CMS-SUS-16-040

arXiv:1712.08920v2 [hep-ex] 2 Jul 2018

Search for R-parity violating supersymmetry in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13\,\text{TeV}$ using b jets in a final state with a single lepton, many jets, and high sum of large-radius jet masses

The CMS Collaboration*

Abstract

Results are reported from a search for physics beyond the standard model in proton-proton collisions at a center-of-mass energy of $\sqrt{s} = 13\,\text{TeV}$. The search uses a signature of a single lepton, large jet and bottom quark jet multiplicities, and high sum of large-radius jet masses, without any requirement on the missing transverse momentum in an event. The data sample corresponds to an integrated luminosity of $35.9\,\text{fb}^{-1}$ recorded by the CMS experiment at the LHC. No significant excess beyond the prediction from standard model processes is observed. The results are interpreted in terms of upper limits on the production cross section for R-parity violating supersymmetric extensions of the standard model using a benchmark model of gluino pair production, in which each gluino decays promptly via $\widetilde{\text{g}} \to \text{tbs}$. Gluinos with a mass below $1610\,\text{GeV}$ are excluded at 95% confidence level.

*See Appendix A for the list of collaboration members

1 Introduction

Searches for physics beyond the standard model (SM) are motivated by several considerations, including theoretical problems associated with explaining the observed mass of the Higgs boson in the presence of quantum corrections (the hierarchy problem) [1], and astrophysical evidence for dark matter [2]. While the SM has been successful in describing a vast range of phenomena, its inability to address these theoretical and experimental issues makes it an incomplete description of fundamental particles and their interactions.

Supersymmetry (SUSY), a proposed extension of the SM, provides possible solutions to these problems [3–12]. The hierarchy problem can be addressed by SUSY models with a sufficiently low-mass top squark and gluino, and the lightest supersymmetric particle (LSP), if stable, is a potential dark matter candidate [1, 13–16]. That stability is assured in R-parity conserving (RPC) SUSY models, where the R-parity of a particle is defined as $(-1)^{2s+3(B-L)}$ with s, B, and L denoting the spin, baryon number, and lepton number of the particle, respectively [17].

Recent searches at the CERN LHC have set stringent limits on RPC SUSY production, as mass limits for the models studied are reaching $\sim$1 TeV for the top squark [18–20] and $\sim$2 TeV [21–26] for the gluino. Due to these limits, there is mounting tension in the ability of RPC SUSY models to explain the hierarchy problem with little fine tuning. These RPC SUSY searches, however, typically require signatures with significant missing transverse momentum (p_T^{miss}) resulting from the undetected LSPs, while in R-parity violating (RPV) SUSY, the LSP is not stable and decays to SM particles, which removes the large p_T^{miss} signature. Though this disfavors the LSP as a dark matter candidate, it allows RPV SUSY models to evade constraints from typical RPC SUSY searches.

Given that there is no fundamental theoretical reason for R-parity conservation, RPV SUSY yields an important class of models that can ease the tension between natural solutions to the hierarchy problem and current experimental limits. In addition, the absence of a p_T^{miss} requirement can allow RPV SUSY searches to be sensitive to a parameter space of RPC SUSY where only a small amount of p_T^{miss} is expected, such as in models where the mass splitting between the supersymmetric particles is small. Therefore, RPV SUSY searches help to complete the coverage of SUSY parameter space.

The additional R-parity violating terms in the superpotential are

$$W = \frac{1}{2}\lambda^{ijk}L_iL_j\overline{e}_k + \lambda'^{ijk}L_iQ_j\overline{d}_k + \frac{1}{2}\lambda''^{ijk}\overline{u}_i\overline{d}_j\overline{d}_k + \mu'^i L_iH_u. \tag{1}$$

Here L_i, Q_j, and H_u are SU(2) doublets corresponding to leptons, quarks, and the Higgs boson, respectively. The fields $\overline{e}_k$, $\overline{u}_i$, and $\overline{d}_j$ are the charged lepton, up-type quark, and down-type quark SU(2) singlets, while the various λ and μ factors denote the coupling strengths for their corresponding interaction. Color indices are suppressed and letters i, j, k denote generation indices. More details on RPV SUSY can be found in Ref. [27].

This search is motivated by a particular model of R-parity violation, minimal flavor violating (MFV) SUSY [28], in which the R-parity violating couplings arise from the SM Yukawa couplings. This makes the third generation RPV couplings large and those of the first two generations small, which is consistent with the strong experimental constraints from proton decay searches on baryon and lepton number violation involving the lightest two generations [27]. The coupling λ''^{ijk} must be antisymmetric in the last two indices because of gauge invariance, which requires λ''^{tbb} to be 0. Therefore, the largest allowed MFV coupling is λ''^{tbs}.

Figure 1: Example diagram for the simplified model used as the benchmark signal in this analysis.

Due to the high $\widetilde{g}\widetilde{g}$ cross section and large value of λ''^{tbs}, a search for the pair production of gluinos that decay via $\widetilde{g} \to \bar{\tilde{t}}t \to tbs$ is well motivated. The simplified model [29, 30] that is used in the interpretation makes several assumptions about the SUSY mass spectrum. It is assumed that squarks other than the top squark are much heavier than the gluino, so they do not affect the gluino decay, and the branching ratio of $\widetilde{g} \to \bar{\tilde{t}}t \to tbs$ is 100%. The top squark is assumed to be virtual in its decay. This results in a three-body decay, so searches for dijet resonances, i.e., $\tilde{t} \to bs$, are not applicable in this scenario. It is further assumed that the gluinos decay promptly. An example diagram for this simplified model is shown in Fig. 1. Although this benchmark is used for interpreting results, the search is structured to be generically sensitive to high-mass signatures with large jet and bottom quark jet multiplicities and either little or no p_T^{miss}, which are potential features of other models of physics beyond the SM. Previous limits on such MFV models were obtained by the ATLAS and CMS Collaborations at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV [31–33] and by the ATLAS Collaboration at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV [34], excluding gluino masses below $\sim$1 TeV and 1.6 TeV, respectively.

This analysis searches in a single-lepton (electron or muon) final state for an excess of events with a large number of identified bottom quark (b-tagged) jets in regions determined as a function of the jet multiplicity and the sum of masses of large-radius jets, M_J. Signal events are expected to contribute to this final state through the leptonic decay of one of the top quarks while populating the high jet multiplicity and high M_J kinematic regions due to the hadronic decay of the second top quark and the additional bottom and strange quark jets. The four b quarks, two from the top quark decays and two from the top squark decays, provide a high b-tagged jet multiplicity signature. The quantity M_J was proposed in phenomenological studies [35–37] and was first used for RPC SUSY searches by the ATLAS Collaboration in all-hadronic final states [38, 39] and by the CMS Collaboration in single-lepton events [26, 40].

2 The CMS detector, samples, and event selection

This search uses a sample of proton-proton collision data at a center-of-mass energy of $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 35.9 fb^{-1}, which was collected by the CMS experiment during 2016. 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 the charged particle tracking systems, composed of silicon-pixel and silicon-strip detectors,

and the calorimeter systems, consisting of a lead tungstate crystal electromagnetic calorimeter (ECAL), and a brass and scintillator hadron calorimeter. Muons are identified and measured by gas-ionization detectors embedded in the magnetic flux-return yoke outside the solenoid. A more detailed description of the CMS detector, together with a definition of the coordinate system used and the relevant kinematic variables, is given in Ref. [41].

The background predictions use Monte Carlo (MC) simulation samples with corrections to the normalization and shape of distributions measured in data control samples. MAD-GRAPH5_aMC@NLO 2.2.2 is used in leading-order mode [42, 43] to generate the $t\bar{t}$, W+jets, quantum chromodynamics multijet (QCD), and Drell–Yan background processes with extra partons. Comparison to a POWHEG 2.0 [44–46] sample generated at next-to-leading order (NLO) shows that the NLO effects do not have a significant impact. The $t\bar{t}$W, $t\bar{t}$Z, $t\bar{t}t\bar{t}$, and t-channel single top quark production backgrounds are generated with MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO 2.2.2 in NLO mode [47], while the tW, $\bar{t}$W, and s-channel single top quark processes are generated with POWHEG 2.0. The $t\bar{t}$, W+jets, and QCD samples are generated with up to 2, 4, 2 extra partons, respectively. All samples are generated using a top quark mass of 172.5 GeV and with the NNPDF3.0 set of parton distribution functions (PDF) [48]. For the fragmentation and showering of partons, the generated samples are interfaced with PYTHIA 8.205 [49] and use the CUETP8M1 tune to describe the underlying event [50]. All samples use the highest precision cross sections available [51–57]. The detector response is simulated with GEANT4 [58]. Simulated samples are processed through the same reconstruction algorithms as the data.

The signal samples are generated with up to two extra partons in leading-order mode and dynamic factorization and renormalization scales by MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO 2.2.2. The same fragmentation, parton showering, simulation, and event reconstruction procedure as for the background samples is used. The samples are normalized to NLO + next-to-leading logarithmic cross sections [59].

The reconstruction of objects in an event proceeds from the candidate particles identified by the particle-flow (PF) algorithm [60], which uses information from the tracker, calorimeters, and muon systems to identify the candidates as charged or neutral hadrons, photons, electrons, or muons. Charged-particle tracks are required to originate from the event primary vertex (PV), which is the reconstructed vertex with the largest value of summed physics-object squared transverse momentum (p_T). The physics objects used for the PV reconstruction are those returned by a jet finding algorithm [61, 62] with the tracks assigned to the vertex as inputs, and the associated missing transverse momentum, taken as the negative vector sum of the p_T of those objects.

Electrons are reconstructed by pairing a charged-particle track with an ECAL supercluster [63]. The resulting electron candidates are required to have $p_T > 20$ GeV and $|\eta| < 2.5$, and to satisfy identification criteria designed to remove hadrons misidentified as electrons, photon conversions, and electrons from heavy-flavor hadron decays. Muons are reconstructed by associating tracks in the muon system with those found in the silicon tracker [64]. Muon candidates are required to satisfy $p_T > 20$ GeV, $|\eta| < 2.4$, and identification criteria designed to select a high-purity muon sample.

To preferentially select leptons that originate in the decay of W and Z bosons, leptons are required to be isolated from other PF candidates. The relative isolation of a particle I^{rel} is quantified using an optimized version of the mini-isolation variable I_{mini}. Mini-isolation is computed as the scalar sum of the p_T of charged hadrons from the PV, neutral hadrons, and photons that are within a cone of radius $R^{\mathrm{mini\text{-}iso}}$ surrounding the lepton momentum vector $\vec{p}^{\ell}$ in η-ϕ

space [65]. The cone radius $R^{\text{mini-iso}}$ varies with $1/p_T^\ell$ according to

$$R^{\text{mini-iso}} = \begin{cases} 0.2, & p_T^\ell \leq 50\,\text{GeV} \\ 10\,\text{GeV}/p_T^\ell, & 50 < p_T^\ell \leq 200\,\text{GeV} \\ 0.05, & p_T^\ell > 200\,\text{GeV}. \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

The p_T-dependent cone size reduces the rate of accidental overlaps between the lepton and jets in high-multiplicity or highly Lorentz-boosted events, particularly overlaps between bottom quark jets and leptons originating from a boosted top quark. Relative isolation is computed as $I^{\text{rel}} = I_{\text{mini}}/p_T^\ell$ after subtraction of the average contribution from additional proton-proton collisions in the same bunch-crossing (pileup). To be considered isolated, electrons and muons must satisfy $I^{\text{rel}} < 0.1$ and 0.2, respectively, where the different thresholds account for purity differences between electrons and muons.

The combined efficiency for the electron reconstruction, identification, and isolation requirements is about 50% at p_T^ℓ of 20 GeV, increasing to 65% at 50 GeV, and reaching a plateau of 80% above 200 GeV. The corresponding efficiency for muons is about 70% at p_T^ℓ of 20 GeV, increasing to 80% at 50 GeV, and reaching a plateau of 95% for $p_T^\ell > 200$ GeV. Data-to-simulation corrections (scale factors) are applied for both electrons and muons to correct the simulated lepton selection efficiency to match that observed in data.

The charged PF candidates associated with the PV and the neutral PF candidates are clustered into jets using the anti-k_T algorithm [61] with distance parameter $R = 0.4$, as implemented in the FASTJET package [62]. The estimated contribution to the jet p_T from neutral PF candidates produced by pileup is removed with a correction based on the area of the jet and the average energy density of the event [66]. The jet energy is calibrated using p_T- and η-dependent corrections; the resulting calibrated jets are selected if they satisfy $p_T > 30$ GeV and $|\eta| \leq 2.4$. Each jet must also meet loose identification requirements [67] to suppress, for example, calorimeter noise. Finally, jets that have PF constituents matched to the selected lepton are removed from the jet collection. These resulting jets are considered to be "small-R" jets.

The combined secondary vertex algorithm [68, 69] is applied to each small-R jet to create a subset of b-tagged jets. The tagging efficiency for b jets in the range $p_T = 30$ to 50 GeV is 60–67% (51–57%) in the barrel (endcap) and increases with p_T. Above $p_T \approx 150$ GeV the efficiency decreases to ≈50%. The probability to misidentify jets arising from c quarks is 13–15% (11–13%) in the barrel (endcap), while the misidentification probability for light-flavor quarks or gluons is 1–2%. Data-derived scale factors for the b tag efficiency and mistag rate are applied to simulation such that the simulated b tagging performance matches that observed in data.

"Large-R" ($R = 1.2$) jets are created by clustering small-R jets and the selected lepton using the anti-k_T algorithm. Leptons are included to encompass the full kinematics of the event. Clustering small-R jets instead of PF candidates incorporates the jet pileup corrections, thereby reducing the dependence of the large-R jet mass on pileup. This technique of clustering small-R jets into large-R jets has been used previously, e.g. Refs. [18, 40, 70]. The variable M_J is defined as the sum of all large-R jet masses, where $m(J)$ is the mass of a single large-R jet:

$$M_J = \sum_{J_i \in \text{large-}R \text{ jets}} m(J_i). \tag{3}$$

The quantity M_J is used as a measure of the mass-scale of an event. Signal events tend to have large M_J as the large-R jets capture the kinematic information of the high-mass gluinos. Comparatively, SM background processes tend to have smaller values of M_J due to their lower

Figure 2: Distributions of M_J, normalized to the same area, for $t\bar{t}$ events and signal events with two different gluino masses in a selection of $H_T > 1200\,\text{GeV}$, $N_{\text{lep}} = 1$, $N_{\text{jet}} \geq 8$, $M_J > 500\,\text{GeV}$, and $N_b \geq 1$.

mass-scales. SM events, however, can have large values of M_J in the presence of significant initial-state-radiation (ISR). For example, in $t\bar{t}$ events, ISR jets can either overlap with $t\bar{t}$ daughter jets or boost the $t\bar{t}$ system such that the system is collimated, both of which result in high-mass large-R jets and, correspondingly, high M_J. The M_J distributions for $t\bar{t}$ and signal are shown in Fig. 2, which uses events with $N_{\text{jet}} \geq 8$ to ensure similar N_{jet} distributions for both $t\bar{t}$ and signal.

Events are selected with triggers [71] that require either at least one jet with $p_T > 450\,\text{GeV}$ or the scalar sum of the p_T of all small-R jets (H_T) above $900\,\text{GeV}$. Trigger efficiencies are over 99% for signal events passing the analysis selection defined below.

These events are further selected with a baseline requirement of exactly one electron or muon, $M_J > 500\,\text{GeV}$, $H_T > 1200\,\text{GeV}$, that the number of small-R jets (N_{jet}) be at least 4, and that the number of those jets that are tagged as bottom quark jets (N_b) be at least 1.

3 Background prediction

After the baseline selection, the dominant background contribution is from the $t\bar{t}$ process, with small contributions from W+jets and QCD events with a misidentified lepton. Rare background contributions, classified below as "Other", come from single top quark, $t\bar{t}W$, $t\bar{t}Z$, $t\bar{t}H$, $t\bar{t}t\bar{t}$, and Drell–Yan production.

To search for signal events arising from new high-mass particles decaying with large jet and b-jet multiplicities, the N_b distribution is examined in different kinematic regions based on N_{jet} and M_J. The N_{jet} bins are defined to be 4–5, 6–7, and ≥ 8. The M_J bins are $500 < M_J \leq 800\,\text{GeV}$, $800 < M_J \leq 1000\,\text{GeV}$, and $M_J > 1000\,\text{GeV}$, with the two highest M_J bins merged for the $4 \leq N_{\text{jet}} \leq 5$ case due to the limited data sample size in the $M_J > 1000\,\text{GeV}$ region. The low-N_{jet}, low-M_J bins are expected to be background-dominated and are used as control regions to constrain systematic uncertainties, while the high-N_{jet}, high-M_J bins are used as signal regions. A diagram representing this binning is shown in Figure 3. The N_b distribution is separated into $N_b = 1, 2, 3$, and ≥ 4 bins for each region. The two highest N_b bins are the most sensitive to

M_J [GeV]	N_{jet}		
	4–5	6–7	≥8
500–800	CR	CR	SR
800–1000	CR	SR	SR
>1000		SR	SR

Figure 3: Illustration depicting the (N_{jet}, M_J) binning after the baseline selection, with control and signal region bins denoted by "CR" and "SR", respectively.

signal due to larger signal-to-background ratios, while the lower N_b bins provide constraints on the background normalizations and systematic uncertainties. The signal efficiency for the bin requiring $N_{jet} \geq 8$ and $M_J > 1000\,\text{GeV}$ is 2% and 8% for $m_{\tilde{g}} = 1000\,\text{GeV}$ and $1600\,\text{GeV}$, respectively.

A global maximum-likelihood fit is performed to obtain predictions for the SM background processes. This fit is carried out both for a background-only hypothesis and for signal-plus-background hypotheses, in which an additional signal contribution is extracted. The model is constructed using the poisson probabilities of the bin contents of the N_b distribution for all N_{jet}, M_J regions, while systematic uncertainties are applied as nuisance parameters. The N_b shape for each process is taken from simulation, but varied to assess the impact of mismodeling of relevant parameters, including the rate of gluon splitting to $b\bar{b}$ and tagging efficiencies for heavy- and light-flavor jets [68, 69]. The appropriate ranges for these parameters are determined based on measurements in dedicated control samples and then constrained by a simultaneous fit across all bins of N_{jet} and M_J in a correlated manner. Various studies with simulated pseudo-experiments were conducted to validate the likelihood model and to confirm that signal contamination effects are negligible.

Because the kinematic tails of the N_{jet} and M_J variables are difficult to model reliably, the $t\bar{t}$ and QCD normalizations are individually allowed to freely vary in each (N_{jet}, M_J) bin. The $t\bar{t}$ normalizations are constrained in each bin by the background-dominated $N_b \leq 2$ bins, while the QCD normalizations are constrained by control regions with no identified leptons ($N_{lep} = 0$). These $N_{lep} = 0$ control regions follow the same kinematic binning as the $N_{lep} = 1$ bins, but are integrated in N_b for $N_b \geq 1$ and use offset N_{jet} bins of 6–7, 8–9, and ≥ 10 to account for differences in the N_{jet} distributions between the $N_{lep} = 1$ and $N_{lep} = 0$ samples. The QCD contribution in a particular $N_{lep} = 1$ bin is then constrained by the corresponding $N_{lep} = 0$ bin. To avoid biasing the normalization measurement, the small contribution of $t\bar{t}$ background to the $N_{lep} = 0$ control regions is included using the normalization from the corresponding $N_{lep} = 1$ bins, while contributions from other processes are taken from simulation.

The N_{jet} shape of the W+jets background is taken from simulation and allowed to vary based on the data-to-simulation agreement in a kinematically similar Z+jets sample selected with $N_{lep} = 2$ (ee or $\mu\mu$), $H_T > 1200\,\text{GeV}$, $M_J > 500\,\text{GeV}$, $N_b = 1$, and $80 < m_{\ell\ell} < 100\,\text{GeV}$, where $m_{\ell\ell}$ is the invariant mass of the two leptons. The N_{jet} distribution and data/simulation yields ratio for this sample are shown in Fig. 4. The W+jets background is then determined in the fit with one global normalization parameter and two parameters to adjust the bin-to-bin normalization based on the difference between the ratios in adjacent N_{jet} bins – 17% between $4 \leq N_{jet} \leq 5$ and $6 \leq N_{jet} \leq 7$ and 62% between $6 \leq N_{jet} \leq 7$ and $N_{jet} \geq 8$. After correcting the N_{jet} spectrum, the residual M_J mismodeling is expected to be small, so no further correction is applied.

The "Other" component is estimated from simulation. Its contribution is less than 20% of the total backgrounds in all kinematic regions considered.

Figure 4: Jet multiplicity distribution for data and MC simulation in a Z+jets control sample selected by requiring $N_{lep} = 2$, $H_T > 1200 \, \text{GeV}$, $M_J > 500 \, \text{GeV}$, $N_b = 1$, and $80 < m_{\ell\ell} < 100 \, \text{GeV}$. The total yield from simulation is normalized to the number of events in data. The uncertainty in the ratio of data to simulation yields (lower panel) is statistical only.

4 Systematic uncertainties

4.1 Background systematic uncertainties

The nominal simulated shape of the N_b distribution is allowed to vary by the inclusion of systematic uncertainties. Each uncertainty is incorporated in the fit with template N_b histograms to account for the effects of the systematic variation and a nuisance parameter θ to control the variation amplitude. The nuisance parameters are subject to Gaussian constraints, normalized so that $\theta = 0$ corresponds to the nominal N_b shape and $\theta = \pm 1$ corresponds to ± 1 standard deviation (s.d.) variation of the systematic uncertainty. These uncertainties affect only the N_b shape for $t\bar{t}$, QCD, and W+jets backgrounds, because their normalizations are determined from data, while for the other (subleading) backgrounds the uncertainties affect both the N_b shape and normalization.

The primary source of systematic uncertainty is the modeling of the gluon splitting rate, which can produce additional b quarks in events and may not be properly simulated. To account for this, a nuisance parameter controlling the gluon splitting rate is included in the likelihood. The size of the ± 1 s.d. variation for this nuisance parameter is estimated using a fit to the $\Delta R_{b\bar{b}}$ distribution in a control sample, where $\Delta R_{b\bar{b}}$ is defined as the ΔR between two b-tagged jets in the event. This control sample is selected by requiring $N_{lep} = 0$, $H_T > 1500 \, \text{GeV}$, $N_b = 2$, $N_{jet} \geq 4$, and $M_J > 500 \, \text{GeV}$, as the gluon splitting signal in a $N_{lep} = 1$ control region is contaminated by b quarks from the decay of top quarks. To ensure that these measurements in the QCD-dominated $N_{lep} = 0$ region are applicable to the ttbar-dominated $N_{lep} = 1$ region, both processes are simulated with the same procedure and settings. Furthermore, the $N_{lep} = 0$ control sample is formed from a subset of the data that is selected to be most stable in the b tagging algorithm performance, since the precision of the $\Delta R_{b\bar{b}}$ fit is not limited by the data sample size. This choice isolates the physical effects of gluon splitting from the potential time dependence of the b tagging performance due to variations in experimental conditions, which are separately incorporated by the b-tag scale factor uncertainties. The nuisance parameter obtained from this control sample is allowed to vary in the full likelihood fit and further constrained by the

observed data in the $N_{lep} = 1$ regions.

Events where both of the b-tagged jets originate from one gluon splitting populate the low-$\Delta R_{b\bar{b}}$ region, while events without a gluon splitting or where the splitting yields one or no b-tagged jets populate both the low- and high-$\Delta R_{b\bar{b}}$ regions roughly equally. Gluon splittings can sometimes be reconstructed with fewer than two b-tagged jets either because the quarks are collimated into a single jet, one of the b jets is not tagged, or because one of the quarks is not within the kinematic acceptance.

A fit to the $\Delta R_{b\bar{b}}$ distribution is used to extract the relative contributions of events with and without gluon splitting and is performed in four equal bins in the range $0 \leq \Delta R_{b\bar{b}} < 4.8$. This binning is chosen to avoid relying on the fine details of the simulated $\Delta R_{b\bar{b}}$ shape. The instances of gluon splitting in simulation are identified by requiring a gluon with $p_T > 30\,\text{GeV}$ that decays to b quarks. Three categories are then defined: events with gluon splitting resulting in two b-tagged jets (denoted GSbb), with gluon splitting resulting in one or fewer b-tagged jets (GSb), and without any gluon splitting (no GS). In the fit, the GSbb and GSb contributions are varied together with a single normalization parameter.

The $\Delta R_{b\bar{b}}$ fit extracts a weight of 0.77 ± 0.09 for gluon splitting events and a weight of 1.21 ± 0.08 for non-gluon splitting events. The post-fit distributions are shown in Figure 5. The GSbb and GSb categories are plotted separately to demonstrate the difference in shapes. The discrepancy in the last bin does not significantly impact the fit because the higher yield bins at lower values of $\Delta R_{b\bar{b}}$ constrain the fit. The deviations of these weights from unity, summed in quadrature with their post-fit uncertainty, are used to form the ± 1 s.d. variations of the gluon splitting rate nuisance parameter by applying weights of 1 ± 0.25 to gluon splitting events and 1 ∓ 0.22 to non-gluon splitting events in an anti-correlated manner. The fit results are used as a measure of the uncertainty on modelling of the GS rate as opposed to a correction to the central value, since the $\Delta R_{b\bar{b}}$ variable may not be a perfect proxy for the GS rate.

Various tests are conducted to assess the stability of the fit results. To test the dependence of the gluon splitting weights across kinematic regions, the fit is repeated both with a higher M_J threshold and with different N_{jet} bins. Additionally the fit is conducted with finer binning to test the dependence of the results on the binning of the $\Delta R_{b\bar{b}}$ distribution. The resulting weights are all consistent with those of the nominal fit.

Another significant systematic uncertainty is the uncertainty in the data-to-simulation scale factors (SF) for b tagging efficiency and mistag rates. These scale factors are derived from data in various QCD and $t\bar{t}$ control samples and are binned in jet p_T and jet flavor (light + g, c, and b) [72]. The ± 1 s.d. N_b templates for these scale factors are assessed by varying them according to the uncertainties in their measurements.

Other experimental uncertainties are small and include lepton selection efficiency, lepton misidentification rate, jet energy scale, jet energy resolution, and integrated luminosity. The uncertainty associated with lepton selection efficiency is determined by varying the efficiency to select a lepton within its uncertainty determined from data. The N_{lep} distribution for QCD events may not be simulated well because it relies on modeling the tail of the fragmentation function and various detector effects. To account for this, an uncertainty of 20% is assigned to the relative normalization of QCD events in the 0- and 1-lepton bins, which is motivated by data-to-simulation studies of lepton isolation distributions. Jet energy scale uncertainties [67, 73] are assessed by varying the p_T of small-R jets as a function of p_T and η. The uncertainty arising from jet energy resolution [67, 73] is determined by applying an $|\eta|$-dependent factor to the jet p_T to match the jet energy resolution observed in data. The integrated luminosity is varied

Figure 5: Post-fit $\Delta R_{b\bar{b}}$ distributions in a selection with $N_{\text{lep}} = 0$, $H_T > 1500\,\text{GeV}$, $N_b = 2$, $N_{\text{jet}} \geq 4$, and $M_J > 500\,\text{GeV}$ with the post-fit uncertainty represented by a hatched band. The ratio of data to simulation yields is shown in the lower panel.

according to its uncertainty of 2.5% [74], affecting only the backgrounds estimated from simulation. No uncertainty is applied for the amount of pileup as studies have shown its effect to be negligible in this high-H_T selection. The uncertainties due to the limited size of simulation samples are incorporated as uncorrelated nuisance parameters in the fit.

Theoretical systematic uncertainties are applied and include independent and correlated variations of the renormalization and factorization scales. Additionally, uncertainties on the PDF are incorporated by considering variations in the NNPDF 3.0 scheme [48]. The size of these uncertainties is typically small as the effect of these variations is largely to modify the cross section of processes, which for the main backgrounds are constrained by data.

The background systematic uncertainties that affect the N_b shape are shown in Fig. 6 (left) for the most sensitive search bin.

4.2   Signal systematic uncertainties

Several of the systematic uncertainties affecting the signal yield are evaluated in the same way as the background yield. These are the uncertainties due to gluon splitting, lepton selection efficiency, jet energy scale, jet energy resolution, b tagging scale factors, simulation sample size, integrated luminosity, and theoretical uncertainties. All systematic variations affect both the N_b shape and normalization, except for the gluon splitting uncertainty, which is taken to affect only the N_b shape.

The number of jets from ISR produced in the signal simulation is reweighted based on comparisons between data and simulated $t\bar{t}$ samples. The reweighting factors vary between 0.92 and 0.51 for the number of ISR jets between 1 and ≥ 6. One half of the deviation from unity is taken as the systematic uncertainty in these reweighting factors.

The systematic uncertainties affecting the signal N_b shape are shown in Fig. 6 (right) for the most sensitive bin in a model with $m_{\tilde{g}} = 1600\,\text{GeV}$. The dominant signal systematic uncertainties arise from the limited simulation sample size, the b tagging efficiency scale factors, and the ISR modeling. There is no systematic uncertainty taken for pileup reweighting, as the signal

Figure 6: Background (left) and $m_{\widetilde{g}} = 1600\,\text{GeV}$ signal (right) systematic uncertainties affecting the N_b shape (in percent) in the $N_{\text{jet}} \geq 8$ and $M_J \geq 1000\,\text{GeV}$ bin. The bottom row shows the total uncertainty for a given N_b bin by summing in quadrature all uncertainties. These values are similar for other (N_{jet}, M_J) bins.

efficiency is found to be insensitive to the number of pileup interactions.

5 Results

The results of a background-only fit of the observed N_b distributions are shown in Figs. 7 and 8. These figures separately show the $N_{\text{lep}} = 1$ control and signal regions, although the fit includes all bins simultaneously. The N_b distributions in data are well described by the fit, and examination of the nuisance parameters shows that none of them are significantly changed by the fit. The post-fit yields are presented in Table 1.

A signal-plus-background fit is performed for gluino masses ranging from 1000 to 2000 GeV. For all masses, the post-fit N_b distribution describes the data well, and the fit extracts at most a small and insignificant signal contribution. For example, with a 1600 GeV gluino, the extracted signal yield relative to the model prediction is $r = 0.18^{+0.41}_{-0.18}$. The change of nuisance parameters by the fit is small and consistent with those of the background-only fit. Limits on the signal production cross section are calculated at 95% confidence level (CL) using the asymptotic approximation of the CL_s criterion [75–78] and shown in Fig. 9. Comparing the observed limit to the gluino pair production cross section [59], gluino masses below 1610 GeV are excluded in the benchmark $\widetilde{g} \to \text{tbs}$ model.

6 Summary

Results are presented from a search for new phenomena in events with a single lepton, large jet and bottom quark jet multiplicities, and high sum of large-radius jet masses, without a missing transverse momentum requirement. The background is predicted using a simultaneous fit in bins of the number of jets, number of b-tagged jets, and the sum of masses of large radius jets, using Monte Carlo simulated predictions with corrections measured in data control samples for the normalizations of the dominant backgrounds and nuisance parameters for theoretical and experimental uncertainties. Statistical uncertainties dominate in the signal

Figure 7: Data and the background-only post-fit N_b distribution for bins with low expected signal contribution: $500 < M_J \leq 800\,\text{GeV}$, $4 \leq N_{\text{jet}} \leq 5$ (upper-left), $M_J > 800\,\text{GeV}$, $4 \leq N_{\text{jet}} \leq 5$ (upper-right), $500 < M_J \leq 800\,\text{GeV}$, $6 \leq N_{\text{jet}} \leq 7$ (lower-left), and $500 < M_J \leq 800\,\text{GeV}$, $N_{\text{jet}} \geq 8$ (lower-right). The expected signal distribution is also shown for a gluino mass of $1600\,\text{GeV}$. The ratio of data to post-fit yields is shown in the lower panel. The post-fit uncertainty is depicted as a hatched band.

Figure 8: Data and the background-only post-fit N_b distribution for bins with large expected signal contribution: $800 < M_J \leq 1000\,\mathrm{GeV}$, $6 \leq N_{\mathrm{jet}} \leq 7$ (upper-left), $800 < M_J \leq 1000\,\mathrm{GeV}$, $N_{\mathrm{jet}} \geq 8$ (upper-right), $M_J > 1000\,\mathrm{GeV}$, $6 \leq N_{\mathrm{jet}} \leq 7$ (lower-left), and $M_J > 1000\,\mathrm{GeV}$, $N_{\mathrm{jet}} \geq 8$ (lower-right). The expected signal distribution is also shown for a gluino mass of $1600\,\mathrm{GeV}$. The ratio of data to post-fit yields is shown in the lower panel. The post-fit uncertainty is depicted as a hatched band.

Table 1: Post-fit yields for the background-only fit, observed data, and expected yields for $m_{\widetilde{g}} = 1600\,\text{GeV}$ in each search bin.

| N_b	QCD	$t\bar{t}$	W+jets	Other	All bkg.	Data	Expected $m_{\widetilde{g}} = 1600\,\text{GeV}$
				$4 \leq N_\text{jet} \leq 5,\ 500 < M_\text{J} \leq 800\,\text{GeV}$			
1	148	340	196	91	775 ± 43	777	0.50 ± 0.13
2	29	175	30	31	264 ± 17	264	0.39 ± 0.11
3	4.3	24.8	2.5	4.4	36 ± 4	34	0.18 ± 0.08
≥ 4	0.0	2.2	0.3	0.2	2.7 ± 0.4	3	0.04 ± 0.04
				$4 \leq N_\text{jet} \leq 5,\ M_\text{J} > 800\,\text{GeV}$			
1	16.5	26.3	22.5	11.0	76 ± 6	77	0.32 ± 0.11
2	1.1	10.6	3.4	3.8	19 ± 2	18	0.40 ± 0.12
3	0.7	1.3	0.3	0.3	2.7 ± 0.5	3	0.13 ± 0.06
≥ 4	0.00	0.09	0.03	0.01	0.13 ± 0.03	0	0.03 ± 0.03
				$6 \leq N_\text{jet} \leq 7,\ 500 < M_\text{J} \leq 800\,\text{GeV}$			
1	197	620	169	120	1106 ± 48	1105	2.5 ± 0.3
2	49	440	36	66	591 ± 21	588	3.1 ± 0.3
3	6.4	89.2	4.6	13.4	114 ± 8	112	1.4 ± 0.2
≥ 4	1.9	11.4	0.6	2.1	16 ± 2	21	0.25 ± 0.09
				$N_\text{jet} \geq 8,\ 500 < M_\text{J} \leq 800\,\text{GeV}$			
1	130	574	53	68	825 ± 38	821	3.5 ± 0.3
2	45	478	14	49	586 ± 20	603	5.4 ± 0.4
3	6.3	138.1	2.5	16.7	164 ± 9	148	3.0 ± 0.3
≥ 4	2.8	29.8	0.4	4.8	38 ± 4	40	1.4 ± 0.2
				$6 \leq N_\text{jet} \leq 7,\ 800 < M_\text{J} \leq 1000\,\text{GeV}$			
1	17.3	48.4	19.2	12.3	97 ± 8	105	1.2 ± 0.2
2	6.6	30.1	4.3	7.3	48 ± 4	37	2.0 ± 0.3
3	0.8	6.6	0.5	1.3	9.3 ± 1.0	12	1.0 ± 0.2
≥ 4	0.0	0.9	0.1	0.2	1.1 ± 0.2	2	0.31 ± 0.09
				$N_\text{jet} \geq 8,\ 800 < M_\text{J} \leq 1000\,\text{GeV}$			
1	17.0	58.7	10.3	10.2	96 ± 8	90	4.2 ± 0.4
2	5.8	47.5	2.5	6.8	63 ± 5	65	5.3 ± 0.4
3	1.1	15.0	0.4	2.0	19 ± 2	22	2.6 ± 0.3
≥ 4	0.2	3.4	0.1	0.9	4.6 ± 0.6	5	1.3 ± 0.2
				$6 \leq N_\text{jet} \leq 7,\ M_\text{J} > 1000\,\text{GeV}$			
1	4.4	8.7	6.0	4.1	23 ± 2	21	2.0 ± 0.3
2	0.7	5.0	1.4	1.6	8.8 ± 1.2	11	2.3 ± 0.3
3	0.1	1.2	0.2	0.5	1.9 ± 0.3	2	1.0 ± 0.2
≥ 4	0.00	0.13	0.01	0.05	0.19 ± 0.04	0	0.23 ± 0.08
				$N_\text{jet} \geq 8,\ M_\text{J} > 1000\,\text{GeV}$			
1	6.4	16.7	3.5	4.1	31 ± 3	28	5.4 ± 0.4
2	1.6	13.1	1.1	2.1	18 ± 2	21	8.2 ± 0.5
3	0.6	4.2	0.2	1.0	6.0 ± 0.8	5	5.7 ± 0.4
≥ 4	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.2	1.4 ± 0.3	2	3.2 ± 0.3

Figure 9: Cross section upper limits at 95% CL for a model of gluino pair production with $\widetilde{g} \to$ tbs compared to the gluino pair production cross section. The theoretical uncertainties in the cross section are shown as a band around the red line [59]. The expected limits (dashed line) and their ± 1 s.d. and ± 2 s.d. variations are shown as green and yellow bands, respectively. The observed limit is shown by the solid line with dots.

regions, while the most important systematic uncertainties arise from the modeling of gluon splitting and the bquark tagging efficiency and mistag rate. The observed data are consistent with the background-only hypothesis. An upper limit of approximately 10 fb is determined for the gluino-gluino production cross section using a benchmark R-parity violating supersymmetry model of gluino pair production with a prompt three-body decay to tbs quarks, as predicted in minimal flavor violating models. For this model, gluinos are observed (expected) to be excluded up to 1610 (1640) GeV at a 95% confidence level, which improves upon previous searches at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV [31–33] and is comparable to recent results at 13 TeV [34].

Acknowledgments

References

[1] R. Barbieri and G. F. Giudice, "Upper bounds on supersymmetric particle masses", *Nucl. Phys. B* **306** (1988) 63, `doi:10.1016/0550-3213(88)90171-X`.

[2] 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`.

[3] E. Witten, "Dynamical breaking of supersymmetry", *Nucl. Phys. B* **188** (1981) 513, `doi:10.1016/0550-3213(81)90006-7`.

[4] S. Dimopoulos and H. Georgi, "Softly broken supersymmetry and SU(5)", *Nucl. Phys. B* **193** (1981) 150, `doi:10.1016/0550-3213(81)90522-8`.

[5] P. Ramond, "Dual theory for free fermions", *Phys. Rev. D* **3** (1971) 2415, `doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.3.2415`.

[6] Y. A. Gol'fand and E. P. Likhtman, "Extension of the algebra of Poincaré group generators and violation of P invariance", *JETP Lett.* **13** (1971) 323.

[7] A. Neveu and J. H. Schwarz, "Factorizable dual model of pions", *Nucl. Phys. B* **31** (1971) 86, `doi:10.1016/0550-3213(71)90448-2`.

[8] D. V. Volkov and V. P. Akulov, "Possible universal neutrino interaction", *JETP Lett.* **16** (1972) 438.

[9] J. Wess and B. Zumino, "A lagrangian model invariant under supergauge transformations", *Phys. Lett. B* **49** (1974) 52, `doi:10.1016/0370-2693(74)90578-4`.

[10] J. Wess and B. Zumino, "Supergauge transformations in four dimensions", *Nucl. Phys. B* **70** (1974) 39, `doi:10.1016/0550-3213(74)90355-1`.

[11] P. Fayet, "Supergauge invariant extension of the Higgs mechanism and a model for the electron and its neutrino", *Nucl. Phys. B* **90** (1975) 104, `doi:10.1016/0550-3213(75)90636-7`.

[12] H. P. Nilles, "Supersymmetry, supergravity and particle physics", *Phys. Rep.* **110** (1984) 1, `doi:10.1016/0370-1573(84)90008-5`.

[13] S. Dimopoulos and G. F. Giudice, "Naturalness constraints in supersymmetric theories with nonuniversal soft terms", *Phys. Lett. B* **357** (1995) 573, `doi:10.1016/0370-2693(95)00961-J`, `arXiv:hep-ph/9507282`.

[14] R. Barbieri and D. Pappadopulo, "S-particles at their naturalness limits", *JHEP* **10** (2009) 061, `doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2009/10/061`, `arXiv:0906.4546`.

[15] M. Papucci, J. T. Ruderman, and A. Weiler, "Natural SUSY Endures", *JHEP* **09** (2012) 035, `doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2012)035`, `arXiv:1110.6926`.

[16] J. L. Feng, "Naturalness and the status of supersymmetry", *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **63** (2013) 351, `doi:10.1146/annurev-nucl-102010-130447`, `arXiv:1302.6587`.

[17] G. R. Farrar and P. Fayet, "Phenomenology of the production, decay, and detection of new hadronic states associated with supersymmetry", *Phys. Lett. B* **76** (1978) 575, `doi:10.1016/0370-2693(78)90858-4`.

[18] ATLAS Collaboration, "Search for top-squark pair production in final states with one lepton, jets, and missing transverse momentum using 36 fb^{-1} of $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV pp collision data with the ATLAS detector", (2017). `arXiv:1711.11520`. Submitted to JHEP.

[19] CMS Collaboration, "Search for top squark pair production in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV using single lepton events", *JHEP* **10** (2017) 013, `doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2017)019`, `arXiv:1706.04402`.

[20] ATLAS Collaboration, "Search for a scalar partner of the top quark in the jets plus missing transverse momentum final state at $\sqrt{s}$=13 TeV with the ATLAS detector", *JHEP* **12** (2017) 085, `doi:10.1007/JHEP12(2017)085`, `arXiv:1709.04183`.

[21] ATLAS Collaboration, "Search for squarks and gluinos in events with an isolated lepton, jets, and missing transverse momentum at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector", *Phys. Rev. D* **96** (2017), no. 11, 112010, `doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.96.112010`, `arXiv:1708.08232`.

[22] ATLAS Collaboration, "Search for squarks and gluinos in final states with jets and missing transverse momentum using 36 fb^{-1} of $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV pp collision data with the ATLAS detector", *Phys. Rev. D* **97** (2018), no. 11, 112001, `doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.97.112001`, `arXiv:1712.02332`.

[23] ATLAS Collaboration, "Search for new phenomena with large jet multiplicities and missing transverse momentum using large-radius jets and flavour-tagging at ATLAS in 13 TeV *pp* collisions", *JHEP* **12** (2017) 034, `doi:10.1007/JHEP12(2017)034`, `arXiv:1708.02794`.

[24] CMS Collaboration, "Search for new phenomena with the M_{T2} variable in the all-hadronic final state produced in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV", *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77** (2017) 710, `doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-5267-x`, `arXiv:1705.04650`.

[25] CMS Collaboration, "Search for supersymmetry in multijet events with missing transverse momentum in proton-proton collisions at 13 TeV", *Phys. Rev. D* **96** (2017) 032003, `doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.96.032003`, `arXiv:1704.07781`.

[26] CMS Collaboration, "Search for supersymmetry in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV in the single-lepton final state using the sum of masses of large-radius jets", *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119** (2017) 151802, `doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.119.151802`, `arXiv:1705.04673`.

[27] R. Barbier et al., "*R*-parity violating supersymmetry", *Phys. Rept.* **420** (2005) 1, `doi:10.1016/j.physrep.2005.08.006`, `arXiv:hep-ph/0406039`.

[28] C. Csáki, Y. Grossman, and B. Heidenreich, "MFV SUSY: a natural theory for *R*-parity violation", *Phys. Rev. D* **85** (2012) 095009, `doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.85.095009`, `arXiv:1111.1239`.

[29] J. Alwall, P. Schuster, and N. Toro, "Simplified models for a first characterization of new physics at the LHC", *Phys. Rev. D* **79** (2009) 075020, `doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.79.075020`, `arXiv:0810.3921`.

[30] LHC New Physics Working Group, D. Alves et al., "Simplified models for LHC new physics searches", *J. Phys. G* **39** (2012) 105005, `doi:10.1088/0954-3899/39/10/105005`, `arXiv:1105.2838`.

[31] ATLAS Collaboration, "A search for top squarks with R-parity-violating decays to all-hadronic final states with the ATLAS detector in $\sqrt{s} = 8\,\text{TeV}$ proton-proton collisions", *JHEP* **06** (2016) 067, doi:10.1007/JHEP06(2016)067, arXiv:1601.07453.

[32] CMS Collaboration, "Searches for R-parity-violating supersymmetry in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8\,\text{TeV}$ in final states with 0-4 leptons", *Phys. Rev. D* **94** (2016) 112009, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.94.112009, arXiv:1606.08076.

[33] CMS Collaboration, "Search for R-parity violating supersymmetry with displaced vertices in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8\,\text{TeV}$", *Phys. Rev. D* **95** (2017) 012009, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.95.012009, arXiv:1610.05133.

[34] ATLAS Collaboration, "Search for new phenomena in a lepton plus high jet multiplicity final state with the ATLAS experiment using $\sqrt{s} = 13\,\text{TeV}$ proton-proton collision data", *JHEP* **09** (2017) 088, doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2017)088, arXiv:1704.08493.

[35] A. Hook, E. Izaguirre, M. Lisanti, and J. G. Wacker, "High multiplicity searches at the LHC using jet masses", *Phys. Rev. D* **85** (2012) 055029, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.85.055029, arXiv:1202.0558.

[36] T. Cohen, E. Izaguirre, M. Lisanti, and H. K. Lou, "Jet substructure by accident", *JHEP* **03** (2013) 161, doi:10.1007/JHEP03(2013)161, arXiv:1212.1456.

[37] S. El Hedri, A. Hook, M. Jankowiak, and J. G. Wacker, "Learning how to count: a high multiplicity search for the LHC", *JHEP* **08** (2013) 136, doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2013)136, arXiv:1302.1870.

[38] ATLAS Collaboration, "Search for massive supersymmetric particles decaying to many jets using the ATLAS detector in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8\,\text{TeV}$", *Phys. Rev. D* **91** (2015) 112016, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.91.112016, arXiv:1502.05686.

[39] ATLAS Collaboration, "Search for new phenomena in final states with large jet multiplicities and missing transverse momentum at $\sqrt{s} = 8\,\text{TeV}$ proton-proton collisions using the ATLAS experiment", *JHEP* **10** (2013) 130, doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2013)130, arXiv:1308.1841. [Erratum: doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2014)109].

[40] CMS Collaboration, "Search for supersymmetry in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13\,\text{TeV}$ in the single-lepton final state using the sum of masses of large-radius jets", *JHEP* **08** (2016) 122, doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2016)122, arXiv:1605.04608.

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

[42] 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.

[43] 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.

[44] 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.

[45] 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`.

[46] 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`.

[47] R. Frederix and S. Frixione, "Merging meets matching in MC@NLO", *JHEP* **12** (2012) 061, `doi:10.1007/JHEP12(2012)061`, `arXiv:1209.6215`.

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

[49] T. Sjöstrand et al., "An introduction to PYTHIA 8.2", *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **191** (2015) 159, `doi:10.1016/j.cpc.2015.01.024`.

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

[51] M. Czakon, P. Fiedler, and A. Mitov, "Total top-quark pair-production cross section at hadron colliders through $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_S^4)$", *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110** (Jun, 2013) 252004, `doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.110.252004`.

[52] R. Gavin, Y. Li, F. Petriello, and S. Quackenbush, "W Physics at the LHC with FEWZ 2.1", *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **184** (2013) 208, `doi:10.1016/j.cpc.2012.09.005`, `arXiv:1201.5896`.

[53] 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`].

[54] 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`.

[55] S. Frixione et al., "Electroweak and QCD corrections to top-pair hadroproduction in association with heavy bosons", *JHEP* **06** (2015) 184, `doi:10.1007/JHEP06(2015)184`, `arXiv:1504.03446`.

[56] G. Bevilacqua and M. Worek, "Constraining BSM Physics at the LHC: Four top final states with NLO accuracy in perturbative QCD", *JHEP* **07** (2012) 111, `doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2012)111`, `arXiv:1206.3064`.

[57] Z. Nagy, "Three jet cross-sections in hadron hadron collisions at next-to-leading order", *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88** (2002) 122003, `doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.88.122003`, `arXiv:hep-ph/0110315`.

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

[59] C. Borschensky et al., "Squark and gluino production cross sections in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13, 14, 33,$ and $100\,\text{TeV}$", *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74** (2014) 3174, `doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-014-3174-y`, `arXiv:1407.5066`.

[60] 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`.

[61] 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`.

[62] 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`.

[63] 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`.

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

[65] K. Rehermann and B. Tweedie, "Efficient identification of boosted semileptonic top quarks at the LHC", *JHEP* **03** (2011) 059, `doi:10.1007/JHEP03(2011)059`, `arXiv:1007.2221`.

[66] 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`.

[67] CMS Collaboration, "Determination of jet energy calibration and transverse momentum resolution in CMS", *JINST* **6** (2011) P11002, `doi:10.1088/1748-0221/6/11/P11002`, `arXiv:1107.4277`.

[68] CMS Collaboration, "Identification of b-quark jets with the CMS experiment", *JINST* **8** (2013) P04013, `doi:10.1088/1748-0221/8/04/P04013`, `arXiv:1211.4462`.

[69] CMS Collaboration, "Identification of heavy-flavour jets with the CMS detector in pp collisions at 13 TeV", *JINST* **13** (2018), no. 05, P05011, `doi:10.1088/1748-0221/13/05/P05011`, `arXiv:1712.07158`.

[70] ATLAS Collaboration, "Search for direct pair production of the top squark in all-hadronic final states in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV with the ATLAS detector", *JHEP* **09** (2014) 015, `doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2014)015`, `arXiv:1406.1122`.

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

[72] CMS Collaboration, "Performance of heavy flavour identification algorithms in proton-proton collisions at 13 TeV at the CMS experiment", CMS Detector Performance Summary CMS-DP-2017-012, 2017.

[73] CMS Collaboration, "Jet energy scale and resolution in the CMS experiment in pp collisions at 8 TeV", *JINST* **12** (2017), no. 02, P02014, `doi:10.1088/1748-0221/12/02/P02014`, `arXiv:1607.03663`.

[74] CMS Collaboration, "CMS luminosity measurements for the 2016 data taking period", CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-LUM-17-001, 2017.

[75] 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`.

[76] ATLAS and CMS Collaborations, 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.

[77] 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`. [Erratum: `doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-013-2501-z`].

[78] 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`.

A The CMS Collaboration

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

Institut für Hochenergiephysik, Wien, Austria
W. Adam, F. Ambrogi, E. Asilar, T. Bergauer, J. Brandstetter, E. Brondolin, M. Dragicevic, J. Erö, A. Escalante Del Valle, M. Flechl, M. Friedl, R. Frühwirth[1], V.M. Ghete, J. Grossmann, J. Hrubec, M. Jeitler[1], A. König, N. Krammer, I. Krätschmer, D. Liko, T. Madlener, I. Mikulec, E. Pree, N. Rad, H. Rohringer, J. Schieck[1], R. Schöfbeck, M. Spanring, D. Spitzbart, A. Taurok, W. Waltenberger, J. Wittmann, C.-E. Wulz[1], 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. Van De Klundert, H. Van Haevermaet, P. Van Mechelen, N. Van Remortel

Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussel, Belgium
S. Abu Zeid, F. Blekman, J. D'Hondt, I. De Bruyn, 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, T. Maerschalk, A. Marinov, T. Seva, E. Starling, C. Vander Velde, P. Vanlaer, D. Vannerom, R. Yonamine, F. Zenoni

Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium
T. Cornelis, D. Dobur, A. Fagot, M. Gul, I. Khvastunov[2], D. Poyraz, C. Roskas, S. Salva, D. Trocino, M. Tytgat, W. Verbeke, M. Vit, N. Zaganidis

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

Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Fisicas, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
W.L. Aldá Júnior, F.L. Alves, G.A. Alves, L. Brito, 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. Chinellato[3], E. Coelho, E.M. Da Costa, G.G. Da Silveira[4], D. De Jesus Damiao, S. Fonseca De Souza, L.M. Huertas Guativa, H. Malbouisson, M. Melo De Almeida, C. Mora Herrera, L. Mundim, H. Nogima, L.J. Sanchez Rosas, A. Santoro, A. Sznajder, M. Thiel, E.J. Tonelli Manganote[3], F. Torres Da Silva De Araujo, A. Vilela Pereira

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

Institute for Nuclear Research and Nuclear Energy, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia, Bulgaria
A. Aleksandrov, R. Hadjiiska, P. Iaydjiev, 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. Fang[5], X. Gao[5], 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. Shaheen, A. Spiezia, J. Tao, C. Wang, Z. Wang, E. Yazgan, H. Zhang, J. Zhao

State Key Laboratory of Nuclear Physics and Technology, Peking University, Beijing, China
Y. Ban, G. Chen, J. Li, Q. Li, S. Liu, Y. Mao, S.J. Qian, D. Wang, Z. Xu, F. Zhang[5]

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, J.D. Ruiz Alvarez, 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, P.M. Ribeiro Cipriano, T. Sculac

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

Institute Rudjer Boskovic, Zagreb, Croatia
V. Brigljevic, D. Ferencek, K. Kadija, B. Mesic, A. Starodumov[6], T. Susa

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

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

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

Academy of Scientific Research and Technology of the Arab Republic of Egypt, Egyptian Network of High Energy Physics, Cairo, Egypt
A.A. Abdelalim[8,9], S. Elgammal[10], S. Khalil[9]

National Institute of Chemical Physics and Biophysics, Tallinn, Estonia
S. Bhowmik, R.K. Dewanjee, M. Kadastik, L. Perrini, 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, S. Ghosh, A. Givernaud, P. Gras, G. Hamel de Monchenault, P. Jarry, C. Leloup, E. Locci, M. Machet, 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. Abdulsalam[11], C. Amendola, I. Antropov, S. Baffioni, F. Beaudette, P. Busson, L. Cadamuro, C. Charlot, R. Granier de Cassagnac, M. Jo, I. Kucher, S. Lisniak, A. Lobanov, J. Martin Blanco, M. Nguyen, C. Ochando, G. Ortona, P. Paganini, P. Pigard, R. Salerno, J.B. Sauvan, Y. Sirois, A.G. Stahl Leiton, T. Strebler, Y. Yilmaz, A. Zabi, A. Zghiche

Université de Strasbourg, CNRS, IPHC UMR 7178, F-67000 Strasbourg, France
J.-L. Agram[12], J. Andrea, D. Bloch, J.-M. Brom, M. Buttignol, E.C. Chabert, N. Chanon, C. Collard, E. Conte[12], X. Coubez, F. Drouhin[12], J.-C. Fontaine[12], D. Gelé, U. Goerlach, M. Jansová, P. Juillot, 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, 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, M. Lethuillier, L. Mirabito, A.L. Pequegnot, S. Perries, A. Popov[13], V. Sordini, M. Vander Donckt, S. Viret, S. Zhang

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

Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia
L. Rurua

RWTH Aachen University, I. Physikalisches Institut, Aachen, Germany
C. Autermann, L. Feld, M.K. Kiesel, K. Klein, M. Lipinski, M. Preuten, C. Schomakers, J. Schulz, M. Teroerde, B. Wittmer, V. Zhukov[13]

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

RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut B, Aachen, Germany
G. Flügge, B. Kargoll, T. Kress, A. Künsken, T. Müller, A. Nehrkorn, A. Nowack, C. Pistone, O. Pooth, A. Stahl[14]

Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Hamburg, Germany
M. Aldaya Martin, T. Arndt, C. Asawatangtrakuldee, K. Beernaert, O. Behnke, U. Behrens, A. Bermúdez Martínez, A.A. Bin Anuar, K. Borras[15], V. Botta, A. Campbell, P. Connor, C. Contreras-Campana, F. Costanza, C. Diez Pardos, G. Eckerlin, D. Eckstein, T. Eichhorn, E. Eren, E. Gallo[16], J. Garay Garcia, A. Geiser, J.M. Grados Luyando, A. Grohsjean, P. Gunnellini, M. Guthoff, A. Harb, J. Hauk, M. Hempel[17], H. Jung, M. Kasemann, J. Keaveney, C. Kleinwort, I. Korol, D. Krücker, W. Lange, A. Lelek, T. Lenz, K. Lipka, W. Lohmann[17], R. Mankel, I.-A. Melzer-Pellmann, A.B. Meyer, M. Missiroli, G. Mittag, J. Mnich, A. Mussgiller, E. Ntomari, D. Pitzl, A. Raspereza, M. Savitskyi, P. Saxena, R. Shevchenko, N. Stefaniuk, G.P. Van Onsem, R. Walsh, Y. Wen, K. Wichmann, C. Wissing, O. Zenaiev

University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany
R. Aggleton, S. Bein, V. Blobel, M. Centis Vignali, T. Dreyer, E. Garutti, D. Gonzalez, J. Haller, A. Hinzmann, M. Hoffmann, A. Karavdina, R. Klanner, R. Kogler, N. Kovalchuk, S. Kurz, D. Marconi, M. Meyer, M. Niedziela, D. Nowatschin, F. Pantaleo[14], T. Peiffer, A. Perieanu, C. Scharf, P. Schleper, A. Schmidt, S. Schumann, J. Schwandt, J. Sonneveld, H. Stadie, G. Steinbrück, F.M. Stober, M. Stöver, H. Tholen, D. Troendle, E. Usai, A. Vanhoefer, B. Vormwald

Institut für Experimentelle Kernphysik, Karlsruhe, Germany
M. Akbiyik, C. Barth, M. Baselga, S. Baur, E. Butz, R. Caspart, T. Chwalek, F. Colombo, W. De Boer, A. Dierlamm, N. Faltermann, B. Freund, R. Friese, M. Giffels, M.A. Harrendorf, F. Hartmann[14], S.M. Heindl, U. Husemann, F. Kassel[14], S. Kudella, H. Mildner, M.U. Mozer, Th. Müller, M. Plagge, G. Quast, K. Rabbertz, M. Schröder, I. Shvetsov, G. Sieber, H.J. Simonis, R. Ulrich, S. Wayand, M. Weber, T. Weiler, S. Williamson, C. Wöhrmann, R. Wolf

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

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

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

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

MTA-ELTE Lendület CMS Particle and Nuclear Physics Group, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary
M. Csanad, N. Filipovic, G. Pasztor, O. Surányi, G.I. Veres[18]

Wigner Research Centre for Physics, Budapest, Hungary
G. Bencze, C. Hajdu, D. Horvath[19], Á. Hunyadi, F. Sikler, V. Veszpremi, G. Vesztergombi[18]

Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary
N. Beni, S. Czellar, J. Karancsi[20], A. Makovec, J. Molnar, Z. Szillasi

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

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

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

Panjab University, Chandigarh, India
S. Bansal, S.B. Beri, V. Bhatnagar, R. Chawla, N. Dhingra, A. Kaur, M. Kaur, S. Kaur, R. Kumar, P. Kumari, A. Mehta, J.B. Singh, G. Walia

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

Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, HBNI, Kolkata, India
R. Bhardwaj[23], R. Bhattacharya, S. Bhattacharya, U. Bhawandeep[23], D. Bhowmik, S. Dey, S. Dutt[23], S. Dutta, S. Ghosh, N. Majumdar, A. Modak, K. Mondal, S. Mukhopadhyay, S. Nandan, A. Purohit, P.K. Rout, A. Roy, S. Roy Chowdhury, S. Sarkar, M. Sharan, B. Singh, S. Thakur[23]

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

Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, Mumbai, India
R. Chudasama, D. Dutta, V. Jha, V. Kumar, A.K. Mohanty[14], P.K. Netrakanti, L.M. Pant, P. Shukla, A. Topkar

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

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-B, Mumbai, India
S. Banerjee, S. Bhattacharya, S. Chatterjee, P. Das, M. Guchait, Sa. Jain, S. Kumar, M. Maity[24], G. Majumder, K. Mazumdar, T. Sarkar[24], N. Wickramage[25]

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

Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM), Tehran, Iran
S. Chenarani[26], E. Eskandari Tadavani, S.M. Etesami[26], M. Khakzad, M. Mohammadi Najafabadi, M. Naseri, S. Paktinat Mehdiabadi[27], F. Rezaei Hosseinabadi, B. Safarzadeh[28], 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], F. Errico[a,b], L. Fiore[a], G. Iaselli[a,c], S. Lezki[a,b], G. Maggi[a,c], M. Maggi[a], G. Miniello[a,b], S. My[a,b], S. Nuzzo[a,b], A. Pompili[a,b], G. Pugliese[a,c], R. Radogna[a], A. Ranieri[a], G. Selvaggi[a,b], A. Sharma[a], L. Silvestris[a,14], R. Venditti[a], P. Verwilligen[a]

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

28

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

INFN Sezione di Firenze ^{a}, Università di Firenze ^{b}, Firenze, Italy
G. Barbagli^a, K. Chatterjee^{a,b}, V. Ciulli^{a,b}, C. Civinini^a, R. D'Alessandro^{a,b}, E. Focardi^{a,b}, P. Lenzi^{a,b}, M. Meschini^a, S. Paoletti^a, L. Russo^{a,29}, G. Sguazzoni^a, D. Strom^a, L. Viliani^a

INFN Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, Frascati, Italy
L. Benussi, S. Bianco, F. Fabbri, D. Piccolo, F. Primavera^{14}

INFN Sezione di Genova ^{a}, Università di Genova ^{b}, Genova, Italy
V. Calvelli^{a,b}, F. Ferro^a, 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, L. Brianza^{a,b}, F. Brivio^{a,b}, V. Ciriolo^{a,b,14}, M.E. Dinardo^{a,b}, S. Fiorendi^{a,b}, S. Gennai^a, A. Ghezzi^{a,b}, P. Govoni^{a,b}, M. Malberti^{a,b}, S. Malvezzi^a, R.A. Manzoni^{a,b}, D. Menasce^a, L. Moroni^a, M. Paganoni^{a,b}, K. Pauwels^{a,b}, D. Pedrini^a, S. Pigazzini^{a,b,30}, S. Ragazzi^{a,b}, T. Tabarelli de Fatis^{a,b}

INFN Sezione di Napoli ^{a}, Università di Napoli 'Federico II' ^{b}, Napoli, Italy, Università della Basilicata ^{c}, Potenza, Italy, Università G. Marconi ^{d}, Roma, Italy
S. Buontempo^a, N. Cavallo^{a,c}, S. Di Guida^{a,d,14}, F. Fabozzi^{a,c}, F. Fienga^{a,b}, A.O.M. Iorio^{a,b}, W.A. Khan^a, L. Lista^a, S. Meola^{a,d,14}, P. Paolucci^{a,14}, C. Sciacca^{a,b}, F. Thyssen^a

INFN Sezione di Padova ^{a}, Università di Padova ^{b}, Padova, Italy, Università di Trento ^{c}, Trento, Italy
P. Azzi^a, N. Bacchetta^a, S. Badoer^a, L. Benato^{a,b}, D. Bisello^{a,b}, A. Boletti^{a,b}, R. Carlin^{a,b}, A. Carvalho Antunes De Oliveira^{a,b}, P. Checchia^a, M. Dall'Osso^{a,b}, P. De Castro Manzano^a, T. Dorigo^a, U. Dosselli^a, U. Gasparini^{a,b}, S. Lacaprara^a, P. Lujan, M. Margoni^{a,b}, A.T. Meneguzzo^{a,b}, N. Pozzobon^{a,b}, P. Ronchese^{a,b}, R. Rossin^{a,b}, F. Simonetto^{a,b}, A. Tiko, E. Torassa^a, 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
L. Alunni Solestizi^{a,b}, M. Biasini^{a,b}, G.M. Bilei^a, C. Cecchi^{a,b}, D. Ciangottini^{a,b}, L. Fanò^{a,b}, P. Lariccia^{a,b}, R. Leonardi^{a,b}, E. Manoni^a, G. Mantovani^{a,b}, V. Mariani^{a,b}, M. Menichelli^a, A. Rossi^{a,b}, A. Santocchia^{a,b}, D. Spiga^a

INFN Sezione di Pisa ^{a}, Università di Pisa ^{b}, Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa ^{c}, Pisa, Italy
K. Androsov^a, P. Azzurri^{a,14}, G. Bagliesi^a, L. Bianchini^a, T. Boccali^a, L. Borrello, R. Castaldi^a, M.A. Ciocci^{a,b}, R. Dell'Orso^a, G. Fedi^a, L. Giannini^{a,c}, A. Giassi^a, M.T. Grippo^{a,29}, F. Ligabue^{a,c}, T. Lomtadze^a, E. Manca^{a,c}, G. Mandorli^{a,c}, A. Messineo^{a,b}, F. Palla^a, A. Rizzi^{a,b}, A. Savoy-Navarro^{a,31}, P. Spagnolo^a, R. Tenchini^a, G. Tonelli^{a,b}, A. Venturi^a, P.G. Verdini^a

INFN Sezione di Roma ^{a}, Sapienza Università di Roma ^{b}, Rome, Italy
L. Barone^{a,b}, F. Cavallari^a, M. Cipriani^{a,b}, N. Daci^a, D. Del Re^{a,b}, E. Di Marco^{a,b}, M. Diemoz^a, S. Gelli^{a,b}, E. Longo^{a,b}, F. Margaroli^{a,b}, B. Marzocchi^{a,b}, P. Meridiani^a, G. Organtini^{a,b}, R. Paramatti^{a,b}, F. Preiato^{a,b}, S. Rahatlou^{a,b}, C. Rovelli^a, F. Santanastasio^{a,b}

INFN Sezione di Torino ^{a}, Università di Torino ^{b}, Torino, Italy, Università del Piemonte Orientale ^{c}, Novara, Italy
N. Amapane^{a,b}, R. Arcidiacono^{a,c}, S. Argiro^{a,b}, M. Arneodo^{a,c}, N. Bartosik^a, R. Bellan^{a,b},

C. Biino[a], N. Cartiglia[a], F. Cenna[a,b], M. Costa[a,b], R. Covarelli[a,b], A. Degano[a,b], N. Demaria[a], B. Kiani[a,b], C. Mariotti[a], S. Maselli[a], E. Migliore[a,b], V. Monaco[a,b], E. Monteil[a,b], M. Monteno[a], M.M. Obertino[a,b], L. Pacher[a,b], N. Pastrone[a], M. Pelliccioni[a], G.L. Pinna Angioni[a,b], A. Romero[a,b], M. Ruspa[a,c], R. Sacchi[a,b], K. Shchelina[a,b], V. Sola[a], A. Solano[a,b], A. Staiano[a], P. Traczyk[a,b]

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

Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea
D.H. Kim, G.N. Kim, M.S. Kim, J. Lee, S. Lee, S.W. Lee, C.S. Moon, Y.D. Oh, 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
J.A. Brochero Cifuentes, J. Goh, T.J. Kim

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

Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea
J. Almond, J. Kim, 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
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. Dudenas, A. Juodagalvis, J. Vaitkus

National Centre for Particle Physics, Universiti Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
I. Ahmed, Z.A. Ibrahim, M.A.B. Md Ali[32], F. Mohamad Idris[33], W.A.T. Wan Abdullah, M.N. Yusli, Z. Zolkapli

Centro de Investigacion y de Estudios Avanzados del IPN, Mexico City, Mexico
Duran-Osuna, M. C., H. Castilla-Valdez, E. De La Cruz-Burelo, Ramirez-Sanchez, G., I. Heredia-De La Cruz[34], Rabadan-Trejo, R. I., R. Lopez-Fernandez, J. Mejia Guisao, Reyes-Almanza, R, 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
P.H. Butler

National Centre for Physics, Quaid-I-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan
A. Ahmad, M. Ahmad, 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, K. Nawrocki, M. Szleper, P. Zalewski

Institute of Experimental Physics, Faculty of Physics, University of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland
K. Bunkowski, A. Byszuk[35], K. Doroba, A. Kalinowski, M. Konecki, J. Krolikowski, M. Misiura, M. Olszewski, A. Pyskir, M. Walczak

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

Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia
V. Alexakhin, P. Bunin, M. Gavrilenko, A. Golunov, I. Golutvin, N. Gorbounov, I. Gorbunov, V. Karjavin, A. Lanev, A. Malakhov, V. Matveev[36,37], P. Moisenz, V. Palichik, V. Perelygin, M. Savina, S. Shmatov, S. Shulha, V. Smirnov, A. Zarubin

Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, Gatchina (St. Petersburg), Russia
Y. Ivanov, V. Kim[38], E. Kuznetsova[39], P. Levchenko, V. Murzin, V. Oreshkin, I. Smirnov, D. Sosnov, V. Sulimov, L. Uvarov, S. Vavilov, A. Vorobyev

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

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

Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Moscow, Russia
T. Aushev, A. Bylinkin[37]

National Research Nuclear University 'Moscow Engineering Physics Institute' (MEPhI), Moscow, Russia
R. Chistov[40], M. Danilov[40], P. Parygin, D. Philippov, S. Polikarpov, E. Tarkovskii

P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia
V. Andreev, M. Azarkin[37], I. Dremin[37], M. Kirakosyan[37], S.V. Rusakov, A. Terkulov

Skobeltsyn Institute of Nuclear Physics, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia
A. Baskakov, A. Belyaev, E. Boos, M. Dubinin[41], L. Dudko, A. Ershov, A. Gribushin, V. Klyukhin, O. Kodolova, I. Lokhtin, I. Miagkov, S. Obraztsov, S. Petrushanko, V. Savrin, A. Snigirev

Novosibirsk State University (NSU), Novosibirsk, Russia
V. Blinov[42], D. Shtol[42], Y. Skovpen[42]

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

University of Belgrade, Faculty of Physics and Vinca Institute of Nuclear Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia
P. Adzic[43], 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, 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, I. Gonzalez Caballero, J.R. González Fernández, E. Palencia Cortezon, 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, E. Curras, 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

CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland
D. Abbaneo, B. Akgun, E. Auffray, P. Baillon, A.H. Ball, D. Barney, J. Bendavid, M. Bianco, A. Bocci, C. Botta, T. Camporesi, R. Castello, M. Cepeda, G. Cerminara, E. Chapon, Y. Chen, D. d'Enterria, A. Dabrowski, V. Daponte, A. David, M. De Gruttola, A. De Roeck, N. Deelen, M. Dobson, T. du Pree, M. Dünser, N. Dupont, A. Elliott-Peisert, P. Everaerts, F. Fallavollita, G. Franzoni, J. Fulcher, W. Funk, D. Gigi, A. Gilbert, K. Gill, F. Glege, D. Gulhan, J. Hegeman, V. Innocente, A. Jafari, P. Janot, O. Karacheban[17], J. Kieseler, V. Knünz, A. Kornmayer, M.J. Kortelainen, M. Krammer[1], C. Lange, P. Lecoq, C. Lourenço, M.T. Lucchini, L. Malgeri, M. Mannelli, A. Martelli, F. Meijers, J.A. Merlin, S. Mersi, E. Meschi, P. Milenovic[44], F. Moortgat, M. Mulders, H. Neugebauer, J. Ngadiuba, S. Orfanelli, L. Orsini, L. Pape, E. Perez, M. Peruzzi, A. Petrilli, G. Petrucciani, A. Pfeiffer, M. Pierini, F.M. Pitters, D. Rabady, A. Racz, T. Reis, G. Rolandi[45], M. Rovere, H. Sakulin, C. Schäfer, C. Schwick, M. Seidel, M. Selvaggi, A. Sharma, P. Silva, P. Sphicas[46], A. Stakia, J. Steggemann, M. Stoye, M. Tosi, D. Treille, A. Tsirou, V. Veckalns[47], M. Verweij, W.D. Zeuner

Paul Scherrer Institut, Villigen, Switzerland
W. Bertl[†], L. Caminada[48], 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, B. Casal, G. Dissertori, M. Dittmar, M. Donegà, C. Dorfer, C. Grab, C. Heidegger, D. Hits, J. Hoss, G. Kasieczka, T. Klijnsma, W. Lustermann, B. Mangano, M. Marionneau, M.T. Meinhard, D. Meister, F. Micheli, P. Musella, F. Nessi-Tedaldi, F. Pandolfi,

J. Pata, F. Pauss, G. Perrin, L. Perrozzi, M. Quittnat, M. Reichmann, 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. Amsler[49], M.F. Canelli, A. De Cosa, R. Del Burgo, S. Donato, C. Galloni, T. Hreus, B. Kilminster, D. Pinna, G. Rauco, P. Robmann, D. Salerno, K. Schweiger, C. Seitz, Y. Takahashi, A. Zucchetta

National Central University, Chung-Li, Taiwan
V. Candelise, Y.H. Chang, K.y. Cheng, T.H. Doan, Sh. Jain, 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, F. Fiori, W.-S. Hou, Y. Hsiung, Arun Kumar, Y.F. Liu, R.-S. Lu, E. Paganis, A. Psallidas, A. Steen, J.f. Tsai

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

Çukurova University, Physics Department, Science and Art Faculty, Adana, Turkey
A. Bat, F. Boran, S. Cerci[50], S. Damarseckin, Z.S. Demiroglu, C. Dozen, I. Dumanoglu, S. Girgis, G. Gokbulut, Y. Guler, I. Hos[51], E.E. Kangal[52], O. Kara, A. Kayis Topaksu, U. Kiminsu, M. Oglakci, G. Onengut, K. Ozdemir[53], D. Sunar Cerci[50], B. Tali[50], U.G. Tok, S. Turkcapar, I.S. Zorbakir, C. Zorbilmez

Middle East Technical University, Physics Department, Ankara, Turkey
G. Karapinar[54], K. Ocalan[55], M. Yalvac, M. Zeyrek

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

Istanbul Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey
M.N. Agaras, S. Atay, A. Cakir, K. Cankocak, Y. Komurcu

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, L. Beck, J.J. Brooke, D. Burns, E. Clement, D. Cussans, O. Davignon, H. Flacher, J. Goldstein, G.P. Heath, H.F. Heath, L. Kreczko, D.M. Newbold[59], S. Paramesvaran, T. Sakuma, S. Seif El Nasr-storey, D. Smith, V.J. Smith

Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom
K.W. Bell, A. Belyaev[60], C. Brew, R.M. Brown, L. Calligaris, D. Cieri, D.J.A. Cockerill, J.A. Coughlan, K. Harder, S. Harper, J. Linacre, E. Olaiya, D. Petyt, C.H. Shepherd-Themistocleous, A. Thea, I.R. Tomalin, T. Williams, W.J. Womersley

Imperial College, London, United Kingdom
G. Auzinger, R. Bainbridge, P. Bloch, J. Borg, S. Breeze, O. Buchmuller, A. Bundock, S. Casasso, M. Citron, D. Colling, L. Corpe, P. Dauncey, G. Davies, M. Della Negra, R. Di Maria, Y. Haddad, G. Hall, G. Iles, T. James, R. Lane, C. Laner, L. Lyons, A.-M. Magnan, S. Malik, L. Mastrolorenzo,

T. Matsushita, J. Nash[61], A. Nikitenko[6], V. Palladino, M. Pesaresi, D.M. Raymond, A. Richards, A. Rose, E. Scott, C. Seez, A. Shtipliyski, S. Summers, A. Tapper, K. Uchida, M. Vazquez Acosta[62], T. Virdee[14], N. Wardle, D. Winterbottom, J. Wright, S.C. Zenz

Brunel University, Uxbridge, United Kingdom
J.E. Cole, P.R. Hobson, A. Khan, P. Kyberd, A. Morton, I.D. Reid, L. Teodorescu, S. Zahid

Baylor University, Waco, USA
A. Borzou, K. Call, J. Dittmann, K. Hatakeyama, H. Liu, 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, A. Avetisyan, T. Bose, D. Gastler, D. Rankin, C. Richardson, J. Rohlf, L. Sulak, D. Zou

Brown University, Providence, USA
G. Benelli, D. Cutts, M. Hadley, J. Hakala, U. Heintz, J.M. Hogan, K.H.M. Kwok, E. Laird, G. Landsberg, J. Lee, Z. Mao, M. Narain, J. Pazzini, S. Piperov, S. Sagir, R. Syarif, 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, R. Lander, C. Mclean, M. Mulhearn, D. Pellett, J. Pilot, S. Shalhout, M. Shi, J. Smith, D. Stolp, D. Taylor, K. Tos, M. Tripathi, Z. Wang

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. Ellison, 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, 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. Wasserbaech[63], J. Wood, F. Würthwein, A. Yagil, G. Zevi Della Porta

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

California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA
D. Anderson, A. Bornheim, J. Bunn, I. Dutta, J.M. Lawhorn, H.B. Newman, T. Q. Nguyen, C. Pena, 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, J. Russ, M. Sun, H. Vogel, I. Vorobiev, M. Weinberg

University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, USA

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

Cornell University, Ithaca, USA

J. Alexander, J. Chaves, Y. Cheng, J. Chu, S. Dittmer, 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, G. Bolla[†], K. Burkett, J.N. Butler, A. Canepa, G.B. Cerati, H.W.K. Cheung, F. Chlebana, M. Cremonesi, J. Duarte, V.D. Elvira, J. Freeman, Z. Gecse, E. Gottschalk, L. Gray, D. Green, S. Grünendahl, O. Gutsche, J. Hanlon, R.M. Harris, S. Hasegawa, J. Hirschauer, Z. Hu, B. Jayatilaka, S. Jindariani, M. Johnson, U. Joshi, B. Klima, B. Kreis, S. Lammel, D. Lincoln, R. Lipton, M. Liu, T. Liu, R. Lopes De Sá, J. Lykken, K. Maeshima, N. Magini, J.M. Marraffino, D. Mason, P. McBride, P. Merkel, S. Mrenna, S. Nahn, V. O'Dell, K. Pedro, O. Prokofyev, G. Rakness, L. Ristori, 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, W. Wu

University of Florida, Gainesville, USA

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

Florida International University, Miami, USA

Y.R. Joshi, S. Linn, P. Markowitz, J.L. Rodriguez

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, A. Santra, V. Sharma, R. Yohay

Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, USA

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

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

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

The University of Iowa, Iowa City, USA

B. Bilki[64], W. Clarida, K. Dilsiz[65], S. Durgut, R.P. Gandrajula, M. Haytmyradov, V. Khristenko, J.-P. Merlo, H. Mermerkaya[66], A. Mestvirishvili, A. Moeller, J. Nachtman, H. Ogul[67], Y. Onel, F. Ozok[68], A. Penzo, C. Snyder, E. Tiras, J. Wetzel, K. Yi

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA

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

The University of Kansas, Lawrence, USA
A. Al-bataineh, P. Baringer, A. Bean, S. Boren, J. Bowen, J. Castle, S. Khalil, A. Kropivnitskaya, D. Majumder, W. Mcbrayer, M. Murray, C. Rogan, C. Royon, S. Sanders, E. Schmitz, J.D. Tapia Takaki, Q. Wang

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

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, F. Ricci-Tam, Y.H. Shin, A. Skuja, S.C. Tonwar

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, USA
D. Abercrombie, B. Allen, V. Azzolini, R. Barbieri, 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, A. Levin, P.D. Luckey, B. Maier, A.C. Marini, C. Mcginn, C. Mironov, S. Narayanan, X. Niu, C. Paus, C. Roland, G. Roland, J. Salfeld-Nebgen, G.S.F. Stephans, K. 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, S. Kalafut, Y. Kubota, Z. Lesko, J. Mans, S. Nourbakhsh, N. Ruckstuhl, R. Rusack, J. Turkewitz, 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
J. Dolen, A. Godshalk, C. Harrington, I. Iashvili, D. Nguyen, A. Parker, S. Rappoccio, B. Roozbahani

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

Northwestern University, Evanston, USA
S. Bhattacharya, 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. Musienko[36], 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, A. Hart, C. Hill, W. Ji, T.Y. Ling, B. Liu, W. Luo, B.L. Winer, H.W. Wulsin

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

University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez, USA
S. Malik, S. Norberg

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

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

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

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

The Rockefeller University, New York, USA
R. Ciesielski, K. Goulianos, C. Mesropian

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

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

Texas A&M University, College Station, USA
O. Bouhali[69], A. Castaneda Hernandez[69], A. Celik, M. Dalchenko, M. De Mattia, A. Delgado, S. Dildick, R. Eusebi, J. Gilmore, T. Huang, T. Kamon[70], R. Mueller, Y. Pakhotin, R. Patel, A. Perloff, L. Perniè, D. Rathjens, A. Safonov, A. Tatarinov, K.A. Ulmer

Texas Tech University, Lubbock, USA
N. Akchurin, J. Damgov, F. De Guio, P.R. Dudero, J. Faulkner, E. Gurpinar, 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, P. Sheldon, S. Tuo, J. Velkovska, 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, L. Dodd, S. Duric, B. Gomber, M. Grothe, M. Herndon, A. Hervé, U. Hussain, P. Klabbers, A. Lanaro, A. Levine, K. Long, R. Loveless, V. Rekovic, T. Ruggles, A. Savin, 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 Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia
7: Also at Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia
8: Also at Helwan University, Cairo, Egypt
9: Now at Zewail City of Science and Technology, Zewail, Egypt
10: Now at British University in Egypt, Cairo, Egypt
11: Also at Department of Physics; King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
12: Also at Université de Haute Alsace, Mulhouse, France
13: Also at Skobeltsyn Institute of Nuclear Physics; Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia
14: Also at CERN; European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland
15: Also at RWTH Aachen University; III. Physikalisches Institut A, Aachen, Germany
16: Also at University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany
17: Also at Brandenburg University of Technology, Cottbus, Germany
18: Also at MTA-ELTE Lendület CMS Particle and Nuclear Physics Group; Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary
19: Also at Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary
20: Also at Institute of Physics; University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary
21: Also at Indian Institute of Technology Bhubaneswar, Bhubaneswar, India
22: Also at Institute of Physics, Bhubaneswar, India
23: Also at Shoolini University, Solan, India
24: Also at University of Visva-Bharati, Santiniketan, India
25: Also at University of Ruhuna, Matara, Sri Lanka
26: Also at Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, Iran
27: Also at Yazd University, Yazd, Iran
28: Also at Plasma Physics Research Center; Science and Research Branch; Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
29: Also at Università degli Studi di Siena, Siena, Italy
30: Also at INFN Sezione di Milano-Bicocca; Università di Milano-Bicocca, Milano, Italy
31: Also at Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA
32: Also at International Islamic University of Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
33: Also at Malaysian Nuclear Agency; MOSTI, Kajang, Malaysia
34: Also at Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología, Mexico city, Mexico
35: Also at Warsaw University of Technology; Institute of Electronic Systems, Warsaw, Poland
36: Also at Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia
37: Now at National Research Nuclear University 'Moscow Engineering Physics Institute' (MEPhI), Moscow, Russia
38: Also at St. Petersburg State Polytechnical University, St. Petersburg, Russia
39: Also at University of Florida, Gainesville, USA
40: Also at P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia