

CERN-PH-EP/2011-137  
2011/09/29

CMS-TAU-11-001

# Performance of $\tau$ -lepton reconstruction and identification in CMS

The CMS Collaboration\*

## Abstract

The performance of  $\tau$ -lepton reconstruction and identification algorithms is studied using a data sample of proton-proton collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 7$  TeV, corresponding to an integrated luminosity of  $36 \text{ pb}^{-1}$  collected with the CMS detector at the LHC. The  $\tau$  leptons that decay into one or three charged hadrons, zero or more short-lived neutral hadrons, and a neutrino are identified using final-state particles reconstructed in the CMS tracker and electromagnetic calorimeter. The reconstruction efficiency of the algorithms is measured using  $\tau$  leptons produced in Z-boson decays. The  $\tau$ -lepton misidentification rates for jets and electrons are determined.

*Submitted to the Journal of Instrumentation*

arXiv:1109.6034v1 [physics.ins-det] 27 Sep 2011

---

\*See Appendix A for the list of collaboration members



## 1 Introduction

The primary goal of the Compact Muon Solenoid (CMS) [1] experiment is to explore particle physics at the TeV energy scale by studying the final states produced in the proton-proton collisions at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) [2]. Leptons play a very important role in these studies because they often represent an experimentally favourable signature.

The three generations of charged leptons, electrons, muons, and taus, are characterized by their masses. Because of their higher mass,  $\tau$  leptons play a crucial role in the searches for the standard model (SM) Higgs boson, especially for the mass region below twice the W-boson mass. The motivation for searches for the Higgs boson in its  $\tau$ -leptonic decays is also supported for example by the minimal supersymmetric standard model (MSSM) [3]. Other models of new physics, such as supersymmetric left-right models (SUSYLR), also predict increased couplings to the third-generation charged fermions. As a result, the decay chains of the supersymmetric particles lead to the lighter stau, which can lead to multi-tau final states [4]. Lepton universality ensures that one third of W and Z-boson leptonic decays result in  $\tau$  leptons. When measuring rare processes, this contribution becomes substantial. For example, in the search for high-mass SM Higgs bosons that decay preferentially into W and Z bosons, the addition of modes with  $\tau$  leptons in the final state improves the early discovery potential.

The lifetime of  $\tau$  leptons is short enough that they decay before reaching the detector elements. In two thirds of the cases,  $\tau$  leptons decay hadronically, typically into one or three charged mesons (predominantly  $\pi^+$ ,  $\pi^-$ ), often accompanied by neutral pions (decaying via  $\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ ), and a  $\nu_\tau$ .

The CMS collaboration has designed algorithms that use final-state photons and charged hadrons to identify hadronic decays of  $\tau$  leptons ( $\tau_h$ ) through the reconstruction of the intermediate resonances. The  $\nu_\tau$  escapes undetected and is not considered in the  $\tau_h$  reconstruction. These algorithms use decay mode identification techniques and efficiently discriminate against potentially large backgrounds from quarks and gluons that occasionally hadronize into jets of low particle multiplicity. The algorithms described here have already been successfully used in a measurement of the  $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$  production cross section [5] and in a search for neutral MSSM Higgs bosons decaying into  $\tau$  pairs [6].

This paper describes performance studies based on a sample of proton-proton collisions collected during 2010 at  $\sqrt{s} = 7$  TeV, corresponding to an integrated luminosity of  $36 \text{ pb}^{-1}$ . The analysis uses genuine taus from inclusive  $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$  production. One tau is required to decay leptonically, into a muon, and the other one hadronically, thus creating a  $\mu\tau_h$  final state. The analysis provides estimates of the  $\tau_h$  reconstruction and identification efficiency, and determines the misidentification rate, the probability for quark and gluon jets or electrons to be misidentified as  $\tau_h$ . This paper uses the selection requirements that are most commonly used in the Z and Higgs analyses, and compares the LHC collision data with predictions based on Monte Carlo (MC) simulation.

## 2 CMS Detector

A detailed description of CMS can be found elsewhere [1]. The central feature of the CMS apparatus is a superconducting solenoid of 6 m internal diameter, providing a magnetic field of 3.8 T. Within the field volume are the silicon pixel and strip tracker, the crystal electromagnetic calorimeter (ECAL), and the brass/scintillator hadron calorimeter. Muons are measured in gas-ionization detectors embedded in the steel return yoke.

CMS uses a right-handed coordinate system, with the origin at the nominal interaction point, the  $x$  axis pointing to the centre of the LHC ring, the  $y$  axis pointing up perpendicular to the LHC plane, and the  $z$  axis along the counterclockwise beam direction. The polar angle  $\theta$  is measured from the positive  $z$  axis and the azimuthal angle  $\phi$  is measured in the  $x$ - $y$  plane. Variables used in this article are the pseudorapidity,  $\eta \equiv -\ln[\tan(\theta/2)]$ , and the transverse momentum,  $p_T = \sqrt{p_x^2 + p_y^2}$ .

The ECAL is designed to have both excellent energy resolution and high granularity, properties that are crucial for reconstructing electrons and photons produced in  $\tau$ -lepton decays. The ECAL is constructed with projective lead tungstate crystals in two pseudorapidity regions: the barrel ( $|\eta| < 1.479$ ) and the endcap ( $1.479 < |\eta| < 3$ ). In the barrel region, the crystals are  $25.8X_0$  long, where  $X_0$  is the radiation length, and provide a granularity of  $\Delta\eta \times \Delta\phi = 0.0174 \times 0.0174$ . The endcap region is instrumented with a lead/silicon-strip preshower detector consisting of two orthogonal strip detectors with a strip pitch of 1.9 mm. One plane is at a depth of  $2X_0$  and the other at  $3X_0$ . The ECAL has an energy resolution of better than 0.5% for unconverted photons with transverse energies above 100 GeV.

The inner tracker measures charged particle tracks within the range  $|\eta| < 2.5$ . It consists of 1 440 silicon pixel and 15 148 silicon strip detector modules, and provides an impact parameter resolution of  $\sim 15 \mu\text{m}$  and a transverse momentum resolution of about 1.5% for 100 GeV particles. The reconstructed tracks are used to measure the location of interaction vertex(es). The spatial resolution of the reconstruction is  $\approx 25 \mu\text{m}$  for vertexes with more than 30 associated tracks [7].

The muon barrel region is covered by drift tubes, and the endcap regions by cathode strip chambers. In both regions, resistive plate chambers provide additional coordinate and timing information. Muons can be reconstructed in the range  $|\eta| < 2.4$ , with a typical  $p_T$  resolution of 1% for  $p_T \approx 40 \text{ GeV}/c$ .

### 3 CMS $\tau_h$ Reconstruction Algorithms

CMS has developed two algorithms for identifying  $\tau_h$  decays, based on the categorization of the  $\tau_h$ -decay channels through the reconstruction of intermediate resonances: the hadron plus strips (HPS) and the tau neural classifier (TaNC) algorithms. The HPS algorithm is used as the main algorithm in most previous CMS  $\tau$  analyses, with TaNC used for crosschecks. Both algorithms use particle flow (PF [8]) particles. In the PF approach, information from all sub-detectors is combined to reconstruct and identify all particles produced in the collision. The particles are classified into mutually exclusive categories: charged hadrons, photons, neutral hadrons, muons, and electrons. These algorithms are designed to optimize the performance of the  $\tau_h$  identification and reconstruction by considering the different hadronic decay modes of the tau individually. The dominant hadronic decays of  $\tau$  leptons consist of one or three charged  $\pi$  mesons and up to two  $\pi^0$  mesons, as summarized in Table 1.

Both algorithms start the reconstruction of a  $\tau_h$  candidate from a PF jet, whose four-momentum is reconstructed using the anti- $k_T$  algorithm with a distance parameter  $R = 0.5$  [10]. Using a PF jet as an initial seed, the algorithms first reconstruct the  $\pi^0$  components of the  $\tau_h$ , then combine them with charged hadrons to reconstruct the tau decay mode and calculate the tau four-momentum and isolation quantities.

Table 1: Branching fractions of the dominant hadronic decays of the  $\tau$  lepton and the symbol and mass of any intermediate resonance [9]. The  $h$  stands for both  $\pi$  and  $K$ , but in this analysis the  $\pi$  mass is assigned to all charged particles. The table is symmetric under charge conjugation.

Decay mode	Resonance	Mass (MeV/ $c^2$ )	Branching fraction (%)
$\tau^- \rightarrow h^- \nu_\tau$			11.6%
$\tau^- \rightarrow h^- \pi^0 \nu_\tau$	$\rho^-$	770	26.0%
$\tau^- \rightarrow h^- \pi^0 \pi^0 \nu_\tau$	$a_1^-$	1200	9.5%
$\tau^- \rightarrow h^- h^+ h^- \nu_\tau$	$a_1^-$	1200	9.8%
$\tau^- \rightarrow h^- h^+ h^- \pi^0 \nu_\tau$			4.8%

### 3.1 HPS Algorithm

The HPS algorithm gives special attention to photon conversions in the CMS tracker material. The bending of electron/positron tracks in the magnetic field of the CMS solenoid broadens the calorimeter signatures of neutral pions in the azimuthal direction. This effect is taken into account in the HPS algorithm by reconstructing photons in “strips”, objects that are built out of electromagnetic particles (PF photons and electrons). The strip reconstruction starts by centering a strip on the most energetic electromagnetic particle within the PF jet. The algorithm then searches for other electromagnetic particles within a window of size  $\Delta\eta = 0.05$  and  $\Delta\phi = 0.20$  centered on the strip center. If other electromagnetic particles are found within that window, the most energetic one gets associated with the strip and the strip four-momentum is recalculated. The procedure is repeated until no further particles are found that can be associated with the strip. Strips satisfying a minimum transverse momentum requirement of  $p_T^{\text{strip}} > 1 \text{ GeV}/c$  are finally combined with the charged hadrons to reconstruct individual  $\tau_h$  decay modes.

The decay topologies that are considered by the HPS tau identification algorithm are

1. *Single hadron* corresponds to  $h^- \nu_\tau$  and  $h^- \pi^0 \nu_\tau$  decays in which the neutral pions have too little energy to be reconstructed as strips.
2. *One hadron + one strip* reconstructs the decay mode  $h^- \pi^0 \nu_\tau$  in events in which the photons from  $\pi^0$  decay are close together on the calorimeter surface.
3. *One hadron + two strips* corresponds to the decay mode  $h^- \pi^0 \nu_\tau$  in events in which photons from  $\pi^0$  decays are well separated.
4. *Three hadrons* corresponds to the decay mode  $h^- h^+ h^- \nu_\tau$ . The three charged hadrons are required to come from the same secondary vertex.

There are no separate decay topologies for the  $h^- \pi^0 \pi^0$  and  $h^- h^+ h^- \pi^0 \nu_\tau$  decay modes. They are reconstructed via the existing topologies. All charged hadrons and strips are required to be contained within a cone of size  $\Delta R = (2.8 \text{ GeV}/c)/p_T^{\tau_h}$ , where  $p_T^{\tau_h}$  is the transverse momentum of the reconstructed  $\tau_h$ . The reconstructed tau momentum  $\vec{p}^{\tau_h}$  is required to match the  $(\eta, \phi)$  direction of the original PF jet within a maximum distance of  $\Delta R = 0.1$ , where  $\Delta R = \sqrt{(\Delta\eta)^2 + (\Delta\phi)^2}$ .

The four-momenta of charged hadrons and strips are reconstructed according to the respective  $\tau_h$  decay topology hypothesis, assuming all charged hadrons to be pions, and are required to be consistent with the masses of the intermediate meson resonances listed in Table 1. The following invariant mass windows are allowed for candidates: 50 – 200 MeV/ $c^2$  for  $\pi^0$ , 0.3 –

1.3 GeV/ $c^2$  for  $\rho$ , and 0.8 – 1.5 GeV/ $c^2$  for  $a_1$ . In cases where a  $\tau_h$  decay is consistent with more than one hypothesis, the hypothesis giving the highest  $p_T^{\tau_h}$  is chosen.

Finally, reconstructed candidates are required to be isolated. The isolation criterion requires that, apart from the  $\tau_h$  decay products, there be no charged hadrons or photons present within an isolation cone of size  $\Delta R = 0.5$  around the direction of the  $\tau_h$ . By adjusting the  $p_T$  threshold for particles that are considered in the isolation cone, three working points, “loose”, “medium”, and “tight” are defined. The working points are determined using a simulated sample of QCD dijet events. The “loose” working point corresponds to a probability of approximately 1% for jets to be misidentified as  $\tau_h$ . Successive working points reduce the misidentification rate by a factor of two with respect to the previous one.

### 3.2 TaNC Algorithm

In the TaNC case the leading (highest- $p_T$ ) particle is required to have a  $p_T$  above 5 GeV/ $c$  and to be within  $\Delta R = 0.1$  around the jet direction. The PF  $\tau_h$  four-momentum is reconstructed as a sum of the four-momenta of all particles with  $p_T$  above 0.5 GeV/ $c$  in a cone of radius  $\Delta R = 0.15$  around the direction of the leading particle. A signal cone size is defined to be  $\Delta R_{\text{photons}} = 0.15$  for photons and  $\Delta R_{\text{charged}} = (5 \text{ GeV})/E_T$  for charged hadrons, where  $E_T$  is the transverse energy of the PF  $\tau_h$ , and  $\Delta R_{\text{charged}}$  is restricted to be within the range  $0.07 \leq \Delta R_{\text{charged}} \leq 0.15$ . The signal cone is the region where the  $\tau_h$  decay products are expected to be found. An isolation annulus is defined between the signal cone and a wider isolation cone of outer radius  $\Delta R = 0.5$  around the leading particle.

The decay mode is reconstructed from the particles that are contained within the signal cone of the  $\tau_h$  candidate by counting the number of tracks and  $\pi^0$  meson candidates. The  $\pi^0$  meson candidates are reconstructed by merging pairs of photons that have an invariant mass of less than 0.2 GeV/ $c^2$ . All unpaired photons are considered as  $\pi^0$  candidates if their  $p_T$  exceeds 10% of the PF  $\tau_h$  transverse momentum.

The decay mode of each  $\tau_h$  candidate is uniquely determined by the multiplicity of reconstructed objects in the signal cone. Candidates with decay topologies other than those listed in Table 1 are immediately rejected. Otherwise, a neural network is used to compute a discriminant quantity for the  $\tau_h$  candidate. Each decay mode of Table 1 uses a different neural network. The input observables used for each neural network are optimized for the topology of the decay mode, and are constructed from the four-momenta of the particles in the signal cone and the isolation annulus. In general, the signal cone input observables are chosen to parameterize the decay kinematics of the intermediate resonance, and the isolation cone observables to describe the multiplicity and  $p_T$  spectrum of nearby particles. The variables include angular correlations between different particles within the signal and the isolation cones, invariant masses calculated using different combinations of the particles, transverse momenta, and numbers of charged particles in the signal and the isolation regions. The neural networks are trained to discriminate between genuine  $\tau_h$  produced in  $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$  decays and misidentified jets from a sample of QCD multijet events. The set of input observables for a given neural network is chosen to be the minimal set of observables for which the removal of any two input variables significantly degrades the classification performance.

The output of the neural network is a continuous quantity. By adjusting the thresholds of selections on the neural network output, three working points, again called “loose”, “medium”, and “tight”, are defined, similar to those discussed in Section 3.1.

## 4 Efficiency of $\tau_h$ Reconstruction and Identification

To compare the performance of  $\tau_h$  reconstruction in data and MC simulation, a set of MC samples is used to reproduce a mixture of signal and background events. The signal is expected to come from inclusive  $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$  production. The major sources of background are  $\tau\tau$  Drell–Yan production outside of the  $Z$ -mass region,  $W$  production with associated jets, QCD multijet, and  $t\bar{t}$  production. The Drell–Yan signal and background are simulated with the next-to-leading order (NLO) MC generator POWHEG [11–13]. The QCD multijet and  $W$  backgrounds are simulated with PYTHIA [14] and the top quark samples with Madgraph [15]. The  $\tau$ -lepton decays are simulated with Tauola [16]. The samples are normalized using the cross section at next-to-next-to-leading order (NNLO) for Drell–Yan and  $W$ , at leading order (LO) for QCD, and NLO for the  $t\bar{t}$  sample. The MC samples are mixed based on the corresponding cross sections.

To measure the efficiency of  $\tau_h$  reconstruction and identification in data, a tag-and-probe method is used with a sample of  $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau \rightarrow \mu\tau_h$  events. The events are preselected using kinematic cuts and a set of requirements to suppress the background from  $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ ,  $W$ , and QCD events, but without applying the  $\tau_h$ -identification algorithms. The preselection requires the event to be triggered by a single-muon high level trigger [17], and to contain only one isolated muon with  $p_T^\mu > 15 \text{ GeV}/c$  within the geometric acceptance  $|\eta_\mu| < 2.1$ , that is used as a tag. An isolated jet candidate of  $p_T^{\text{jet}} > 20 \text{ GeV}/c$  within the geometric acceptance  $|\eta_{\text{jet}}| < 2.3$ , with a “leading” (highest- $p_T$ ) track constituent in the jet with  $p_T > 5 \text{ GeV}/c$ , is used as a probe. The preselection is needed to increase the percentage of  $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$  events in the final sample. This preselection clearly biases the sample, but the bias is taken into account when computing the final efficiency. The four-momentum of the jet is reconstructed using the anti- $k_T$  algorithm with a distance parameter of 0.5 [10]. The muon and the “leading” track in the jet are required to be of opposite charge. To suppress background from  $W$ +jet(s) events, an additional requirement on transverse mass,  $M_T$ , of the muon and missing transverse energy,  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$ , of less than 40 GeV is applied. The transverse mass is defined as  $M_T = \sqrt{2p_T^\mu E_T^{\text{miss}} \cdot (1 - \cos \Delta\phi)}$ , where  $p_T^\mu$  is the muon transverse momentum and  $\Delta\phi$  is the azimuthal angle between the  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  vector and  $p_T^\mu$ .

The HPS and TaNC algorithms are both applied to the preselected events. The resulting invariant mass distributions of the  $\mu$ -jet system for those events that pass or fail the  $\tau_h$  identification are fitted using signal and background distributions provided by MC simulation. The efficiency is then calculated as  $\varepsilon = N_{\text{pass}}^{Z \rightarrow \tau\tau} / (N_{\text{pass}}^{Z \rightarrow \tau\tau} + N_{\text{fail}}^{Z \rightarrow \tau\tau})$ , where  $N_{\text{pass,fail}}^{Z \rightarrow \tau\tau}$  are the numbers of  $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$  events after background contributions are subtracted. Figure 1 shows the invariant mass of the  $\mu$ -jet system for preselected events that pass (left) and fail (right) the “loose”  $\tau_h$  identification requirements. Since in the “failed” sample there is no  $\tau_h$  reconstructed, for consistency the visible mass is always computed using the jet four-vector and not the four-vector as reconstructed by the  $\tau_h$  algorithms. The MC predictions for signal and background events are also shown. The “passed” sample is dominated by  $Z$  events and a small background contribution. The sample of “failed” events is dominated by background contributions. The MC predictions describe the data reasonably well. The stability of the fit results is tested by using background estimates from data instead of the MC predictions and by varying the invariant mass ranges for the fit. All checks demonstrate consistent results within the uncertainties of the method.

Results of the fits are summarized in Table 2. The values measured in data, “Fit data”, are compared with the expected values, “Expected MC”, obtained by repeating the fitting procedure on simulated events. The efficiency of the  $\tau_h$  algorithms on preselected events is approximately 30% higher than for an inclusive sample, without preselection. In general the value of the ef-




Figure 1: Invariant mass distribution of the  $\mu$ -jet system for preselected events which pass (left) and fail (right) the HPS “loose”  $\tau_h$  identification requirements (solid symbols) compared to predictions of the MC simulation (histograms).

Table 2: Efficiency for a  $\tau_h$  to pass the HPS and TaNC identification criteria, measured by fitting the  $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$  signal contribution in the samples of the “passed” and “failed” preselected events. The uncertainties of the fit are statistical only. The statistical uncertainties of the MC predictions are small and can be neglected. The last column represents the data-to-MC correction factors and their full uncertainties including statistical and systematic components. Data-to-MC ratios for the  $\tau_h$  reconstruction efficiency determined using fits to the measured  $Z$  production cross sections as described in [5] are also shown.

Algorithm	Fit data	Expected MC	Data/MC
HPS “loose”	$0.70 \pm 0.15$	0.70	$1.00 \pm 0.24$
HPS “medium”	$0.53 \pm 0.13$	0.53	$1.01 \pm 0.26$
HPS “tight”	$0.33 \pm 0.08$	0.36	$0.93 \pm 0.25$
TaNC “loose”	$0.76 \pm 0.20$	0.72	$1.06 \pm 0.30$
TaNC “medium”	$0.63 \pm 0.17$	0.66	$0.96 \pm 0.27$
TaNC “tight”	$0.55 \pm 0.15$	0.55	$1.00 \pm 0.28$
HPS “loose”	$\tau\tau$ combined fit [5]		$0.94 \pm 0.09$
HPS “loose”	$\tau\tau$ to $\mu\mu, ee$ fit [5]		$0.96 \pm 0.07$



efficiency depends on the  $p_T$  and  $\eta$  requirements, which are applied in each individual physics analysis. The main goal of this study is to perform the data-to-MC comparison and to determine data-to-MC correction factors and their uncertainties. The agreement in the mean values of the fits between data and MC simulation is observed to be better than a few percent, although with this data sample, the statistical uncertainties of the fits are in the range of 20–30%.

Systematic uncertainties on the measured  $\tau_h$  identification efficiencies arise from uncertainties on track reconstruction (4%) and from uncertainties on the probabilities for jets to pass the “leading” track  $p_T$  and loose isolation requirements applied in the preselection ( $\leq 12\%$ ). Uncertainties on track momentum and  $\tau_h$  energy scales have an effect on the measured  $\tau_h$  identification efficiencies below 1%. All numbers represent relative uncertainties.

The resulting ratio of the measured efficiencies to those predicted by MC simulation for  $\tau_h$  decays to pass the “loose”, “medium”, and “tight” HPS and TaNC working points are presented in the last column of Table 2. The uncertainties on the ratios represent the full uncertainties of the method, which are calculated by adding the statistical and systematic uncertainties in quadrature. The total uncertainty of the measured efficiency of the  $\tau_h$  algorithms is dominated by the statistical uncertainty of the fit. The simulation describes the data well. Since the same event sample is used to evaluate efficiencies for different working points, the results are correlated.

The values presented in Table 2 are used as inputs for fits to measure the uncertainty of the  $\tau_h$  reconstruction and identification efficiency with higher precision by comparing the yield of the  $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$  events in different decay modes and the yield of  $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$  and  $Z \rightarrow ee$  events, as described elsewhere [5]. The first approach uses a simultaneous fit of the four  $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$  decay channels with final states  $\mu\mu$ ,  $e\mu$ ,  $\mu\tau_h$ , and  $e\tau_h$ . As a result of the fit, the combined cross section and  $\tau_h$  efficiency are measured. The data-to-MC correction factor for the HPS “loose” working point is measured to be  $0.94 \pm 0.09$ . The second approach is based on a comparison of the  $\tau_h$  channels,  $Z \rightarrow \mu\tau_h$  and  $e\tau_h$ , to the combined  $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu, ee$  cross section as measured by CMS. The data-to-MC correction factor for the HPS “loose” working point in this case is measured to be  $0.96 \pm 0.07$ . The slightly smaller uncertainty of the latter method is explained by the higher precision of the combined  $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu, ee$  cross-section measurement. These values are also presented in Table 2. Both approaches yield more precise uncertainties, 9% and 7%, than the 24% from the tag-and-probe method, for the “loose” HPS working point. To achieve this precision, the methods rely on assumptions about the physics source of the signal, i.e., the values of the inclusive  $Z$  production cross section and  $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$  branching fraction, and the absence of non-SM sources in the data sample. In physics analyses where these assumptions cannot be made, such as the measurement of the  $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$  production cross section itself [5] and the search for  $H \rightarrow \tau\tau$  [6], the tag-and-probe method remains the only one available.

The expected  $\tau_h$  efficiency values from the  $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$  process, with a reconstructed  $|\eta_{\tau_h}| < 2.3$ , and either  $p_T^{\tau_h} > 15 \text{ GeV}/c$  or  $p_T^{\tau_h} > 20 \text{ GeV}/c$ , are estimated using simulated events and presented in Table 3. The selections are applied both at the generated and reconstructed levels. A matching of  $\Delta R < 0.15$  between the generated and reconstructed  $\tau_h$  directions is required. Figure 2 shows the expected efficiencies as a function of the generated  $p_T^{\tau_h}$  for all working points of each algorithm.

## 5 Reconstruction of the $\tau_h$ Decay Mode

The correlation between the generated and reconstructed  $\tau_h$  decay modes is studied using a sample of simulated  $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$  events. The results are presented in Fig. 3 (left). Each column

Table 3: The expected efficiency for  $\tau_h$  decays to pass the HPS and TaNC identification criteria estimated using  $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$  events from the MC simulation for two different selection requirements on  $p_T^{\tau_h}$ . The requirement is applied both at the reconstruction and generator levels. The statistical uncertainties of the MC predictions are smaller than the least significant digit of the efficiency values in the table and are not shown.

Algorithm	HPS			TaNC		
	"loose"	"medium"	"tight"	"loose"	"medium"	"tight"
Efficiency ( $p_T^{\tau_h} > 15 \text{ GeV}/c$ )	0.46	0.34	0.23	0.54	0.43	0.30
Efficiency ( $p_T^{\tau_h} > 20 \text{ GeV}/c$ )	0.50	0.37	0.25	0.58	0.48	0.36




Figure 2: The expected efficiency of the  $\tau_h$  algorithms as a function of generated  $p_T^{\tau_h}$ , estimated using a sample of simulated  $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$  events for the HPS (left) and TaNC (right) algorithms, for the "loose", "medium", and "tight" working points.




Figure 3: (left) The fraction of generated  $\tau_h$  decays of a given type reconstructed in a certain decay mode for the HPS “loose” working point from simulated  $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$  events. (right) The relative yield of  $\tau_h$  reconstructed in different decay modes in the  $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau \rightarrow \mu\tau_h$  data sample compared to the MC predictions. The MC simulation is a mixture of the signal and background samples based on the corresponding cross sections, as shown by the histograms.

represents one generated decay mode normalized to unity. Each row corresponds to one reconstructed decay mode. The numbers demonstrate the fraction of generated  $\tau_h$  of a given type reconstructed in a specific decay mode. Both generated and reconstructed  $\tau_h$  are required to have a visible transverse momentum  $p_T^{\tau_h} > 15 \text{ GeV}/c$ , and to match within a cone of  $\Delta R = 0.15$ . For each of the generated decay modes, the fraction of correctly reconstructed decays is more than 80%, reaching 90% for the three-charged-pion decay mode.

A data-to-MC comparison of the relative yield of events reconstructed in different  $\tau_h$  decay modes in a data sample of  $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau \rightarrow \mu\tau_h$  events is shown in Fig. 3 (right). The events are selected using the requirements described in [5]. The  $\tau_h$  candidates are required to have visible transverse momenta  $p_T^{\tau_h} > 20 \text{ GeV}/c$  within the geometric acceptance  $|\eta| < 2.3$ . The MC sample represents a mixture of the signal and background MC samples based on the corresponding cross sections. The performance of the  $\tau_h$  algorithm is well reproduced by the MC simulation.

## 6 Reconstruction of the $\tau_h$ Energy

Since charged hadrons and photons are reconstructed with high precision using the PF techniques, the reconstructed  $\tau_h$  energy is expected to be close to the true energy of its visible decay products. According to simulation, the ratio of the reconstructed to the true visible  $\tau_h$  energy for the HPS algorithm is constant as a function of energy and within 2% of unity, while for TaNC it decreases by about 2% as  $p_T^{\tau_h}$  approaches  $60 \text{ GeV}/c$ . The  $\eta$  dependence is more pronounced. For both algorithms the reconstructed  $\tau_h$  energy is underestimated by 5% with respect to the true energy as one moves towards higher  $\eta$  (from barrel to endcap region).

The quality of the  $\tau_h$  energy scale simulation can be examined by analyzing the  $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau \rightarrow \mu\tau_h$  data sample. The reconstructed invariant mass of the  $\mu\tau_h$  system is very sensitive to the energy scale of the  $\tau_h$ , since the muon four-momenta are measured with high precision. By varying the  $\tau_h$  energy scale simultaneously in the signal and background MC samples, a set of templates is




Figure 4: The reconstructed invariant mass of  $\tau_h$  decaying into one charged and one neutral pion (left) and into three charged pions (right) from data, compared to predictions of the simulation. The solid lines represent results of the best fit described in the text and the dashed lines represent the predictions with the tau energy scale, TauES, varied up and down by 3% with respect to the best fit value.

produced. The resulting templates are fitted to the data and the best agreement is achieved by scaling the  $\tau_h$  energy in simulation by a factor  $0.97 \pm 0.03$ , where the uncertainty is averaged over the pseudorapidity range of the data sample.

A complementary procedure, which does not assume knowledge of the  $\tau\tau$  invariant mass spectrum, is based on the invariant mass of reconstructed  $\tau_h$  constituents, shown in Fig. 4. The method uses  $\tau_h$  as an independent object but relies on good understanding of underlying background events that contribute to the signal sample. The fit is performed separately for  $\pi\pi^0$  and  $\pi\pi\pi$  decay channels, since the major source of the uncertainty is expected to come from reconstruction of the electromagnetic energy. The simulation describes both decay channels well. The best agreement is achieved by scaling the  $\tau_h$  energy in simulation by a factor  $0.97 \pm 0.03$  for the  $\pi\pi^0$  decay mode and by a factor  $1.01 \pm 0.02$  for the  $\pi\pi\pi$  decay mode. The effect of the energy-scale uncertainty on the shape of the  $\tau_h$  invariant mass distribution is also shown in Fig. 4. Varying the energy scale in simulation by the uncertainty derived from the  $\mu\tau_h$  invariant mass fit, i.e. 3%, corresponds to a significant deviation in the predicted  $\tau_h$  mass shape.

## 7 Measurement of the $\tau_h$ Misidentification Rate for Jets

Jets that could be misidentified as  $\tau_h$  have different properties depending on their origin. Most of the jets are produced in QCD processes, either with or without the associated production of Z or W bosons. To distinguish between them, different data samples are selected. The QCD-type, gluon-enriched, jets are selected using events with at least one jet of transverse momentum  $p_T^{\text{jet}} > 15 \text{ GeV}/c$  and a second jet of  $p_T^{\text{jet}} > 10 \text{ GeV}/c$ , both within  $|\eta| < 2.5$ . The Z- and W-type, quark-enriched, jets are selected by requiring at least one isolated muon with transverse momentum  $p_T > 15 \text{ GeV}/c$  and  $|\eta| < 2.1$  and a jet of transverse momentum  $p_T^{\text{jet}} > 10 \text{ GeV}/c$  within  $|\eta| < 2.5$ . In addition, a muon-enriched QCD sample is selected by requiring a muon and a jet, but suppressing the W contribution by selecting events with  $M_T < 40 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ . For each of these

samples additional selection requirements are applied to suppress the background contribution from events with jets from other sources.

Figure 5 shows the  $\tau_h$  misidentification rate as a function of the jet  $p_T$  for the “loose” working points of the HPS and TaNC algorithms, where the measured values are compared with the MC predictions for the different types of jets. The misidentification rates expected from simulation, and the measured data-to-MC ratios are summarized in Table 4 for the three working points of both reconstruction algorithms. The values are integrated over the  $p_T$  and  $\eta$  phase space used in the  $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$  analysis,  $p_T^{\text{jet}} > 20 \text{ GeV}/c$  and  $|\eta| < 2.3$ . The misidentification rate as a function of reconstruction efficiency for all working points of both algorithms is shown in Fig. 6, which summarizes the MC estimated efficiency and the measured misidentification rate values presented in Tables 3 and 4. Since the QCD and  $\mu$ -enriched QCD misidentification rate values are observed to be similar, only one set of QCD points is shown. Open symbols represent results obtained by running an early fixed-cone  $\tau_h$ -identification algorithm, used in the CMS physics technical design report (PTDR, [18]) on simulated events. The decay-mode-based HPS and TaNC algorithms perform significantly better than the fixed-cone algorithm.




Figure 5: Misidentification probabilities for jets to pass “loose” working points of the HPS (left) and TaNC (right) algorithms as a function of jet  $p_T$  for QCD,  $\mu$ -enriched QCD, and  $W$  type events. The misidentification rates measured in data are shown by solid symbols and compared to MC prediction, displayed with open symbols.

## 8 Measurement of the $\tau_h$ Misidentification Rate for Electrons

Isolated electrons passing the identification and isolation criteria of the  $\tau_h$  algorithms are also an important source of background in many analyses with  $\tau_h$  in the final state. In this case the electron is misidentified as a pion originating from  $\tau_h$ . A multivariate discriminant is used to reduce this background, improving the separation between pions and electrons. The discriminant is implemented in the PF algorithm and its output is denoted by  $\zeta$ . The value of the




Figure 6: The measured  $\tau_h$  misidentification rate as a function of the MC-estimated  $\tau_h$  reconstruction efficiency for the three working points of the HPS and TaNC algorithms from  $\mu$ -enriched QCD and W data samples. For each algorithm the “loose”, “medium”, and “tight” selections are the points with highest, middle and lowest efficiencies respectively. The PTDR points represent results of the fixed-cone  $\tau_h$ -identification algorithm [18] on simulation.

Table 4: The MC predicted  $\tau_h$  misidentification rates and the measured data-to-MC ratios, integrated over the  $p_T$  and  $\eta$  phase space typical for the  $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$  analysis.

Algorithm	QCD		QCD $\mu$		W + jets	
	MC (%)	Data/MC	MC (%)	Data/MC	MC (%)	Data/MC
HPS “loose”	1.0	$1.00 \pm 0.04$	1.0	$1.07 \pm 0.01$	1.5	$0.99 \pm 0.04$
HPS “medium”	0.4	$1.02 \pm 0.06$	0.4	$1.05 \pm 0.02$	0.6	$1.04 \pm 0.06$
HPS “tight”	0.2	$0.94 \pm 0.09$	0.2	$1.06 \pm 0.02$	0.3	$1.08 \pm 0.09$
TaNC “loose”	2.1	$1.05 \pm 0.04$	1.9	$1.12 \pm 0.01$	3.0	$1.02 \pm 0.05$
TaNC “medium”	1.3	$1.05 \pm 0.05$	0.9	$1.08 \pm 0.02$	1.6	$0.98 \pm 0.07$
TaNC “tight”	0.5	$0.98 \pm 0.07$	0.4	$1.06 \pm 0.02$	0.8	$0.95 \pm 0.09$

discriminant  $\zeta$  ranges between  $-1.0$  (most compatible with the pion hypothesis) and  $1.0$  (most compatible with the electron hypothesis).

Two selected working points, corresponding to  $\zeta < -0.1$  and  $\zeta < 0.6$ , are considered in this analysis. The first working point rejects even those electrons, that are poorly reconstructed and is optimized for a low misidentification rate, about 2%, at the price of about 4% losses of genuine  $\tau_h$ . The second working point suffers from larger misidentification rates of about 20%, since it was optimized for  $\tau_h$  efficiencies exceeding 99.5%. It rejects only well identified electrons.

The probability for an electron to be misidentified as  $\tau_h$ , the  $e \rightarrow \tau_h$  misidentification rate, is determined using a sample of isolated electrons coming from the decay  $Z \rightarrow ee$ . The events are required to have a reconstructed electron and an electron that is reconstructed as  $\tau_h$ . The particles must have opposite charge. The invariant mass of the pair is required to be between 60 and 120  $\text{GeV}/c^2$ . The tag electron is required to be isolated and to have a  $p_T$  in excess of 25  $\text{GeV}/c$ . The second electron, a probe, is required to pass the HPS “loose” working point, without requiring any specific veto against electrons, and have  $p_T$  in excess of 15  $\text{GeV}/c$ . The  $e \rightarrow \tau_h$  misidentification rate is estimated by measuring the ratio between the number of probes passing the electron-rejection discriminant and the overall number of selected probes. The sample of events that does not pass the electron-rejection discriminant, is populated by well-reconstructed electrons. The sample that passes the discriminant contains poorly reconstructed electrons, as well as other background contributions, “misidentified electrons”. To remove the contamination from misidentified electrons, a background subtraction procedure is performed by fitting the passing and failing  $e\tau_h$  invariant mass distributions to the superposition of signal and background components.

Table 5 gives the ratio between the misidentification rates as measured in the data and those obtained using MC simulation for two  $|\eta|$  bins. In the central  $\eta$  region, the simulation underestimates the measured misidentification rates. Within the uncertainties of the measurement the data-to-MC ratios for both discriminants agree in the same  $\eta$  intervals.

Table 5: The  $e \rightarrow \tau_h$  misidentification rates, found by applying the tag-and-probe method to the MC simulation and the ratio of the tag-and-probe values obtained in data and MC simulation, shown in two regions of  $\eta$  and for two working points of the electron-rejection discriminant.

Bin	Discriminant $\zeta < -0.1$		Discriminant $\zeta < 0.6$	
	MC (%)	Data/MC	MC (%)	Data/MC
$< 1.5$	$2.21 \pm 0.05$	$1.13 \pm 0.17$	$13.10 \pm 0.08$	$1.14 \pm 0.04$
$> 1.5$	$3.96 \pm 0.09$	$0.82 \pm 0.18$	$26.80 \pm 0.16$	$0.90 \pm 0.04$

## 9 Summary

The performances of two reconstruction algorithms for hadronic tau decays developed by CMS, HPS and TaNC, have been studied using the data sample collected at a centre-of-mass energy of 7 TeV in 2010 and corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 36  $\text{pb}^{-1}$ . Both algorithms show good performance in terms of  $\tau_h$  identification efficiency, approximately 50%, while keeping the misidentification rate for jets at the level of  $\sim 1\%$ . The MC simulation was found to describe the data well. The  $\tau_h$  identification efficiency was measured with an uncertainty of 24% by using a tag-and-probe method in a  $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau \rightarrow \mu\tau_h$  data sample, and with an uncertainty of 7% by using a global fit to all  $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$  decay channels and constraining the yield to the measured combined  $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu, ee$  cross section. The scale factor for measured  $\tau_h$  energies was found to be close to unity with a relative uncertainty less than 3%.

## Acknowledgments

We wish to congratulate our colleagues in the CERN accelerator departments for the excellent performance of the LHC machine. We thank the technical and administrative staff at CERN and other CMS institutes. This work was supported by the Austrian Federal Ministry of Science and Research; the Belgium Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique, and Fonds voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek; the Brazilian Funding Agencies (CNPq, CAPES, FAPERJ, and FAPESP); the Bulgarian Ministry of Education and Science; CERN; the Chinese Academy of Sciences, Ministry of Science and Technology, and National Natural Science Foundation of China; the Colombian Funding Agency (COLCIENCIAS); the Croatian Ministry of Science, Education and Sport; the Research Promotion Foundation, Cyprus; the Estonian Academy of Sciences and NICPB; the Academy of Finland, Finnish Ministry of Education and Culture, and Helsinki Institute of Physics; the Institut National de Physique Nucléaire et de Physique des Particules / CNRS, and Commissariat à l'Énergie Atomique et aux Énergies Alternatives / CEA, France; the Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, and Helmholtz-Gemeinschaft Deutscher Forschungszentren, Germany; the General Secretariat for Research and Technology, Greece; the National Scientific Research Foundation, and National Office for Research and Technology, Hungary; the Department of Atomic Energy and the Department of Science and Technology, India; the Institute for Studies in Theoretical Physics and Mathematics, Iran; the Science Foundation, Ireland; the Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Italy; the Korean Ministry of Education, Science and Technology and the World Class University program of NRF, Korea; the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences; the Mexican Funding Agencies (CINVESTAV, CONACYT, SEP, and UASLP-FAI); the Ministry of Science and Innovation, New Zealand; the Pakistan Atomic Energy Commission; the State Commission for Scientific Research, Poland; the Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, Portugal; JINR (Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, Ukraine, Uzbekistan); the Ministry of Science and Technologies of the Russian Federation, the Russian Ministry of Atomic Energy and the Russian Foundation for Basic Research; the Ministry of Science and Technological Development of Serbia; the Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación, and Programa Consolider-Ingenio 2010, Spain; the Swiss Funding Agencies (ETH Board, ETH Zurich, PSI, SNF, UniZH, Canton Zurich, and SER); the National Science Council, Taipei; the Scientific and Technical Research Council of Turkey, and Turkish Atomic Energy Authority; the Science and Technology Facilities Council, UK; the US Department of Energy, and the US National Science Foundation.

Individuals have received support from the Marie-Curie programme and the European Research Council (European Union); the Leventis Foundation; the A. P. Sloan Foundation; the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation; the Belgian Federal Science Policy Office; the Fonds pour la Formation à la Recherche dans l'Industrie et dans l'Agriculture (FRIA-Belgium); the Agentschap voor Innovatie door Wetenschap en Technologie (IWT-Belgium); and the Council of Science and Industrial Research, India.

## References

- [1] CMS Collaboration, "The CMS experiment at the CERN LHC", *JINST* **03** (2008) S08004. doi:10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08004.
- [2] L. Evans and P. Bryant, "LHC Machine", *JINST* **03** (2008) S08001. doi:10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08001.
- [3] S. P. Martin, "A Supersymmetry Primer", (1997). arXiv:hep-ph/9709356. See also references therein.



- 
- [4] B. Dutta and R. N. Mohapatra, "Phenomenology of light remnant doubly charged Higgs fields in the supersymmetric left-right model", *Phys. Rev. D* **59** (1999) 015018, arXiv:hep-ph/9804277. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.59.015018.
- [5] CMS Collaboration, "Measurement of the Inclusive Z Cross Section via Decays to Tau Pairs in pp Collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 7$  TeV", *JHEP* **08** (2011) 117, arXiv:1104.1617. doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2011)117.
- [6] CMS Collaboration, "Search for Neutral MSSM Higgs Bosons Decaying to Tau Pairs in pp Collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 7$  TeV", *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106** (2011) 231801. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.106.231801.
- [7] CMS Collaboration, "CMS tracking performance results from early LHC operation", *Eur. Phys. J. C* **70** (2010) 1165. doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-010-1491-3.
- [8] CMS Collaboration, "Particle-Flow Event Reconstruction in CMS and Performance for Jets, Taus, and  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$ ", CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-PFT-09-001, (2009).
- [9] Particle Data Group Collaboration, "Review of particle physics", *J. Phys. G* **37** (2010) 075021. doi:10.1088/0954-3899/37/7A/075021.
- [10] M. Cacciari, G. P. Salam, and G. Soyez, "The anti- $k_t$  jet clustering algorithm", *JHEP* **04** (2008) 063, arXiv:0802.1189. doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2008/04/063.
- [11] S. Alioli, P. Nason, C. Oleari et al., "NLO vector-boson production matched with shower in POWHEG", *JHEP* **07** (2008) 060, arXiv:0805.4802. doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2008/07/060.
- [12] P. Nason, "A new method for combining NLO QCD with shower Monte Carlo algorithms", *JHEP* **11** (2004) 040, arXiv:hep-ph/0409146. doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2004/11/040.
- [13] S. Frixione, P. Nason, and C. Oleari, "Matching NLO QCD computations with Parton Shower simulations: the POWHEG method", *JHEP* **11** (2007) 070, arXiv:0709.2092. doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2007/11/070.
- [14] T. Sjöstrand, S. Mrenna, and P. Z. Skands, "PYTHIA 6.4 Physics and Manual", *JHEP* **05** (2006) 026, arXiv:hep-ph/0603175. doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2006/05/026.
- [15] F. Maltoni and T. Stelzer, "MadEvent: Automatic event generation with MadGraph", *JHEP* **02** (2003) 027, arXiv:hep-ph/0208156. doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2003/02/027.
- [16] S. Jadach, Z. Was, R. Decker et al., "The tau decay library TAUOLA: Version 2.4", *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **76** (1993) 361. doi:10.1016/0010-4655(93)90061-G.
- [17] CMS Collaboration, "CMS High Level Trigger", LHCC Report CERN-LHCC-2007-021, (2007).
- [18] CMS Collaboration, "CMS technical design report, volume II: Physics performance", *J. Phys. G* **34** (2007) 995. doi:10.1088/0954-3899/34/6/S01.



## A The CMS Collaboration

### Yerevan Physics Institute, Yerevan, Armenia

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

### Institut für Hochenergiephysik der OeAW, Wien, Austria

W. Adam, T. Bergauer, M. Dragicevic, J. Erö, C. Fabjan, M. Friedl, R. Frühwirth, V.M. Ghete, J. Hammer<sup>1</sup>, S. Häsnel, M. Hoch, N. Hörmann, J. Hrubec, M. Jeitler, W. Kiesenhofer, M. Krammer, D. Liko, I. Mikulec, M. Pernicka, B. Rahbaran, H. Rohringer, R. Schöfbeck, J. Strauss, A. Taurok, F. Teischinger, C. Trauner, P. Wagner, W. Waltenberger, G. Walzel, E. Widl, C.-E. Wulz

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

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

### Universiteit Antwerpen, Antwerpen, Belgium

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

### Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussel, Belgium

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

### Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium

O. Charaf, B. Clerbaux, G. De Lentdecker, V. Dero, A.P.R. Gay, G.H. Hammad, T. Hreus, P.E. Marage, A. Raval, L. Thomas, G. Vander Marcken, C. Vander Velde, P. Vanlaer

### Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

V. Adler, A. Cimmino, S. Costantini, M. Grunewald, B. Klein, J. Lellouch, A. Marinov, J. McCartin, D. Ryckbosch, F. Thyssen, M. Tytgat, L. Vanelderen, P. Verwilligen, S. Walsh, N. Zaganidis

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

S. Basegmez, G. Bruno, J. Caudron, L. Ceard, E. Cortina Gil, J. De Favereau De Jeneret, C. Delaere, D. Favart, A. Giammanco, G. Grégoire, J. Hollar, V. Lemaitre, J. Liao, O. Militaru, C. Nuttens, S. Owyn, D. Pagano, A. Pin, K. Piotrkowski, N. Schul

### Université de Mons, Mons, Belgium

N. Bely, T. Caebergs, E. Daubie

### Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Fisicas, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

G.A. Alves, L. Brito, D. De Jesus Damiao, M.E. Pol, M.H.G. Souza

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

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

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

T.S. Anjos<sup>2</sup>, C.A. Bernardes<sup>2</sup>, F.A. Dias<sup>3</sup>, T.R. Fernandez Perez Tomei, E. M. Gregores<sup>2</sup>, C. Lagana, F. Marinho, P.G. Mercadante<sup>2</sup>, S.F. Novaes, Sandra S. Padula

### Institute for Nuclear Research and Nuclear Energy, Sofia, Bulgaria

N. Darmenov<sup>1</sup>, V. Genchev<sup>1</sup>, P. Iaydjiev<sup>1</sup>, S. Piperov, M. Rodozov, S. Stoykova, G. Sultanov, V. Tcholakov, R. Trayanov, M. Vutova

**University of Sofia, Sofia, Bulgaria**

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

**Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing, China**

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

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

Y. Ban, S. Guo, Y. Guo, W. Li, Y. Mao, S.J. Qian, H. Teng, B. Zhu, W. Zou

**Universidad de Los Andes, Bogota, Colombia**

A. Cabrera, B. Gomez Moreno, A.A. Ocampo Rios, A.F. Osorio Oliveros, J.C. Sanabria

**Technical University of Split, Split, Croatia**

N. Godinovic, D. Lelas, K. Lelas, R. Plestina<sup>4</sup>, D. Polic, I. Puljak

**University of Split, Split, Croatia**

Z. Antunovic, M. Dzelalija, M. Kovac

**Institute Rudjer Boskovic, Zagreb, Croatia**

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

**University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus**

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

**Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic**

M. Finger, M. Finger Jr.

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

Y. Assran<sup>5</sup>, A. Ellithi Kamel<sup>6</sup>, S. Khalil<sup>7</sup>, M.A. Mahmoud<sup>8</sup>, A. Radi<sup>9</sup>

**National Institute of Chemical Physics and Biophysics, Tallinn, Estonia**

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

**Department of Physics, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland**

V. Azzolini, P. Eerola, G. Fedi, M. Voutilainen

**Helsinki Institute of Physics, Helsinki, Finland**

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

**Lappeenranta University of Technology, Lappeenranta, Finland**

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

**Laboratoire d'Annecy-le-Vieux de Physique des Particules, IN2P3-CNRS, Annecy-le-Vieux, France**

D. Sillou

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

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

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

S. Baffioni, F. Beaudette, L. Benhabib, L. Bianchini, M. Bluj<sup>10</sup>, C. Broutin, P. Busson, C. Charlot, T. Dahms, L. Dobrzynski, S. Elgammal, R. Granier de Cassagnac, M. Haguenaer, P. Miné, C. Mironov, C. Ochando, P. Paganini, D. Sabes, R. Salerno, Y. Sirois, C. Thiebaut, C. Veelken, A. Zabi

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

J.-L. Agram<sup>11</sup>, J. Andrea, D. Bloch, D. Bodin, J.-M. Brom, M. Cardaci, E.C. Chabert, C. Collard, E. Conte<sup>11</sup>, F. Drouhin<sup>11</sup>, C. Ferro, J.-C. Fontaine<sup>11</sup>, D. Gelé, U. Goerlach, S. Greder, P. Juillot, M. Karim<sup>11</sup>, A.-C. Le Bihan, Y. Mikami, P. Van Hove

**Centre de Calcul de l'Institut National de Physique Nucleaire et de Physique des Particules (IN2P3), Villeurbanne, France**

F. Fassi, D. Mercier

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

C. Baty, S. Beauceron, N. Beaupere, M. Bedjidian, O. Bondu, G. Boudoul, D. Boumediene, H. Brun, J. Chasserat, R. Chierici, D. Contardo, P. Depasse, H. El Mamouni, J. Fay, S. Gascon, B. Ille, T. Kurca, T. Le Grand, M. Lethuillier, L. Mirabito, S. Perries, V. Sordini, S. Tosi, Y. Tschudi, P. Verdier, S. Viret

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

D. Lomidze

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

G. Anagnostou, S. Beranek, M. Edelhoff, L. Feld, N. Heracleous, O. Hindrichs, R. Jussen, K. Klein, J. Merz, N. Mohr, A. Ostapchuk, A. Perieanu, F. Raupach, J. Sammet, S. Schael, D. Sprenger, H. Weber, M. Weber, B. Wittmer, V. Zhukov<sup>12</sup>

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

M. Ata, E. Dietz-Laursonn, M. Erdmann, T. Hebbeker, C. Heidemann, A. Hinzmann, K. Hoepfner, T. Klimkovich, D. Klingebiel, P. Kreuzer, D. Lanske<sup>†</sup>, J. Lingemann, C. Magass, M. Merschmeyer, A. Meyer, P. Papacz, H. Pieta, H. Reithler, S.A. Schmitz, L. Sonnenschein, J. Steggemann, D. Teyssier

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

M. Bontenackels, V. Cherepanov, M. Davids, G. Flügge, H. Geenen, M. Giffels, W. Haj Ahmad, F. Hoehle, B. Kargoll, T. Kress, Y. Kuessel, A. Linn, A. Nowack, L. Perchalla, O. Pooth, J. Rennefeld, P. Sauerland, A. Stahl, D. Tornier, M.H. Zoeller

**Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Hamburg, Germany**

M. Aldaya Martin, W. Behrenhoff, U. Behrens, M. Bergholz<sup>13</sup>, A. Bethani, K. Borrás, A. Cakir, A. Campbell, E. Castro, D. Dammann, G. Eckerlin, D. Eckstein, A. Flossdorf, G. Flucke, A. Geiser, J. Hauk, H. Jung<sup>1</sup>, M. Kasemann, P. Katsas, C. Kleinwort, H. Kluge, A. Knutsson, M. Krämer, D. Krücker, E. Kuznetsova, W. Lange, W. Lohmann<sup>13</sup>, B. Lutz, R. Mankel, M. Marienfeld, I.-A. Melzer-Pellmann, A.B. Meyer, J. Mnich, A. Mussgiller, J. Olzem, A. Petrukhin, D. Pitzl, A. Raspereza, M. Rosin, R. Schmidt<sup>13</sup>, T. Schoerner-Sadenius, N. Sen, A. Spiridonov, M. Stein, J. Tomaszewska, R. Walsh, C. Wissing

**University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany**

C. Autermann, V. Blobel, S. Bobrovskyi, J. Draeger, H. Enderle, U. Gebbert, M. Görner,

T. Hermanns, K. Kaschube, G. Kaussen, H. Kirschenmann, R. Klanner, J. Lange, B. Mura, S. Naumann-Emme, F. Nowak, N. Pietsch, C. Sander, H. Schettler, P. Schleper, E. Schlieckau, M. Schröder, T. Schum, H. Stadie, G. Steinbrück, J. Thomsen

**Institut für Experimentelle Kernphysik, Karlsruhe, Germany**

C. Barth, J. Bauer, J. Berger, V. Buege, T. Chwalek, W. De Boer, A. Dierlamm, G. Dirkes, M. Feindt, J. Gruschke, C. Hackstein, F. Hartmann, M. Heinrich, H. Held, K.H. Hoffmann, S. Honc, I. Katkov<sup>12</sup>, J.R. Komaragiri, T. Kuhr, D. Martschei, S. Mueller, Th. Müller, M. Niegel, O. Oberst, A. Oehler, J. Ott, T. Peiffer, G. Quast, K. Rabbertz, F. Ratnikov, N. Ratnikova, M. Renz, S. Röcker, C. Saout, A. Scheurer, P. Schieferdecker, F.-P. Schilling, M. Schmanau, G. Schott, H.J. Simonis, F.M. Stober, D. Troendle, J. Wagner-Kuhr, T. Weiler, M. Zeise, E.B. Ziebarth

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

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

**University of Athens, Athens, Greece**

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

**University of Ioánnina, Ioánnina, Greece**

I. Evangelou, C. Foudas<sup>1</sup>, P. Kokkas, N. Manthos, I. Papadopoulos, V. Patras, F.A. Triantis

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

A. Aranyi, G. Bencze, L. Boldizsar, C. Hajdu<sup>1</sup>, P. Hidas, D. Horvath<sup>14</sup>, A. Kapusi, K. Krajczar<sup>15</sup>, F. Sikler<sup>1</sup>, G.I. Veres<sup>15</sup>, G. Vesztergombi<sup>15</sup>

**Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary**

N. Beni, J. Molnar, J. Palinkas, Z. Szillasi, V. Veszpremi

**University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary**

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

**Panjab University, Chandigarh, India**

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

**University of Delhi, Delhi, India**

S. Ahuja, B.C. Choudhary, P. Gupta, A. Kumar, A. Kumar, S. Malhotra, M. Naimuddin, K. Ranjan, R.K. Shivpuri

**Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, Kolkata, India**

S. Banerjee, S. Bhattacharya, S. Dutta, B. Gomber, S. Jain, S. Jain, R. Khurana, S. Sarkar

**Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, Mumbai, India**

R.K. Choudhury, D. Dutta, S. Kailas, V. Kumar, P. Mehta, A.K. Mohanty<sup>1</sup>, L.M. Pant, P. Shukla

**Tata Institute of Fundamental Research - EHEP, Mumbai, India**

T. Aziz, M. Guchait<sup>16</sup>, A. Gurtu, M. Maity<sup>17</sup>, D. Majumder, G. Majumder, T. Mathew, K. Mazumdar, G.B. Mohanty, B. Parida, A. Saha, K. Sudhakar, N. Wickramage

**Tata Institute of Fundamental Research - HECR, Mumbai, India**

S. Banerjee, S. Dugad, N.K. Mondal

**Institute for Research and Fundamental Sciences (IPM), Tehran, Iran**

H. Arfaei, H. Bakhshiansohi<sup>18</sup>, S.M. Etesami<sup>19</sup>, A. Fahim<sup>18</sup>, M. Hashemi, H. Hesari, A. Jafari<sup>18</sup>,

M. Khakzad, A. Mohammadi<sup>20</sup>, M. Mohammadi Najafabadi, S. Paktinat Mehdiabadi, B. Safarzadeh, M. Zeinali<sup>19</sup>

**INFN Sezione di Bari <sup>a</sup>, Università di Bari <sup>b</sup>, Politecnico di Bari <sup>c</sup>, Bari, Italy**

M. Abbrescia<sup>a,b</sup>, L. Barbone<sup>a,b</sup>, C. Calabria<sup>a,b</sup>, A. Colaleo<sup>a</sup>, D. Creanza<sup>a,c</sup>, N. De Filippis<sup>a,c,1</sup>, M. De Palma<sup>a,b</sup>, L. Fiore<sup>a</sup>, G. Iaselli<sup>a,c</sup>, L. Lusito<sup>a,b</sup>, G. Maggi<sup>a,c</sup>, M. Maggi<sup>a</sup>, N. Manna<sup>a,b</sup>, B. Marangelli<sup>a,b</sup>, S. My<sup>a,c</sup>, S. Nuzzo<sup>a,b</sup>, N. Pacifico<sup>a,b</sup>, G.A. Pierro<sup>a</sup>, A. Pompili<sup>a,b</sup>, G. Pugliese<sup>a,c</sup>, F. Romano<sup>a,c</sup>, G. Roselli<sup>a,b</sup>, G. Selvaggi<sup>a,b</sup>, L. Silvestris<sup>a</sup>, R. Trentadue<sup>a</sup>, S. Tupputi<sup>a,b</sup>, G. Zito<sup>a</sup>

**INFN Sezione di Bologna <sup>a</sup>, Università di Bologna <sup>b</sup>, Bologna, Italy**

G. Abbiendi<sup>a</sup>, A.C. Benvenuti<sup>a</sup>, D. Bonacorsi<sup>a</sup>, S. Braibant-Giacomelli<sup>a,b</sup>, L. Brigliadori<sup>a</sup>, P. Capiluppi<sup>a,b</sup>, A. Castro<sup>a,b</sup>, F.R. Cavallo<sup>a</sup>, M. Cuffiani<sup>a,b</sup>, G.M. Dallavalle<sup>a</sup>, F. Fabbri<sup>a</sup>, A. Fanfani<sup>a,b</sup>, D. Fasanella<sup>a,1</sup>, P. Giacomelli<sup>a</sup>, M. Giunta<sup>a</sup>, C. Grandi<sup>a</sup>, S. Marcellini<sup>a</sup>, G. Masetti<sup>b</sup>, M. Meneghelli<sup>a,b</sup>, A. Montanari<sup>a</sup>, F.L. Navarria<sup>a,b</sup>, F. Odoricci<sup>a</sup>, A. Perrotta<sup>a</sup>, F. Primavera<sup>a</sup>, A.M. Rossi<sup>a,b</sup>, T. Rovelli<sup>a,b</sup>, G. Siroli<sup>a,b</sup>, R. Travaglini<sup>a,b</sup>

**INFN Sezione di Catania <sup>a</sup>, Università di Catania <sup>b</sup>, Catania, Italy**

S. Albergo<sup>a,b</sup>, G. Cappello<sup>a,b</sup>, M. Chiorboli<sup>a,b</sup>, S. Costa<sup>a,b</sup>, R. Potenza<sup>a,b</sup>, A. Tricomi<sup>a,b</sup>, C. Tuve<sup>a,b</sup>

**INFN Sezione di Firenze <sup>a</sup>, Università di Firenze <sup>b</sup>, Firenze, Italy**

G. Barbagli<sup>a</sup>, V. Ciulli<sup>a,b</sup>, C. Civinini<sup>a</sup>, R. D'Alessandro<sup>a,b</sup>, E. Focardi<sup>a,b</sup>, S. Frosali<sup>a,b</sup>, E. Gallo<sup>a</sup>, S. Gonzi<sup>a,b</sup>, M. Meschini<sup>a</sup>, S. Paoletti<sup>a</sup>, G. Sguazzoni<sup>a</sup>, A. Tropiano<sup>a,1</sup>

**INFN Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, Frascati, Italy**

L. Benussi, S. Bianco, S. Colafranceschi<sup>21</sup>, F. Fabbri, D. Piccolo

**INFN Sezione di Genova, Genova, Italy**

P. Fabbriatore, R. Musenich

**INFN Sezione di Milano-Bicocca <sup>a</sup>, Università di Milano-Bicocca <sup>b</sup>, Milano, Italy**

A. Benaglia<sup>a,b,1</sup>, F. De Guio<sup>a,b</sup>, L. Di Matteo<sup>a,b</sup>, S. Gennai<sup>1</sup>, A. Ghezzi<sup>a,b</sup>, S. Malvezzi<sup>a</sup>, A. Martelli<sup>a,b</sup>, A. Massironi<sup>a,b,1</sup>, D. Menasce<sup>a</sup>, L. Moroni<sup>a</sup>, M. Paganoni<sup>a,b</sup>, D. Pedrini<sup>a</sup>, S. Ragazzi<sup>a,b</sup>, N. Redaelli<sup>a</sup>, S. Sala<sup>a</sup>, T. Tabarelli de Fatis<sup>a,b</sup>

**INFN Sezione di Napoli <sup>a</sup>, Università di Napoli "Federico II" <sup>b</sup>, Napoli, Italy**

S. Buontempo<sup>a</sup>, C.A. Carrillo Montoya<sup>a,1</sup>, N. Cavallo<sup>a,22</sup>, A. De Cosa<sup>a,b</sup>, F. Fabozzi<sup>a,22</sup>, A.O.M. Iorio<sup>a,1</sup>, L. Lista<sup>a</sup>, M. Merola<sup>a,b</sup>, P. Paolucci<sup>a</sup>

**INFN Sezione di Padova <sup>a</sup>, Università di Padova <sup>b</sup>, Università di Trento (Trento) <sup>c</sup>, Padova, Italy**

P. Azzi<sup>a</sup>, N. Bacchetta<sup>a,1</sup>, P. Bellan<sup>a,b</sup>, D. Bisello<sup>a,b</sup>, A. Branca<sup>a</sup>, R. Carlin<sup>a,b</sup>, P. Checchia<sup>a</sup>, T. Dorigo<sup>a</sup>, U. Dosselli<sup>a</sup>, F. Fanzago<sup>a</sup>, F. Gasparini<sup>a,b</sup>, U. Gasparini<sup>a,b</sup>, A. Gozzelino, S. Lacaprara<sup>a,23</sup>, I. Lazzizzera<sup>a,c</sup>, M. Margoni<sup>a,b</sup>, M. Mazzucato<sup>a</sup>, A.T. Meneguzzo<sup>a,b</sup>, M. Nespolo<sup>a,1</sup>, L. Perrozzi<sup>a</sup>, N. Pozzobon<sup>a,b</sup>, P. Ronchese<sup>a,b</sup>, F. Simonetto<sup>a,b</sup>, E. Torassa<sup>a</sup>, M. Tosi<sup>a,b,1</sup>, S. Vanini<sup>a,b</sup>, P. Zotto<sup>a,b</sup>, G. Zumerle<sup>a,b</sup>

**INFN Sezione di Pavia <sup>a</sup>, Università di Pavia <sup>b</sup>, Pavia, Italy**

P. Baesso<sup>a,b</sup>, U. Berzano<sup>a</sup>, S.P. Ratti<sup>a,b</sup>, C. Riccardi<sup>a,b</sup>, P. Torre<sup>a,b</sup>, P. Vitulo<sup>a,b</sup>, C. Viviani<sup>a,b</sup>

**INFN Sezione di Perugia <sup>a</sup>, Università di Perugia <sup>b</sup>, Perugia, Italy**

M. Biasini<sup>a,b</sup>, G.M. Bilei<sup>a</sup>, B. Caponeri<sup>a,b</sup>, L. Fanò<sup>a,b</sup>, P. Lariccia<sup>a,b</sup>, A. Lucaroni<sup>a,b,1</sup>, G. Mantovani<sup>a,b</sup>, M. Menichelli<sup>a</sup>, A. Nappi<sup>a,b</sup>, F. Romeo<sup>a,b</sup>, A. Santocchia<sup>a,b</sup>, S. Taroni<sup>a,b,1</sup>, M. Valdata<sup>a,b</sup>

**INFN Sezione di Pisa <sup>a</sup>, Università di Pisa <sup>b</sup>, Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa <sup>c</sup>, Pisa, Italy**  
 P. Azzurri<sup>a,c</sup>, G. Bagliesi<sup>a</sup>, J. Bernardini<sup>a,b</sup>, T. Boccali<sup>a</sup>, G. Broccolo<sup>a,c</sup>, R. Castaldi<sup>a</sup>,  
 R.T. D’Agnolo<sup>a,c</sup>, R. Dell’Orso<sup>a</sup>, F. Fiori<sup>a,b</sup>, L. Foà<sup>a,c</sup>, A. Giassi<sup>a</sup>, A. Kraan<sup>a</sup>, F. Ligabue<sup>a,c</sup>,  
 T. Lomtadze<sup>a</sup>, L. Martini<sup>a,24</sup>, A. Messineo<sup>a,b</sup>, F. Palla<sup>a</sup>, F. Palmonari, G. Segneri<sup>a</sup>, A.T. Serban<sup>a</sup>,  
 P. Spagnolo<sup>a</sup>, R. Tenchini<sup>a</sup>, G. Tonelli<sup>a,b,1</sup>, A. Venturi<sup>a,1</sup>, P.G. Verdini<sup>a</sup>

**INFN Sezione di Roma <sup>a</sup>, Università di Roma “La Sapienza” <sup>b</sup>, Roma, Italy**  
 L. Barone<sup>a,b</sup>, F. Cavallari<sup>a</sup>, D. Del Re<sup>a,b,1</sup>, E. Di Marco<sup>a,b</sup>, M. Diemoz<sup>a</sup>, D. Franci<sup>a,b</sup>, M. Grassi<sup>a,1</sup>,  
 E. Longo<sup>a,b</sup>, P. Meridiani<sup>a</sup>, S. Nourbakhsh<sup>a</sup>, G. Organtini<sup>a,b</sup>, F. Pandolfi<sup>a,b</sup>, R. Paramatti<sup>a</sup>,  
 S. Rahatlou<sup>a,b</sup>, M. Sigamani<sup>a</sup>

**INFN Sezione di Torino <sup>a</sup>, Università di Torino <sup>b</sup>, Università del Piemonte Orientale (Novara) <sup>c</sup>, Torino, Italy**  
 N. Amapane<sup>a,b</sup>, R. Arcidiacono<sup>a,c</sup>, S. Argiro<sup>a,b</sup>, M. Arneodo<sup>a,c</sup>, C. Biino<sup>a</sup>, C. Botta<sup>a,b</sup>,  
 N. Cartiglia<sup>a</sup>, R. Castello<sup>a,b</sup>, M. Costa<sup>a,b</sup>, N. Demaria<sup>a</sup>, A. Graziano<sup>a,b</sup>, C. Mariotti<sup>a</sup>, S. Maselli<sup>a</sup>,  
 E. Migliore<sup>a,b</sup>, V. Monaco<sup>a,b</sup>, M. Musich<sup>a</sup>, M.M. Obertino<sup>a,c</sup>, N. Pastrone<sup>a</sup>, M. Pelliccioni<sup>a,b</sup>,  
 A. Potenza<sup>a,b</sup>, A. Romero<sup>a,b</sup>, M. Ruspà<sup>a,c</sup>, R. Sacchi<sup>a,b</sup>, V. Sola<sup>a,b</sup>, A. Solano<sup>a,b</sup>, A. Staiano<sup>a</sup>,  
 A. Vilela Pereira<sup>a</sup>

**INFN Sezione di Trieste <sup>a</sup>, Università di Trieste <sup>b</sup>, Trieste, Italy**  
 S. Belforte<sup>a</sup>, F. Cossutti<sup>a</sup>, G. Della Ricca<sup>a,b</sup>, B. Gobbo<sup>a</sup>, M. Marone<sup>a,b</sup>, D. Montanino<sup>a,b</sup>, A. Penzo<sup>a</sup>

**Kangwon National University, Chunchon, Korea**  
 S.G. Heo, S.K. Nam

**Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea**  
 S. Chang, J. Chung, D.H. Kim, G.N. Kim, J.E. Kim, D.J. Kong, H. Park, S.R. Ro, D.C. Son, T. Son

**Chonnam National University, Institute for Universe and Elementary Particles, Kwangju, Korea**  
 J.Y. Kim, Zero J. Kim, S. Song

**Konkuk University, Seoul, Korea**  
 H.Y. Jo

**Korea University, Seoul, Korea**  
 S. Choi, D. Gyun, B. Hong, M. Jo, H. Kim, J.H. Kim, T.J. Kim, K.S. Lee, D.H. Moon, S.K. Park,  
 E. Seo, K.S. Sim

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

**Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon, Korea**  
 Y. Cho, Y. Choi, Y.K. Choi, J. Goh, M.S. Kim, B. Lee, J. Lee, S. Lee, H. Seo, I. Yu

**Vilnius University, Vilnius, Lithuania**  
 M.J. Bilinskas, I. Grigelionis, M. Janulis, D. Martisiute, P. Petrov, M. Polujanskas, T. Sabonis

**Centro de Investigacion y de Estudios Avanzados del IPN, Mexico City, Mexico**  
 H. Castilla-Valdez, E. De La Cruz-Burelo, I. Heredia-de La Cruz, R. Lopez-Fernandez,  
 R. Magaña Villalba, J. Martínez-Ortega, A. Sánchez-Hernández, L.M. Villasenor-Cendejas

**Universidad Iberoamericana, Mexico City, Mexico**  
 S. Carrillo Moreno, F. Vazquez Valencia



**Benemerita Universidad Autonoma de Puebla, Puebla, Mexico**

H.A. Salazar Ibarguen

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

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

**University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand**

D. Krofcheck, J. Tam

**University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand**

P.H. Butler, R. Doesburg, H. Silverwood

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

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

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

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

**Soltan Institute for Nuclear Studies, Warsaw, Poland**

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

**Laboratório de Instrumentação e Física Experimental de Partículas, Lisboa, Portugal**N. Almeida, P. Bargassa, A. David, P. Faccioli, P.G. Ferreira Parracho, M. Gallinaro<sup>1</sup>, P. Musella, A. Nayak, J. Pela<sup>1</sup>, P.Q. Ribeiro, J. Seixas, J. Varela**Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia**

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

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

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

**Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia**

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

**Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia**V. Epshteyn, M. Erofeeva, V. Gavrilov, V. Kaftanov<sup>†</sup>, M. Kossov<sup>1</sup>, A. Krokhotin, N. Lychkovskaya, V. Popov, G. Safronov, S. Semenov, V. Stolin, E. Vlasov, A. Zhokin**Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia**A. Belyaev, E. Boos, M. Dubinin<sup>3</sup>, L. Dudko, A. Ershov, A. Gribushin, O. Kodolova, I. Lokhtin, A. Markina, S. Obraztsov, M. Perfilov, S. Petrushanko, L. Sarycheva, V. Savrin, A. Snigirev**P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia**

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

**State Research Center of Russian Federation, Institute for High Energy Physics, Protvino, Russia**I. Azhgirey, I. Bayshev, S. Bitioukov, V. Grishin<sup>1</sup>, V. Kachanov, D. Konstantinov, A. Korablev,

V. Krychkin, V. Petrov, R. Ryutin, A. Sobol, L. Tourtchanovitch, S. Troshin, N. Tyurin, A. Uzunian, A. Volkov

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

P. Adzic<sup>25</sup>, M. Djordjevic, D. Krpic<sup>25</sup>, J. Milosevic

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

M. Aguilar-Benitez, J. Alcaraz Maestre, P. Arce, C. Battilana, E. Calvo, M. Cerrada, M. Chamizo Llatas, N. Colino, B. De La Cruz, A. Delgado Peris, C. Diez Pardos, D. Domínguez Vázquez, C. Fernandez Bedoya, J.P. Fernández Ramos, A. Ferrando, J. Flix, M.C. Fouz, P. Garcia-Abia, O. Gonzalez Lopez, S. Goy Lopez, J.M. Hernandez, M.I. Josa, G. Merino, J. Puerta Pelayo, I. Redondo, L. Romero, J. Santaolalla, M.S. Soares, C. Willmott

**Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain**

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

**Universidad de Oviedo, Oviedo, Spain**

J. Cuevas, J. Fernandez Menendez, S. Folgueras, I. Gonzalez Caballero, L. Lloret Iglesias, J.M. Vizan Garcia

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

J.A. Brochero Cifuentes, I.J. Cabrillo, A. Calderon, S.H. Chuang, J. Duarte Campderros, M. Felcini<sup>26</sup>, M. Fernandez, G. Gomez, J. Gonzalez Sanchez, C. Jorda, P. Lobelle Pardo, A. Lopez Virto, J. Marco, R. Marco, C. Martinez Rivero, F. Matorras, F.J. Munoz Sanchez, J. Piedra Gomez<sup>27</sup>, T. Rodrigo, A.Y. Rodríguez-Marrero, A. Ruiz-Jimeno, L. Scodellaro, M. Sobron Sanudo, I. Vila, R. Vilar Cortabitarte

**CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland**

D. Abbaneo, E. Auffray, G. Auzinger, P. Baillon, A.H. Ball, D. Barney, A.J. Bell<sup>28</sup>, D. Benedetti, C. Bernet<sup>4</sup>, W. Bialas, P. Bloch, A. Bocci, S. Bolognesi, M. Bona, H. Breuker, K. Bunkowski, T. Camporesi, G. Cerminara, T. Christiansen, J.A. Coarasa Perez, B. Curé, D. D'Enterria, A. De Roeck, S. Di Guida, N. Dupont-Sagorin, A. Elliott-Peisert, B. Frisch, W. Funk, A. Gaddi, G. Georgiou, H. Gerwig, D. Gigi, K. Gill, D. Giordano, F. Glege, R. Gomez-Reino Garrido, M. Gouzevitch, P. Govoni, S. Gowdy, R. Guida, L. Guiducci, M. Hansen, C. Hartl, J. Harvey, J. Hegeman, B. Hegner, H.F. Hoffmann, V. Innocente, P. Janot, K. KaaZe, E. Karavakis, P. Lecoq, P. Lenzi, C. Lourenço, T. Mäki, M. Malberti, L. Malgeri, M. Mannelli, L. Masetti, A. Maurisset, G. Mavromanolakis, F. Meijers, S. Mersi, E. Meschi, R. Moser, M.U. Mozer, M. Mulders, E. Nesvold, M. Nguyen, T. Orimoto, L. Orsini, E. Palencia Cortezon, E. Perez, A. Petrilli, A. Pfeiffer, M. Pierini, M. Pimiä, D. Piparo, G. Polese, L. Quertenmont, A. Racz, W. Reece, J. Rodrigues Antunes, G. Rolandi<sup>29</sup>, T. Rommerskirchen, C. Rovelli<sup>30</sup>, M. Rovere, H. Sakulin, C. Schäfer, C. Schwick, I. Segoni, A. Sharma, P. Siegrist, P. Silva, M. Simon, P. Sphicas<sup>31</sup>, D. Spiga, M. Spiropulu<sup>3</sup>, M. Stoye, A. Tsiros, P. Vichoudis, H.K. Wöhri, S.D. Worm<sup>32</sup>, W.D. Zeuner

**Paul Scherrer Institut, Villigen, Switzerland**

W. Bertl, K. Deiters, W. Erdmann, K. Gabathuler, R. Horisberger, Q. Ingram, H.C. Kaestli, S. König, D. Kotlinski, U. Langenegger, F. Meier, D. Renker, T. Rohe, J. Sibille<sup>33</sup>

**Institute for Particle Physics, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland**

L. Bäni, P. Bortignon, L. Caminada<sup>34</sup>, B. Casal, N. Chanon, Z. Chen, S. Cittolin, G. Dissertori, M. Dittmar, J. Eugster, K. Freudenreich, C. Grab, W. Hintz, P. Lecomte, W. Lustermann,

C. Marchica<sup>34</sup>, P. Martinez Ruiz del Arbol, P. Milenovic<sup>35</sup>, F. Moortgat, C. Nägeli<sup>34</sup>, P. Nef, F. Nessi-Tedaldi, L. Pape, F. Pauss, T. Punz, A. Rizzi, F.J. Ronga, M. Rossini, L. Sala, A.K. Sanchez, M.-C. Sawley, A. Starodumov<sup>36</sup>, B. Stieger, M. Takahashi, L. Tauscher<sup>†</sup>, A. Thea, K. Theofilatos, D. Treille, C. Urscheler, R. Wallny, M. Weber, L. Wehrli, J. Weng

**Universität Zürich, Zurich, Switzerland**

E. Aguilo, C. Amsler, V. Chiochia, S. De Visscher, C. Favaro, M. Ivova Rikova, A. Jaeger, B. Millan Mejias, P. Otiougova, P. Robmann, A. Schmidt, H. Snoek

**National Central University, Chung-Li, Taiwan**

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

**National Taiwan University (NTU), Taipei, Taiwan**

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

**Cukurova University, Adana, Turkey**

A. Adiguzel, M.N. Bakirci<sup>37</sup>, S. Cerci<sup>38</sup>, C. Dozen, I. Dumanoglu, E. Eskut, S. Girgis, G. Gokbulut, I. Hos, E.E. Kangal, A. Kayis Topaksu, G. Onengut, K. Ozdemir, S. Ozturk<sup>39</sup>, A. Polatoz, K. Sogut<sup>40</sup>, D. Sunar Cerci<sup>38</sup>, B. Tali<sup>38</sup>, H. Topakli<sup>37</sup>, D. Uzun, L.N. Vergili, M. Vergili

**Middle East Technical University, Physics Department, Ankara, Turkey**

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

**Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey**

M. Deliomeroglu, D. Demir<sup>41</sup>, E. Gülmez, B. Isildak, M. Kaya<sup>42</sup>, O. Kaya<sup>42</sup>, M. Özbek, S. Ozkorucuklu<sup>43</sup>, N. Sonmez<sup>44</sup>

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

L. Levchuk

**University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom**

F. Bostock, J.J. Brooke, T.L. Cheng, E. Clement, D. Cussans, R. Frazier, J. Goldstein, M. Grimes, G.P. Heath, H.F. Heath, L. Kreczko, S. Metson, D.M. Newbold<sup>32</sup>, K. Nirunpong, A. Poll, S. Senkin, V.J. Smith

**Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom**

L. Basso<sup>45</sup>, K.W. Bell, A. Belyaev<sup>45</sup>, C. Brew, R.M. Brown, B. Camanzi, D.J.A. Cockerill, J.A. Coughlan, K. Harder, S. Harper, J. Jackson, B.W. Kennedy, E. Olaiya, D. Petyt, B.C. Radburn-Smith, C.H. Shepherd-Themistocleous, I.R. Tomalin, W.J. Womersley

**Imperial College, London, United Kingdom**

R. Bainbridge, G. Ball, J. Ballin, R. Beuselinck, O. Buchmuller, D. Colling, N. Cripps, M. Cutajar, G. Davies, M. Della Negra, W. Ferguson, J. Fulcher, D. Futyan, A. Gilbert, A. Guneratne Bryer, G. Hall, Z. Hatherell, J. Hays, G. Iles, M. Jarvis, G. Karapostoli, L. Lyons, A.-M. Magnan, J. Marrouche, B. Mathias, R. Nandi, J. Nash, A. Nikitenko<sup>36</sup>, A. Papageorgiou, M. Pesaresi, K. Petridis, M. Pioppi<sup>46</sup>, D.M. Raymond, S. Rogerson, N. Rompotis, A. Rose, M.J. Ryan, C. Seez, P. Sharp, A. Sparrow, A. Tapper, S. Tourneur, M. Vazquez Acosta, T. Virdee, S. Wakefield, N. Wardle, D. Wardrobe, T. Whyntie

**Brunel University, Uxbridge, United Kingdom**

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

**Baylor University, Waco, USA**

K. Hatakeyama, H. Liu

**The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, USA**

C. Henderson

**Boston University, Boston, USA**

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

**Brown University, Providence, USA**

A. Avetisyan, S. Bhattacharya, J.P. Chou, D. Cutts, A. Ferapontov, U. Heintz, S. Jabeen, G. Kukartsev, G. Landsberg, M. Luk, M. Narain, D. Nguyen, M. Segala, T. Sinthuprasith, T. Speer, K.V. Tsang

**University of California, Davis, Davis, USA**

R. Breedon, G. Breto, M. Calderon De La Barca Sanchez, S. Chauhan, M. Chertok, J. Conway, R. Conway, P.T. Cox, J. Dolen, R. Erbacher, R. Houtz, W. Ko, A. Kopecky, R. Lander, H. Liu, O. Mall, S. Maruyama, T. Miceli, M. Nikolic, D. Pellett, J. Robles, B. Rutherford, S. Salur, M. Searle, J. Smith, M. Squires, M. Tripathi, R. Vasquez Sierra

**University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, USA**

V. Andreev, K. Arisaka, D. Cline, R. Cousins, A. Deisher, J. Duris, S. Erhan, C. Farrell, J. Hauser, M. Ignatenko, C. Jarvis, C. Plager, G. Rakness, P. Schlein<sup>†</sup>, J. Tucker, V. Valuev

**University of California, Riverside, Riverside, USA**

J. Babb, R. Clare, J. Ellison, J.W. Gary, F. Giordano, G. Hanson, G.Y. Jeng, S.C. Kao, H. Liu, O.R. Long, A. Luthra, H. Nguyen, S. Paramesvaran, J. Sturdy, S. Sumowidagdo, R. Wilken, S. Wimpenny

**University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, USA**

W. Andrews, J.G. Branson, G.B. Cerati, D. Evans, F. Golf, A. Holzner, R. Kelley, M. Lebourgeois, J. Letts, B. Mangano, S. Padhi, C. Palmer, G. Petrucciani, H. Pi, M. Pieri, R. Ranieri, M. Sani, V. Sharma, S. Simon, E. Sudano, M. Tadel, Y. Tu, A. Vartak, S. Wasserbaech<sup>47</sup>, F. Würthwein, A. Yagil, J. Yoo

**University of California, Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, USA**

D. Barge, R. Bellan, C. Campagnari, M. D'Alfonso, T. Danielson, K. Flowers, P. Geffert, J. Incandela, C. Justus, P. Kalavase, S.A. Koay, D. Kovalskyi<sup>1</sup>, V. Krutelyov, S. Lowette, N. Mccoll, S.D. Mullin, V. Pavlunin, F. Rebassoo, J. Ribnik, J. Richman, R. Rossin, D. Stuart, W. To, J.R. Vlimant, C. West

**California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA**

A. Apresyan, A. Bornheim, J. Bunn, Y. Chen, J. Duarte, M. Gataullin, Y. Ma, A. Mott, H.B. Newman, C. Rogan, K. Shin, V. Timciuc, P. Traczyk, J. Veverka, R. Wilkinson, Y. Yang, R.Y. Zhu

**Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, USA**

B. Akgun, R. Carroll, T. Ferguson, Y. Iiyama, D.W. Jang, S.Y. Jun, Y.F. Liu, M. Paulini, J. Russ, H. Vogel, I. Vorobiev

**University of Colorado at Boulder, Boulder, USA**

J.P. Cumalat, M.E. Dinardo, B.R. Drell, C.J. Edelmaier, W.T. Ford, A. Gaz, B. Heyburn, E. Luiggi Lopez, U. Nauenberg, J.G. Smith, K. Stenson, K.A. Ulmer, S.R. Wagner, S.L. Zang

**Cornell University, Ithaca, USA**

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

**Fairfield University, Fairfield, USA**

A. Biselli, G. Cirino, D. Winn

**Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, USA**

S. Abdullin, M. Albrow, J. Anderson, G. Apollinari, M. Atac, J.A. Bakken, L.A.T. Bauerdick, A. Beretvas, J. Berryhill, P.C. Bhat, I. Bloch, K. Burkett, J.N. Butler, V. Chetluru, H.W.K. Cheung, F. Chlebana, S. Cihangir, W. Cooper, D.P. Eartly, V.D. Elvira, S. Esen, I. Fisk, J. Freeman, Y. Gao, E. Gottschalk, D. Green, O. Gutsche, J. Hanlon, R.M. Harris, J. Hirschauer, B. Hooberman, H. Jensen, S. Jindariani, M. Johnson, U. Joshi, B. Klima, K. Kousouris, S. Kunori, S. Kwan, C. Leonidopoulos, P. Limon, D. Lincoln, R. Lipton, J. Lykken, K. Maeshima, J.M. Marraffino, D. Mason, P. McBride, T. Miao, K. Mishra, S. Mrenna, Y. Musienko<sup>48</sup>, C. Newman-Holmes, V. O'Dell, J. Pivarski, R. Pordes, O. Prokofyev, T. Schwarz, E. Sexton-Kennedy, S. Sharma, W.J. Spalding, L. Spiegel, P. Tan, L. Taylor, S. Tkaczyk, L. Uplegger, E.W. Vaandering, R. Vidal, J. Whitmore, W. Wu, F. Yang, F. Yumiceva, J.C. Yun

**University of Florida, Gainesville, USA**

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

**Florida International University, Miami, USA**

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

**Florida State University, Tallahassee, USA**

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

**Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, USA**

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

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

M.R. Adams, I.M. Anghel, L. Apanasevich, Y. Bai, V.E. Bazterra, R.R. Betts, J. Callner, R. Cavanaugh, C. Dragoiu, L. Gauthier, C.E. Gerber, D.J. Hofman, S. Khalatyan, G.J. Kunde<sup>49</sup>, F. Lacroix, M. Malek, C. O'Brien, C. Silkworth, C. Silvestre, A. Smoron, D. Strom, N. Varelas

**The University of Iowa, Iowa City, USA**

U. Akgun, E.A. Albayrak, B. Bilki, W. Clarida, F. Duru, C.K. Lae, E. McCliment, J.-P. Merlo, H. Mermerkaya<sup>50</sup>, A. Mestvirishvili, A. Moeller, J. Nachtman, C.R. Newsom, E. Norbeck, J. Olson, Y. Onel, F. Ozok, S. Sen, J. Wetzel, T. Yetkin, K. Yi

**Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA**

B.A. Barnett, B. Blumenfeld, A. Bonato, C. Eskew, D. Fehling, G. Giurgiu, A.V. Gritsan, Z.J. Guo, G. Hu, P. Maksimovic, S. Rappoccio, M. Swartz, N.V. Tran, A. Whitbeck

**The University of Kansas, Lawrence, USA**

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

**Kansas State University, Manhattan, USA**

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

**Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, USA**

J. Gronberg, D. Lange, D. Wright

**University of Maryland, College Park, USA**

A. Baden, M. Boutemour, S.C. Eno, D. Ferencek, J.A. Gomez, N.J. Hadley, R.G. Kellogg, M. Kirn, Y. Lu, A.C. Mignerey, K. Rossato, P. Rumerio, F. Santanastasio, A. Skuja, J. Temple, M.B. Tonjes, S.C. Tonwar, E. Twedt

**Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, USA**

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

**University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, USA**

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

**University of Mississippi, University, USA**

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

**University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, USA**

K. Bloom, S. Bose, J. Butt, D.R. Claes, A. Dominguez, M. Eads, P. Jindal, J. Keller, T. Kelly, I. Kravchenko, J. Lazo-Flores, H. Malbouisson, S. Malik, G.R. Snow

**State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, USA**

U. Baur, A. Godshalk, I. Iashvili, S. Jain, A. Kharchilava, A. Kumar, K. Smith, Z. Wan

**Northeastern University, Boston, USA**

G. Alverson, E. Barberis, D. Baumgartel, O. Boeriu, M. Chasco, S. Reucroft, J. Swain, D. Trocino, D. Wood, J. Zhang

**Northwestern University, Evanston, USA**

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

**University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, USA**

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

**The Ohio State University, Columbus, USA**

B. Bylsma, L.S. Durkin, C. Hill, P. Killewald, K. Kotov, T.Y. Ling, M. Rodenburg, C. Vuosalo, G. Williams

**Princeton University, Princeton, USA**

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

**University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez, USA**

J.G. Acosta, X.T. Huang, A. Lopez, H. Mendez, S. Oliveros, J.E. Ramirez Vargas, A. Zatserklyaniy

**Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA**

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

**Purdue University Calumet, Hammond, USA**

S. Guragain, N. Parashar

**Rice University, Houston, USA**

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

**University of Rochester, Rochester, USA**

B. Betchart, A. Bodek, Y.S. Chung, R. Covarelli, P. de Barbaro, R. Demina, Y. Eshaq, H. Flacher, A. Garcia-Bellido, P. Goldenzweig, Y. Gotra, J. Han, A. Harel, D.C. Miner, G. Petrillo, W. Sakumoto, D. Vishnevskiy, M. Zielinski

**The Rockefeller University, New York, USA**

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

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

S. Arora, O. Atramentov, A. Barker, C. Contreras-Campana, E. Contreras-Campana, D. Duggan, Y. Gershtein, R. Gray, E. Halkiadakis, D. Hidas, D. Hits, A. Lath, S. Panwalkar, M. Park, R. Patel, A. Richards, K. Rose, S. Schnetzer, S. Somalwar, R. Stone, S. Thomas

**University of Tennessee, Knoxville, USA**

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

**Texas A&M University, College Station, USA**

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

**Texas Tech University, Lubbock, USA**

N. Akchurin, C. Bardak, J. Damgov, P.R. Duder, C. Jeong, K. Kovitanggoon, S.W. Lee, T. Libeiro, P. Mane, Y. Roh, A. Sill, I. Volobouev, R. Wigmans, E. Yazgan

**Vanderbilt University, Nashville, USA**

E. Appelt, E. Brownson, D. Engh, C. Florez, W. Gabella, M. Issah, W. Johns, C. Johnston, P. Kurt, C. Maguire, A. Melo, P. Sheldon, B. Snook, S. Tuo, J. Velkovska

**University of Virginia, Charlottesville, USA**

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

**Wayne State University, Detroit, USA**

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

**University of Wisconsin, Madison, USA**

M. Anderson, M. Bachtis, D. Belknap, J.N. Bellinger, D. Carlsmith, M. Cepeda, S. Dasu, J. Efron,

E. Friis, L. Gray, K.S. Grogg, M. Grothe, R. Hall-Wilton, M. Herndon, A. Hervé, P. Klabbers, J. Klukas, A. Lanaro, C. Lazaridis, J. Leonard, R. Loveless, A. Mohapatra, I. Ojalvo, W. Parker, I. Ross, A. Savin, W.H. Smith, J. Swanson, M. Weinberg

†: Deceased

- 1: Also at CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland
- 2: Also at Universidade Federal do ABC, Santo Andre, Brazil
- 3: Also at California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA
- 4: Also at Laboratoire Leprince-Ringuet, Ecole Polytechnique, IN2P3-CNRS, Palaiseau, France
- 5: Also at Suez Canal University, Suez, Egypt
- 6: Also at Cairo University, Cairo, Egypt
- 7: Also at British University, Cairo, Egypt
- 8: Also at Fayoum University, El-Fayoum, Egypt
- 9: Also at Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt
- 10: Also at Soltan Institute for Nuclear Studies, Warsaw, Poland
- 11: Also at Université de Haute-Alsace, Mulhouse, France
- 12: Also at Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia
- 13: Also at Brandenburg University of Technology, Cottbus, Germany
- 14: Also at Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary
- 15: Also at Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary
- 16: Also at Tata Institute of Fundamental Research - HECR, Mumbai, India
- 17: Also at University of Visva-Bharati, Santiniketan, India
- 18: Also at Sharif University of Technology, Tehran, Iran
- 19: Also at Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, Iran
- 20: Also at Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran
- 21: Also at Facoltà Ingegneria Università di Roma, Roma, Italy
- 22: Also at Università della Basilicata, Potenza, Italy
- 23: Also at Laboratori Nazionali di Legnaro dell' INFN, Legnaro, Italy
- 24: Also at Università degli studi di Siena, Siena, Italy
- 25: Also at Faculty of Physics of University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia
- 26: Also at University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, USA
- 27: Also at University of Florida, Gainesville, USA
- 28: Also at Université de Genève, Geneva, Switzerland
- 29: Also at Scuola Normale e Sezione dell' INFN, Pisa, Italy
- 30: Also at INFN Sezione di Roma; Università di Roma "La Sapienza", Roma, Italy
- 31: Also at University of Athens, Athens, Greece
- 32: Now at Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom
- 33: Also at The University of Kansas, Lawrence, USA
- 34: Also at Paul Scherrer Institut, Villigen, Switzerland
- 35: Also at University of Belgrade, Faculty of Physics and Vinca Institute of Nuclear Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia
- 36: Also at Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia
- 37: Also at Gaziosmanpasa University, Tokat, Turkey
- 38: Also at Adiyaman University, Adiyaman, Turkey
- 39: Also at The University of Iowa, Iowa City, USA
- 40: Also at Mersin University, Mersin, Turkey
- 41: Also at Izmir Institute of Technology, Izmir, Turkey
- 42: Also at Kafkas University, Kars, Turkey
- 43: Also at Suleyman Demirel University, Isparta, Turkey
- 44: Also at Ege University, Izmir, Turkey



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

46: Also at INFN Sezione di Perugia; Università di Perugia, Perugia, Italy

47: Also at Utah Valley University, Orem, USA

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

49: Also at Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, USA

50: Also at Erzincan University, Erzincan, Turkey