in the region of the model parameter space for which B_0 is small. For yet smaller values of B_0 , the results of the present analysis are expected to be yet more sensitive.

8 Summary

A search has been performed for dark matter in events containing a muon, a jet, and significant missing transverse momentum. The study is conducted using proton-proton collision data at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV recorded with the CMS detector, corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 77.4 fb^{-1} . It is assumed that dark matter is produced through the production of a leptoquark

pair, with one leptoquark decaying to a muon and a jet, and the other to dark matter and low- p_T standard model particles. The analysis is performed by searching for a peak in the leptoquark candidate invariant mass $m_{\mu j}$ distribution formed from the highest p_T muon and jet in an event, with the requirement of significant missing transverse momentum, as is expected from the presence of dark matter. The observation of such a peak in this novel search would provide strong evidence for the existence of both dark matter particles and leptoquarks. The data are observed to agree with the standard model background predictions within the uncertainties. Upper limits on the product of the cross section and branching fraction are obtained at 95% confidence level as a function of the leptoquark and dark matter particle masses. For the first benchmark scenario, dark matter masses up to 430 GeV are excluded for leptoquark masses $m_{LQ} \approx 1000$ GeV, and up to 300 GeV for $m_{LQ} \approx 1170$ GeV. For the second benchmark scenario, dark matter masses up to 480 GeV are excluded for $m_{LQ} \approx 1100$ GeV.

Acknowledgments

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

Individuals have received support from the Marie-Curie programme and the European Research Council and Horizon 2020 Grant, contract No. 675440 (European Union); the Leventis Foundation; the A. P. Sloan Foundation; the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation; the Belgian Federal Science Policy Office; the Fonds pour la Formation à la Recherche dans l'Industrie et dans l'Agriculture (FRIA-Belgium); the Agentschap voor Innovatie door Wetenschap en Technologie (IWT-Belgium); the F.R.S.-FNRS and FWO (Belgium) under the "Excellence of Science - EOS" - be.h project n. 30820817; the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (MEYS) of the Czech Republic; the Lendület ("Momentum") Programme and the János Bolyai Research Scholarship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, the New National Excellence Program ÚNKP, the NKFI research grants 123842, 123959, 124845, 124850 and 125105 (Hungary); the Council of Science and Industrial Research, India; the HOMING PLUS 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, the National Science Center (Poland), contracts Harmonia 2014/14/M/ST2/00428, Opus 2014/13/B/ST2/02543, 2014/15/B/ST2/03998, and 2015/19/B/ST2/02861, Sonata-bis 2012/07/E/ST2/01406; the

National Priorities Research Program by Qatar National Research Fund; the Programa Estatal de Fomento de la Investigación Científica y Técnica de Excelencia María de Maeztu, grant MDM-2015-0509 and the Programa Severo Ochoa del Principado de Asturias; the Thalís and Aristeia programmes cofinanced by EU-ESF and the Greek NSRF; the Rachadapisek Sompot Fund for Postdoctoral Fellowship, Chulalongkorn University and the Chulalongkorn Academic into Its 2nd Century Project Advancement Project (Thailand); the Welch Foundation, contract C-1845; and the Weston Havens Foundation (USA).

References

- [1] G. Bertone, D. Hooper, and J. Silk, “Particle dark matter: Evidence, candidates and constraints”, *Phys. Rept.* **405** (2005) 279, doi:10.1016/j.physrep.2004.08.031, arXiv:hep-ph/0404175.
- [2] J. L. Feng, “Dark matter candidates from particle physics and methods of detection”, *Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* **48** (2010) 495, doi:10.1146/annurev-astro-082708-101659, arXiv:1003.0904.
- [3] T. A. Porter, R. P. Johnson, and P. W. Graham, “Dark matter searches with astroparticle data”, *Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* **49** (2011) 155, doi:10.1146/annurev-astro-081710-102528, arXiv:1104.2836.
- [4] Particle Data Group, M. Tanabashi et al., “Review of particle physics”, *Phys. Rev. D* **98** (2018) 030001, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.98.030001.
- [5] Planck Collaboration, “Planck 2015 results. XIII. Cosmological parameters”, *Astron. Astrophys.* **594** (2016) A13, doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201525830, arXiv:1502.01589.
- [6] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for dark matter in events with a hadronically decaying W or Z boson and missing transverse momentum in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV with the ATLAS detector”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112** (2014) 041802, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.112.041802, arXiv:1309.4017.
- [7] CMS Collaboration, “Search for dark matter, extra dimensions, and unparticles in monojet events in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **75** (2015) 235, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-015-3451-4, arXiv:1408.3583.
- [8] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for new phenomena in final states with an energetic jet and large missing transverse momentum in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV with the ATLAS detector”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **75** (2015) 299, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-015-3517-3, arXiv:1502.01518. [Erratum: doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-015-3639-7].
- [9] CMS Collaboration, “Search for dark matter in proton-proton collisions at 8 TeV with missing transverse momentum and vector boson tagged jets”, *JHEP* **12** (2016) 083, doi:10.1007/JHEP12(2016)083, arXiv:1607.05764.
- [10] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for new phenomena in final states with an energetic jet and large missing transverse momentum in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV using the ATLAS detector”, *Phys. Rev. D* **94** (2016) 032005, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.94.032005, arXiv:1604.07773.

- [11] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for dark matter produced in association with a hadronically decaying vector boson in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector”, *Phys. Lett. B* **763** (2016) 251, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2016.10.042, arXiv:1608.02372.
- [12] B. Penning, “The pursuit of dark matter at colliders—an overview”, *J. Phys. G* **45** (2018) 063001, doi:10.1088/1361-6471/aabea7, arXiv:1712.01391.
- [13] M. J. Baker et al., “The coannihilation codex”, *JHEP* **12** (2015) 120, doi:10.1007/JHEP12(2015)120, arXiv:1510.03434.
- [14] J. C. Pati and A. Salam, “Unified lepton-hadron symmetry and a gauge theory of the basic interactions”, *Phys. Rev. D* **8** (1973) 1240, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.8.1240.
- [15] J. C. Pati and A. Salam, “Lepton number as the fourth color”, *Phys. Rev. D* **10** (1974) 275, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.10.275. [Erratum: doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.11.703.2].
- [16] H. Georgi and S. L. Glashow, “Unity of all elementary particle forces”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **32** (1974) 438, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.32.438.
- [17] H. Fritzsch and P. Minkowski, “Unified interactions of leptons and hadrons”, *Annals Phys.* **93** (1975) 193, doi:10.1016/0003-4916(75)90211-0.
- [18] B. Schrempp and F. Schrempp, “Light leptoquarks”, *Phys. Lett. B* **153** (1985) 101, doi:10.1016/0370-2693(85)91450-9.
- [19] I. Doršner et al., “Physics of leptoquarks in precision experiments and at particle colliders”, *Phys. Rept.* **641** (2016) 1, doi:10.1016/j.physrep.2016.06.001, arXiv:1603.04993.
- [20] CMS Collaboration, “Search for pair production of second-generation leptoquarks at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV”, (2018). arXiv:1808.05082. Submitted to *Phys. Rev. D*.
- [21] CMS Collaboration, “The CMS experiment at the CERN LHC”, *JINST* **3** (2008) S08004, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08004.
- [22] CMS Collaboration, “The CMS trigger system”, *JINST* **12** (2017) P01020, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/12/01/P01020, arXiv:1609.02366.
- [23] CMS Collaboration, “Particle-flow reconstruction and global event description with the CMS detector”, *JINST* **12** (2017) P10003, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/12/10/P10003, arXiv:1706.04965.
- [24] CMS Collaboration, “Performance of the CMS muon detector and muon reconstruction with proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV”, *JINST* **13** (2018) P06015, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/13/06/P06015, arXiv:1804.04528.
- [25] CMS Collaboration, “Performance of electron reconstruction and selection with the CMS detector in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV”, *JINST* **10** (2015) P06005, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/10/06/P06005, arXiv:1502.02701.
- [26] CMS Collaboration, “Performance of reconstruction and identification of τ leptons in their decays to hadrons and ν_τ in LHC Run-2”, CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-TAU-16-002, 2016.

-
- [27] 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.
- [28] 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.
- [29] M. Cacciari and G. P. Salam, “Pileup subtraction using jet areas”, *Phys. Lett. B* **659** (2008) 119, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2007.09.077, arXiv:0707.1378.
- [30] CMS Collaboration, “Jet energy scale and resolution in the CMS experiment in pp collisions at 8 TeV”, *JINST* **12** (2017) P02014, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/12/02/P02014, arXiv:1607.03663.
- [31] CMS Collaboration, “Pileup removal algorithms”, CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-JME-14-001, 2014.
- [32] CMS Collaboration, “Identification of heavy-flavour jets with the CMS detector in pp collisions at 13 TeV”, *JINST* **13** (2018) P05011, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/13/05/P05011, arXiv:1712.07158.
- [33] UA1 Collaboration, “Experimental observation of isolated large transverse energy electrons with associated missing energy at $\sqrt{s} = 540$ GeV”, *Phys. Lett. B* **122** (1983) 103, doi:10.1016/0370-2693(83)91177-2.
- [34] 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.
- [35] P. Nason, “A new method for combining NLO QCD with shower Monte Carlo algorithms”, *JHEP* **11** (2004) 040, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2004/11/040, arXiv:hep-ph/0409146.
- [36] 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.
- [37] S. Alioli, P. Nason, C. Oleari, and E. Re, “NLO single-top production matched with shower in POWHEG: s - and t -channel contributions”, *JHEP* **09** (2009) 111, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2009/09/111, arXiv:0907.4076. [Erratum: doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2010)011].
- [38] E. Re, “Single-top Wt -channel production matched with parton showers using the POWHEG method”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **71** (2011) 1547, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-011-1547-z, arXiv:1009.2450.
- [39] S. Frixione, P. Nason, and G. Ridolfi, “A positive-weight next-to-leading-order Monte Carlo for heavy flavour hadroproduction”, *JHEP* **09** (2007) 126, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2007/09/126, arXiv:0707.3088.
- [40] 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.

- [41] J. Alwall et al., “Comparative study of various algorithms for the merging of parton showers and matrix elements in hadronic collisions”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **53** (2008) 473, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-007-0490-5, arXiv:0706.2569.
- [42] CMS Collaboration, “Search for new physics in final states with an energetic jet or a hadronically decaying W or Z boson and transverse momentum imbalance at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV”, *Phys. Rev. D* **97** (2018) 092005, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.97.092005, arXiv:1712.02345.
- [43] T. Sjöstrand et al., “An introduction to PYTHIA 8.2”, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **191** (2015) 159, doi:10.1016/j.cpc.2015.01.024, arXiv:1410.3012.
- [44] CMS Collaboration, “Event generator tunes obtained from underlying event and multiparton scattering measurements”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76** (2016) 155, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-3988-x, arXiv:1512.00815.
- [45] R. Gavin, Y. Li, F. Petriello, and S. Quackenbush, “FEWZ 2.0: A code for hadronic Z production at next-to-next-to-leading order”, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **182** (2011) 2388, doi:10.1016/j.cpc.2011.06.008, arXiv:1011.3540.
- [46] Y. Li and F. Petriello, “Combining QCD and electroweak corrections to dilepton production in FEWZ”, *Phys. Rev. D* **86** (2012) 094034, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.86.094034, arXiv:1208.5967.
- [47] T. Melia, P. Nason, R. Rontsch, and G. Zanderighi, “ W^+W^- , WZ and ZZ production in the POWHEG BOX”, *JHEP* **11** (2011) 078, doi:10.1007/JHEP11(2011)078, arXiv:1107.5051.
- [48] M. Krämer, T. Plehn, M. Spira, and P. M. Zerwas, “Pair production of scalar leptoquarks at the CERN LHC”, *Phys. Rev. D* **71** (2005) 057503, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.71.057503, arXiv:hep-ph/0411038.
- [49] M. Krämer, T. Plehn, M. Spira, and P. M. Zerwas, “Pair production of scalar leptoquarks at the Tevatron”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79** (1997) 341, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.79.341, arXiv:hep-ph/9704322.
- [50] NNPDF Collaboration, “Parton distributions for the LHC Run II”, *JHEP* **04** (2015) 040, doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2015)040, arXiv:1410.8849.
- [51] GEANT4 Collaboration, “GEANT4—a simulation toolkit”, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **506** (2003) 250, doi:10.1016/S0168-9002(03)01368-8.
- [52] CMS Collaboration, “Measurement of the differential cross section for top quark pair production in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **75** (2015) 542, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-015-3709-x, arXiv:1505.04480.
- [53] CMS Collaboration, “Measurement of differential top-quark pair production cross sections in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **73** (2013) 2339, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-013-2339-4, arXiv:1211.2220.
- [54] CMS Collaboration, “Cross section measurement of t -channel single top quark production in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV”, *Phys. Lett. B* **772** (2017) 752, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2017.07.047, arXiv:1610.00678.

-
- [55] CMS Collaboration, “Measurement of differential cross sections for Z boson production in association with jets in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV”, (2018).
arXiv:1804.05252. Submitted to *Eur. Phys. J. C*.
- [56] CMS Collaboration, “Measurement of the inclusive W and Z production cross sections in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV with the CMS experiment”, *JHEP* **10** (2011) 132,
doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2011)132, arXiv:1107.4789.
- [57] CMS Collaboration, “Performance of tau-lepton reconstruction and identification in CMS”, *JINST* **7** (2012) P01001, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/7/01/P01001,
arXiv:1109.6034.
- [58] CMS Collaboration, “Reconstruction and identification of τ lepton decays to hadrons and ν_τ at CMS”, *JINST* **11** (2016) P01019, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/11/01/P01019,
arXiv:1510.07488.
- [59] CMS Collaboration, “Measurement of the inelastic proton-proton cross section at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV”, *JHEP* **07** (2018) 161, doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2018)161, arXiv:1802.02613.
- [60] R. Barlow and C. Beeston, “Fitting using finite Monte Carlo samples”, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **77** (1993) 219, doi:10.1016/0010-4655(93)90005-W.
- [61] CMS Collaboration, “CMS luminosity measurements for the 2016 data taking period”, CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-LUM-17-001, 2017.
- [62] CMS Collaboration, “Jet algorithms performance in 13 TeV data”, CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-JME-16-003, 2017.
- [63] CMS Collaboration, “Performance of missing energy reconstruction in 13 TeV pp collision data using the CMS detector”, CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-JME-16-004, 2016.
- [64] J. Butterworth et al., “PDF4LHC recommendations for LHC Run II”, *J. Phys. G* **43** (2016) 023001, doi:10.1088/0954-3899/43/2/023001, arXiv:1510.03865.
- [65] T. Junk, “Confidence level computation for combining searches with small statistics”, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **434** (1999) 435, doi:10.1016/S0168-9002(99)00498-2,
arXiv:hep-ex/9902006.
- [66] A. L. Read, “Presentation of search results: the CL_s technique”, *J. Phys. G* **28** (2002) 2693,
doi:10.1088/0954-3899/28/10/313.
- [67] G. Cowan, K. Cranmer, E. Gross, and O. Vitells, “Asymptotic formulae for likelihood-based tests of new physics”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **71** (2011) 1554,
doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-011-1554-0, arXiv:1007.1727. [Erratum:
doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-013-2501-z].
- [68] The ATLAS Collaboration, The CMS Collaboration, The LHC Higgs Combination Group, “Procedure for the LHC Higgs boson search combination in Summer 2011”, Technical Report CMS-NOTE-2011-005, ATL-PHYS-PUB-2011-11, 2011.

A The CMS Collaboration

Yerevan Physics Institute, Yerevan, Armenia

A.M. Sirunyan, A. Tumasyan

Institut für Hochenergiephysik, Wien, Austria

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

Institute for Nuclear Problems, Minsk, Belarus

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

Universiteit Antwerpen, Antwerpen, Belgium

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

Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussel, Belgium

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

Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium

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

Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

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

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

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

Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Fisicas, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

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

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

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

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

S. Ahuja^a, C.A. Bernardes^a, L. Calligaris^a, T.R. Fernandez Perez Tomei^a, E.M. Gregores^b, P.G. Mercadante^b, S.F. Novaes^a, SandraS. Padula^a

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

Bulgaria

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

University of Sofia, Sofia, Bulgaria

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

Beihang University, Beijing, China

W. Fang⁵, X. Gao⁵, L. Yuan

Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing, China

M. Ahmad, J.G. Bian, G.M. Chen, H.S. Chen, M. Chen, Y. Chen, C.H. Jiang, D. Leggat, H. Liao, Z. Liu, F. Romeo, S.M. Shaheen⁶, A. Spiezia, J. Tao, Z. Wang, E. Yazgan, H. Zhang, S. Zhang⁶, J. Zhao

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

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

Tsinghua University, Beijing, China

Y. Wang

Universidad de Los Andes, Bogota, Colombia

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

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

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

University of Split, Faculty of Science, Split, Croatia

Z. Antunovic, M. Kovac

Institute Rudjer Boskovic, Zagreb, Croatia

V. Brigljevic, D. Ferencek, K. Kadija, B. Mesic, A. Starodumov⁷, T. Susa

University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus

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

Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

M. Finger⁸, M. Finger Jr.⁸

Escuela Politecnica Nacional, Quito, Ecuador

E. Ayala

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

H. Abdalla⁹, A.A. Abdelalim^{10,11}, S. Elgammal¹²

National Institute of Chemical Physics and Biophysics, Tallinn, Estonia

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

Department of Physics, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

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

Helsinki Institute of Physics, Helsinki, Finland

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

Lappeenranta University of Technology, Lappeenranta, Finland

T. Tuuva

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

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

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

A. Abdulsalam¹³, C. Amendola, I. Antropov, F. Beaudette, P. Busson, C. Charlot, R. Granier de Cassagnac, I. Kucher, A. Lobanov, J. Martin Blanco, C. Martin Perez, M. Nguyen, C. Ochando, G. Ortona, P. Paganini, P. Pigard, J. Rembser, R. Salerno, J.B. Sauvan, Y. Sirois, A.G. Stahl Leiton, A. Zabi, A. Zghiche

Université de Strasbourg, CNRS, IPHC UMR 7178, Strasbourg, France

J.-L. Agram¹⁴, J. Andrea, D. Bloch, J.-M. Brom, E.C. Chabert, V. Cherepanov, C. Collard, E. Conte¹⁴, J.-C. Fontaine¹⁴, D. Gelé, U. Goerlach, M. Jansová, A.-C. Le Bihan, N. Tonon, P. Van Hove

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

S. Gadrat

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

S. Beauceron, C. Bernet, G. Boudoul, N. Chanon, R. Chierici, D. Contardo, P. Depasse, H. El Mamouni, J. Fay, L. Finco, S. Gascon, M. Gouzevitch, G. Grenier, B. Ille, F. Lagarde, I.B. Laktineh, H. Lattaüd, M. Lethuillier, L. Mirabito, S. Perries, A. Popov¹⁵, V. Sordini, G. Touquet, M. Vander Donckt, S. Viret

Georgian Technical University, Tbilisi, Georgia

T. Toriashvili¹⁶

Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia

Z. Tsamalaidze⁸

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

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

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

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

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

G. Flügge, O. Hlushchenko, T. Kress, T. Müller, A. Nehr Korn, A. Nowack, C. Pistone, O. Pooth, D. Roy, H. Sert, A. Stahl¹⁷

Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Hamburg, Germany

M. Aldaya Martin, T. Arndt, C. Asawatangtrakuldee, I. Babounikau, K. Beernaert, O. Behnke, U. Behrens, A. Bermúdez Martínez, D. Bertsche, A.A. Bin Anuar, K. Borras¹⁸, V. Botta, A. Campbell, P. Connor, C. Contreras-Campana, V. Danilov, A. De Wit, M.M. Defranchis, C. Diez Pardos, D. Domínguez Damiani, G. Eckerlin, T. Eichhorn, A. Elwood, E. Eren, E. Gallo¹⁹, A. Geiser, J.M. Grados Luyando, A. Grohsjean, M. Guthoff, M. Haranko, A. Harb, J. Hauk, H. Jung, M. Kasemann, J. Keaveney, C. Kleinwort, J. Knolle, D. Krücker, W. Lange, A. Lelek, T. Lenz, J. Leonard, K. Lipka, W. Lohmann²⁰, R. Mankel, I.-A. Melzer-Pellmann, A.B. Meyer, M. Meyer, M. Missiroli, G. Mittag, J. Mnich, V. Myronenko, S.K. Pflitsch, D. Pitzl, A. Raspereza, M. Savitskyi, P. Saxena, P. Schütze, C. Schwanenberger, R. Shevchenko, A. Singh, H. Tholen, O. Turkot, A. Vagnerini, G.P. Van Onsem, R. Walsh, Y. Wen, K. Wichmann, C. Wissing, O. Zenaiev

University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany

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

Karlsruher Institut fuer Technologie, Karlsruhe, Germany

M. Akbiyik, C. Barth, M. Baselga, S. Baur, E. Butz, R. Caspart, T. Chwalek, F. Colombo, W. De Boer, A. Dierlamm, K. El Morabit, N. Faltermann, B. Freund, M. Giffels, M.A. Harrendorf, F. Hartmann¹⁷, S.M. Heindl, U. Husemann, I. Katkov¹⁵, S. Kudella, S. Mitra, M.U. Mozer, Th. Müller, M. Musich, M. Plagge, G. Quast, K. Rabbertz, M. Schröder, I. Shvetsov, H.J. Simonis, R. Ulrich, S. Wayand, M. Weber, T. Weiler, C. Wöhrmann, R. Wolf

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

G. Anagnostou, G. Daskalakis, T. Gerasis, A. Kyriakis, D. Loukas, G. Paspalaki

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece

G. Karathanasis, P. Kontaxakis, A. Panagiotou, I. Papavergou, N. Saoulidou, E. Tziaferi, K. Vellidis

National Technical University of Athens, Athens, Greece

K. Kousouris, I. Papakrivopoulos, G. Tsipolitis

University of Ioánnina, Ioánnina, Greece

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

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

M. Bartók²¹, M. Csanad, N. Filipovic, P. Major, M.I. Nagy, G. Pasztor, O. Surányi, G.I. Veres

Wigner Research Centre for Physics, Budapest, Hungary

G. Bencze, C. Hajdu, D. Horvath²², Á. Hunyadi, F. Sikler, T.Á. Vámi, V. Veszpremi, G. Vesztergombi[†]

Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary

N. Beni, S. Czellar, J. Karancsi²¹, A. Makovec, J. Molnar, Z. Szillasi

Institute of Physics, University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary

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

Indian Institute of Science (IISc), Bangalore, India

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

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

S. Bahinipati²⁴, C. Kar, P. Mal, K. Mandal, A. Nayak²⁵, D.K. Sahoo²⁴, S.K. Swain

Panjab University, Chandigarh, India

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

University of Delhi, Delhi, India

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

Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, HBNI, Kolkata, India

R. Bhardwaj²⁶, M. Bharti²⁶, R. Bhattacharya, S. Bhattacharya, U. Bhawandeep²⁶, D. Bhowmik, S. Dey, S. Dutt²⁶, S. Dutta, S. Ghosh, K. Mondal, S. Nandan, A. Purohit, P.K. Rout, A. Roy, S. Roy Chowdhury, G. Saha, S. Sarkar, M. Sharan, B. Singh²⁶, S. Thakur²⁶

Indian Institute of Technology Madras, Madras, India

P.K. Behera

Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, Mumbai, India

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

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-A, Mumbai, India

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

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-B, Mumbai, India

S. Banerjee, S. Bhattacharya, S. Chatterjee, P. Das, M. Guchait, Sa. Jain, S. Karmakar, S. Kumar, M. Maity²⁷, G. Majumder, K. Mazumdar, N. Sahoo, T. Sarkar²⁷

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

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

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

S. Chenarani²⁸, E. Eskandari Tadavani, S.M. Etesami²⁸, M. Khakzad, M. Mohammadi Najafabadi, M. Naseri, 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}, A. Colaleo^a, D. Creanza^{a,c}, L. Cristella^{a,b}, N. De Filippis^{a,c}, M. De Palma^{a,b}, A. Di Florio^{a,b}, F. Errico^{a,b}, L. Fiore^a, A. Gelmi^{a,b}, G. Iaselli^{a,c}, M. Ince^{a,b}, S. Lezki^{a,b}, G. Maggi^{a,c}, M. Maggi^a, G. Miniello^{a,b}, S. My^{a,b}, S. Nuzzo^{a,b}, A. Pompili^{a,b}, G. Pugliese^{a,c}, R. Radogna^a, A. Ranieri^a, G. Selvaggi^{a,b}, A. Sharma^a, L. Silvestris^a, R. Venditti^a, P. Verwilligen^a, G. Zito^a

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

G. Abbiendi^a, C. Battilana^{a,b}, D. Bonacorsi^{a,b}, L. Borgonovi^{a,b}, S. Braibant-Giacomelli^{a,b}, R. Campanini^{a,b}, P. Capiluppi^{a,b}, A. Castro^{a,b}, F.R. Cavallo^a, S.S. Chhibra^{a,b}, C. Ciocca^a, G. Codispoti^{a,b}, M. Cuffiani^{a,b}, G.M. Dallavalle^a, F. Fabbri^a, A. Fanfani^{a,b}, E. Fontanesi, P. Giacomelli^a, C. Grandi^a, L. Guiducci^{a,b}, S. Lo Meo^a, S. Marcellini^a, G. Masetti^a, A. Montanari^a, F.L. Navarria^{a,b}, A. Perrotta^a, F. Primavera^{a,b,17}, A.M. Rossi^{a,b}, T. Rovelli^{a,b}, G.P. Siroli^{a,b}, N. Tosi^a

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

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

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

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

INFN Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, Frascati, Italy

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

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

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

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

A. Benaglia^a, A. Beschi^b, F. Brivio^{a,b}, V. Ciriolo^{a,b,17}, S. Di Guida^{a,d,17}, M.E. Dinardo^{a,b}, S. Fiorendi^{a,b}, S. Gennai^a, A. Ghezzi^{a,b}, P. Govoni^{a,b}, M. Malberti^{a,b}, S. Malvezzi^a, D. Menasce^a, F. Monti, L. Moroni^a, M. Paganoni^{a,b}, D. Pedrini^a, S. Ragazzi^{a,b}, T. Tabarelli de Fatis^{a,b}, D. Zuolo^{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}, A. De Iorio^{a,b}, A. Di Crescenzo^{a,b}, F. Fabozzi^{a,c}, F. Fienga^a, G. Galati^a, A.O.M. Iorio^{a,b}, W.A. Khan^a, L. Lista^a, S. Meola^{a,d,17}, P. Paolucci^{a,17}, C. Sciacca^{a,b}, E. Voevodina^{a,b}

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

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

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

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

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

M. Biasini^{a,b}, G.M. Bilei^a, C. Cecchi^{a,b}, D. Ciangottini^{a,b}, L. Fanò^{a,b}, P. Lariccia^{a,b}, R. Leonardi^{a,b}, E. Manoni^a, G. Mantovani^{a,b}, V. Mariani^{a,b}, M. Menichelli^a, A. Rossi^{a,b}, A. Santocchia^{a,b}, D. Spiga^a

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

K. Androsov^a, P. Azzurri^a, G. Bagliesi^a, L. Bianchini^a, T. Boccali^a, L. Borrello, R. Castaldi^a, M.A. Ciocci^{a,b}, R. Dell'Orso^a, G. Fedia^a, F. Fiori^{a,c}, L. Giannini^{a,c}, A. Giassi^a, M.T. Grippo^a

F. Ligabue^{a,c}, E. Manca^{a,c}, G. Mandorli^{a,c}, A. Messineo^{a,b}, F. Palla^a, A. Rizzi^{a,b}, G. Rolandi³¹, P. Spagnolo^a, R. Tenchini^a, G. Tonelli^{a,b}, A. Venturi^a, P.G. Verdini^a

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

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

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

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

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

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

Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea

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

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

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

Hanyang University, Seoul, Korea

B. Francois, J. Goh³², T.J. Kim

Korea University, Seoul, Korea

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

Sejong University, Seoul, Korea

H.S. Kim

Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea

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

University of Seoul, Seoul, Korea

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

Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon, Korea

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

Vilnius University, Vilnius, Lithuania

V. Dudenias, A. Juodagalvis, J. Vaitkus

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

I. Ahmed, Z.A. Ibrahim, M.A.B. Md Ali³³, F. Mohamad Idris³⁴, W.A.T. Wan Abdullah, M.N. Yusli, Z. Zolkapli

Universidad de Sonora (UNISON), Hermosillo, Mexico

J.F. Benitez, A. Castaneda Hernandez, J.A. Murillo Quijada

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

H. Castilla-Valdez, E. De La Cruz-Burelo, M.C. Duran-Osuna, I. Heredia-De La Cruz³⁵, R. Lopez-Fernandez, J. Mejia Guisao, R.I. Rabadan-Trejo, M. Ramirez-Garcia, G. Ramirez-Sanchez, R. Reyes-Almanza, A. Sanchez-Hernandez

Universidad Iberoamericana, Mexico City, Mexico

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

Benemerita Universidad Autonoma de Puebla, Puebla, Mexico

J. Eysermans, 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

S. Bheesette, P.H. Butler

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

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

National Centre for Nuclear Research, Swierk, Poland

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

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

K. Bunkowski, A. Byszuk³⁶, K. Doroba, A. Kalinowski, M. Konecki, J. Krolikowski, M. Misiura, M. Olszewski, A. Pyskir, M. Walczak

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

M. Araujo, P. Bargassa, C. Beirão Da Cruz E Silva, A. Di Francesco, P. Faccioli, B. Galinhas, M. Gallinaro, J. Hollar, N. Leonardo, J. Seixas, G. Strong, O. Toldaiev, J. Varela

Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia

S. Afanasiev, P. Bunin, M. Gavrilenko, I. Golutvin, I. Gorbunov, A. Kamenev, V. Karjavine, A. Lanev, A. Malakhov, V. Matveev^{37,38}, 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

V. Golovtsov, Y. Ivanov, V. Kim³⁹, E. Kuznetsova⁴⁰, P. Levchenko, V. Murzin, V. Oreshkin, I. Smirnov, D. Sosnov, V. Sulimov, L. Uvarov, S. Vasilov, 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. Gavrillov, N. Lychkovskaya, V. Popov, I. Pozdnyakov, G. Safronov, A. Spiridonov, A. Steppenov, V. Stolin, M. Toms, E. Vlasov, A. Zhokin

Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Moscow, Russia

T. Aushev

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

M. Chadeeva⁴¹, P. Parygin, D. Philippov, S. Polikarpov⁴¹, E. Popova, V. Rusinov

P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia

V. Andreev, M. Azarkin, I. Dremin³⁸, M. Kirakosyan, A. Terkulov

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

A. Baskakov, A. Belyaev, E. Boos, V. Bunichev, M. Dubinin⁴², L. Dudko, A. Ershov, V. Klyukhin, O. Kodolova, I. Lokhtin, I. Miagkov, S. Obraztsov, S. Petrushanko, V. Savrin, A. Snigirev

Novosibirsk State University (NSU), Novosibirsk, Russia

A. Barnyakov⁴³, V. Blinov⁴³, T. Dimova⁴³, L. Kardapol'tsev⁴³, Y. Skovpen⁴³

Institute for High Energy Physics of National Research Centre 'Kurchatov Institute', Protvino, Russia

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

National Research Tomsk Polytechnic University, Tomsk, Russia

A. Babaev, S. Baidali, V. Okhotnikov

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

P. Adzic⁴⁴, P. Cirkovic, D. Devetak, M. Dordevic, J. Milosevic

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

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

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain

C. Albajar, J.F. de Trocóniz

Universidad de Oviedo, Oviedo, Spain

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

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

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

University of Ruhuna, Department of Physics, Matara, Sri Lanka

N. Wickramage

CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland

D. Abbaneo, B. Akgun, E. Auffray, G. Auzinger, P. Baillon, A.H. Ball, D. Barney, J. Bendavid, M. Bianco, A. Bocci, C. Botta, E. Brondolin, T. Camporesi, M. Cepeda, G. Cerminara, E. Chapon, Y. Chen, G. Cucciati, D. d'Enterria, A. Dabrowski, N. Daci, V. Daponte, A. David, A. De Roeck, N. Deelen, M. Dobson, M. Dünser, N. Dupont, A. Elliott-Peisert, P. Everaerts, F. Fallavollita⁴⁵, D. Fasanella, G. Franzoni, J. Fulcher, W. Funk, D. Gigi, A. Gilbert, K. Gill, F. Glege, M. Gruchala, M. Guilbaud, D. Gulhan, J. Hegeman, C. Heidegger, V. Innocente, A. Jafari, P. Janot, O. Karacheban²⁰, J. Kieseler, A. Kornmayer, M. Krammer¹, C. Lange, P. Lecoq, C. Lourenço, L. Malgeri, M. Mannelli, A. Massironi, F. Meijers, J.A. Merlin, S. Mersi, E. Meschi, P. Milenovic⁴⁶, F. Moortgat, M. Mulders, J. Ngadiuba, S. Nourbakhsh, S. Orfanelli, L. Orsini, F. Pantaleo¹⁷, L. Pape, E. Perez, M. Peruzzi, A. Petrilli, G. Petrucciani, A. Pfeiffer, M. Pierini, F.M. Pitters, D. Rabady, A. Racz, T. Reis, M. Rovere, H. Sakulin, C. Schäfer, C. Schwick, M. Selvaggi, A. Sharma, P. Silva, P. Sphicas⁴⁷, A. Stakia, J. Steggemann, D. Treille, A. Tsiros, V. Veckalns⁴⁸, M. Verzetti, W.D. Zeuner

Paul Scherrer Institut, Villigen, Switzerland

L. Caminada⁴⁹, K. Deiters, W. Erdmann, R. Horisberger, Q. Ingram, H.C. Kaestli, D. Kotlinski, U. Langenegger, T. Rohe, S.A. Wiederkehr

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

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

Universität Zürich, Zurich, Switzerland

T.K. Aarrestad, C. AMSler⁵⁰, D. Brzhechko, M.F. Canelli, A. De Cosa, R. Del Burgo, S. Donato, C. Galloni, T. Hreus, B. Kilminster, S. Leontsinis, I. Neutelings, G. Rauco, P. Robmann, D. Salerno, K. Schweiger, C. Seitz, Y. Takahashi, A. Zucchetta

National Central University, Chung-Li, Taiwan

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

National Taiwan University (NTU), Taipei, Taiwan

P. Chang, Y. Chao, K.F. Chen, P.H. Chen, W.-S. Hou, Arun Kumar, Y.F. Liu, R.-S. Lu, E. Paganis, A. Psallidas, A. Steen

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

B. Asavapibhop, N. Srimanobhas, N. Suwonjandee

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

A. Bat, F. Boran, S. Cerci⁵¹, S. Damarseckin, Z.S. Demiroglu, F. Dolek, C. Dozen, I. Dumanoglu, S. Girgis, G. Gokbulut, Y. Guler, E. Gurpinar, I. Hos⁵², C. Isik, E.E. Kangal⁵³, O. Kara, A. Kayis Topaksu, U. Kiminsu, M. Oglakci, G. Onengut, K. Ozdemir⁵⁴, A. Polatoz, B. Tali⁵¹, U.G. Tok, H. Topakli⁵⁵, S. Turkcapar, I.S. Zorbakir, C. Zorbilmez

Middle East Technical University, Physics Department, Ankara, Turkey

B. Isildak⁵⁶, G. Karapinar⁵⁷, M. Yalvac, M. Zeyrek

Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey

I.O. Atakisi, E. Gülmez, M. Kaya⁵⁸, O. Kaya⁵⁹, S. Ozkorucuklu⁶⁰, S. Tekten, E.A. Yetkin⁶¹

Istanbul Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey

M.N. Agaras, A. Cakir, K. Cankocak, Y. Komurcu, S. Sen⁶²

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

University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom

F. Ball, J.J. Brooke, D. Burns, E. Clement, D. Cussans, O. Davignon, H. Flacher, J. Goldstein, G.P. Heath, H.F. Heath, L. Kreczko, D.M. Newbold⁶³, S. Paramesvaran, B. Penning, T. Sakuma, D. Smith, V.J. Smith, J. Taylor, A. Titterton

Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom

K.W. Bell, A. Belyaev⁶⁴, C. Brew, R.M. Brown, D. Cieri, D.J.A. Cockerill, J.A. Coughlan, K. Harder, S. Harper, J. Linacre, K. Manolopoulos, E. Olaiya, D. Petyt, C.H. Shepherd-Themistocleous, A. Thea, I.R. Tomalin, T. Williams, W.J. Womersley

Imperial College, London, United Kingdom

R. Bainbridge, P. Bloch, J. Borg, S. Breeze, O. Buchmuller, A. Bundock, D. Colling, P. Dauncey, G. Davies, M. Della Negra, R. Di Maria, G. Hall, G. Iles, T. James, M. Komm, C. Laner, L. Lyons, A.-M. Magnan, S. Malik, A. Martelli, J. Nash⁶⁵, A. Nikitenko⁷, V. Palladino, M. Pesaresi, D.M. Raymond, A. Richards, A. Rose, E. Scott, C. Seez, A. Shtipliyski, G. Singh, M. Stoye, T. Strebler, S. Summers, A. Tapper, K. Uchida, T. Virdee¹⁷, N. Wardle, D. Winterbottom, J. Wright, S.C. Zenz

Brunel University, Uxbridge, United Kingdom

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

Baylor University, Waco, USA

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

Catholic University of America, Washington, DC, USA

R. Bartek, A. Dominguez

The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, USA

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

Boston University, Boston, USA

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

Brown University, Providence, USA

G. Benelli, X. Coubez, D. Cutts, M. Hadley, J. Hakala, U. Heintz, J.M. Hogan⁶⁶, K.H.M. Kwok, E. Laird, G. Landsberg, J. Lee, Z. Mao, M. Narain, S. Sagir⁶⁷, R. Syarif, E. Usai, D. Yu

University of California, Davis, Davis, USA

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

University of California, Los Angeles, USA

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

University of California, Riverside, Riverside, USA

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

University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, USA

J.G. Branson, P. Chang, S. Cittolin, M. Derdzinski, R. Gerosa, D. Gilbert, B. Hashemi, A. Holzner, D. Klein, G. Kole, V. Krutelyov, J. Letts, M. Masciovecchio, D. Olivito, S. Padhi, M. Pieri, M. Sani, V. Sharma, S. Simon, M. Tadel, A. Vartak, S. Wasserbaech⁶⁸, J. Wood, F. Würthwein, A. Yagil, G. Zevi Della Porta

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

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

California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA

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

Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, USA

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

University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, USA

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

Cornell University, Ithaca, USA

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

Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, USA

S. Abdullin, M. Albrow, M. Alyari, G. Apollinari, A. Apresyan, A. Apyan, S. Banerjee, L.A.T. Bauerdick, A. Beretvas, J. Berryhill, P.C. Bhat, K. Burkett, J.N. Butler, A. Canepa, G.B. Cerati, H.W.K. Cheung, F. Chlebana, M. Cremonesi, J. Duarte, V.D. Elvira, J. Freeman, Z. Gecse, E. Gottschalk, L. Gray, D. Green, S. Grünendahl, O. Gutsche, J. Hanlon, R.M. Harris, S. Hasegawa, J. Hirschauer, Z. Hu, B. Jayatilaka, S. Jindariani, M. Johnson, U. Joshi, B. Klima, M.J. Kortelainen, B. Kreis, S. Lammel, D. Lincoln, R. Lipton, M. Liu, T. Liu, J. Lykken, K. Maeshima, J.M. Marraffino, D. Mason, P. McBride, P. Merkel, S. Mrenna, S. Nahn, V. O'Dell, K. Pedro, C. Pena, O. Prokofyev, G. Rakness, L. Ristori, A. Savoy-Navarro⁶⁹, B. Schneider, E. Sexton-Kennedy, A. Soha, W.J. Spalding, L. Spiegel, S. Stoynev, J. Strait, N. Strobbe, L. Taylor, S. Tkaczyk, N.V. Tran, L. Uplegger, E.W. Vaandering, C. Vernieri, M. Verzocchi, R. Vidal, M. Wang, H.A. Weber, A. Whitbeck

University of Florida, Gainesville, USA

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

Florida International University, Miami, USA

Y.R. Joshi, S. Linn

Florida State University, Tallahassee, USA

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

Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, USA

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

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

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

The University of Iowa, Iowa City, USA

M. Alhusseini, B. Bilki⁷⁰, W. Clarida, K. Dilsiz⁷¹, S. Durgut, R.P. Gandrajula, M. Haytmyradov, V. Khristenko, J.-P. Merlo, A. Mestvirishvili, A. Moeller, J. Nachtman, H. Ogul⁷², Y. Onel, F. Ozok⁷³, A. Penzo, C. Snyder, E. Tiras, J. Wetzel

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA

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

The University of Kansas, Lawrence, USA

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

Kansas State University, Manhattan, USA

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

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, USA

F. Rebassoo, D. Wright

University of Maryland, College Park, USA

A. Baden, O. Baron, A. Belloni, S.C. Eno, Y. Feng, C. Ferraioli, N.J. Hadley, S. Jabeen, G.Y. Jeng, R.G. Kellogg, J. Kunkle, A.C. Mignerey, S. Nabili, F. Ricci-Tam, M. Seidel, Y.H. Shin, A. Skuja, S.C. Tonwar, K. Wong

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, USA

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

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, USA

A.C. Benvenuti[†], R.M. Chatterjee, A. Evans, P. Hansen, J. Hiltbrand, Sh. Jain, S. Kalafut, M. Krohn, Y. Kubota, Z. Lesko, J. Mans, N. Ruckstuhl, R. Rusack, M.A. Wadud

University of Mississippi, Oxford, USA

J.G. Acosta, S. Oliveros

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, USA

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

State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, USA

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

Northeastern University, Boston, USA

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

Northwestern University, Evanston, USA

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

University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, USA

R. Bucci, N. Dev, M. Hildreth, K. Hurtado Anampa, C. Jessop, D.J. Karmgard, N. Kellams, K. Lannon, W. Li, N. Loukas, N. Marinelli, F. Meng, C. Mueller, Y. Musienko³⁷, M. Planer, A. Reinsvold, R. Ruchti, P. Siddireddy, G. Smith, S. Taroni, M. Wayne, A. Wightman, M. Wolf, A. Woodard

The Ohio State University, Columbus, USA

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

Princeton University, Princeton, USA

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

University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez, USA

S. Malik, S. Norberg

Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA

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

Purdue University Northwest, Hammond, USA

T. Cheng, J. Dolen, N. Parashar

Rice University, Houston, USA

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

University of Rochester, Rochester, USA

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

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

A. Agapitos, J.P. Chou, Y. Gershtein, E. Halkiadakis, A. Hart, M. Heindl, E. Hughes, S. Kaplan, R. Kunnawalkam Elayavalli, S. Kyriacou, A. Lath, R. Montalvo, K. Nash, M. Osherson, H. Saka, S. Salur, S. Schnetzer, D. Sheffield, S. Somalwar, R. Stone, S. Thomas, P. Thomassen, M. Walker

University of Tennessee, Knoxville, USA

A.G. Delannoy, J. Heideman, G. Riley, S. Spanier

Texas A&M University, College Station, USA

O. Bouhali⁷⁴, A. Celik, M. Dalchenko, M. De Mattia, A. Delgado, S. Dildick, R. Eusebi, J. Gilmore, T. Huang, T. Kamon⁷⁵, S. Luo, R. Mueller, D. Overton, L. Perniè, D. Rathjens, A. Safonov

Texas Tech University, Lubbock, USA

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

Vanderbilt University, Nashville, USA

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

University of Virginia, Charlottesville, USA

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

Wayne State University, Detroit, USA

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

University of Wisconsin - Madison, Madison, WI, USA

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

†: Deceased

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

2: Also at IRFU, CEA, Université Paris-Saclay, Gif-sur-Yvette, France

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

4: Also at Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, Brazil

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

6: Also at University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China

7: Also at Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia

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

9: Also at Cairo University, Cairo, Egypt

10: Also at Helwan University, Cairo, Egypt

11: Now at Zewail City of Science and Technology, Zewail, Egypt

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

13: Also at Department of Physics, King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia

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

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 CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland

18: Also at RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut A, Aachen, Germany

19: Also at University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany

20: Also at Brandenburg University of Technology, Cottbus, Germany

21: Also at Institute of Physics, University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary

22: Also at Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary

23: Also at MTA-ELTE Lendület CMS Particle and Nuclear Physics Group, Eötvös Loránd

University, Budapest, Hungary

24: Also at Indian Institute of Technology Bhubaneswar, Bhubaneswar, India

25: Also at Institute of Physics, Bhubaneswar, India

26: Also at Shoolini University, Solan, India

27: Also at University of Visva-Bharati, Santiniketan, India

28: Also at Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, 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 Scuola Normale e Sezione dell'INFN, Pisa, Italy

32: Also at Kyunghee University, Seoul, Korea

33: Also at International Islamic University of Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

34: Also at Malaysian Nuclear Agency, MOSTI, Kajang, Malaysia

35: Also at Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología, Mexico City, Mexico

36: Also at Warsaw University of Technology, Institute of Electronic Systems, Warsaw, Poland

37: Also at Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia

38: Now at National Research Nuclear University 'Moscow Engineering Physics Institute' (MEPhI), Moscow, Russia

39: Also at St. Petersburg State Polytechnical University, St. Petersburg, Russia

40: Also at University of Florida, Gainesville, USA

41: Also at P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia

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

43: Also at Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, Novosibirsk, Russia

44: Also at Faculty of Physics, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia

45: Also at INFN Sezione di Pavia ^a, Università di Pavia ^b, Pavia, Italy

46: Also at University of Belgrade, Faculty of Physics and Vinca Institute of Nuclear Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia

47: Also at National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece

48: Also at Riga Technical University, Riga, Latvia

49: Also at Universität Zürich, Zurich, Switzerland

50: Also at Stefan Meyer Institute for Subatomic Physics (SMI), Vienna, Austria

51: Also at Adiyaman University, Adiyaman, Turkey

52: Also at Istanbul Aydin University, Istanbul, Turkey

53: Also at Mersin University, Mersin, Turkey

54: Also at Piri Reis University, Istanbul, Turkey

55: Also at Gaziosmanpasa University, Tokat, Turkey

56: Also at Ozyegin University, Istanbul, Turkey

57: Also at Izmir Institute of Technology, Izmir, Turkey

58: Also at Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey

59: Also at Kafkas University, Kars, Turkey

60: Also at Istanbul University, Faculty of Science, Istanbul, Turkey

61: Also at Istanbul Bilgi University, Istanbul, Turkey

62: Also at Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey

63: Also at Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom

64: Also at School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southampton, Southampton, United Kingdom

65: Also at Monash University, Faculty of Science, Clayton, Australia

66: Also at Bethel University, St. Paul, USA

67: Also at Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University, Karaman, Turkey

- 68: Also at Utah Valley University, Orem, USA
- 69: Also at Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA
- 70: Also at Beykent University, Istanbul, Turkey
- 71: Also at Bingol University, Bingol, Turkey
- 72: Also at Sinop University, Sinop, Turkey
- 73: Also at Mimar Sinan University, Istanbul, Istanbul, Turkey
- 74: Also at Texas A&M University at Qatar, Doha, Qatar
- 75: Also at Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea