CERN-EP-2020-250
2021/02/03

CMS-SMP-19-010

Measurements of the differential cross sections of the production of $Z + \text{jets}$ and $\gamma + \text{jets}$ and of Z boson emission collinear with a jet in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13 \text{ TeV}$

The CMS Collaboration*

Abstract

Measurements of the differential cross sections of $Z + \text{jets}$ and $\gamma + \text{jets}$ production, and their ratio, are presented as a function of the boson transverse momentum. Measurements are also presented of the angular distribution between the Z boson and the closest jet. The analysis is based on pp collisions at a center-of-mass energy of 13 TeV corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 35.9 fb^{-1} recorded by the CMS experiment at the LHC. The results, corrected for detector effects, are compared with various theoretical predictions. In general, the predictions at higher orders in perturbation theory show better agreement with the measurements. This work provides the first measurement of the ratio of the differential cross sections of $Z + \text{jets}$ and $\gamma + \text{jets}$ production at 13 TeV, as well as the first direct measurement of Z bosons emitted collinearly with a jet.

Submitted to the Journal of High Energy Physics

1 Introduction

The production of vector bosons in association with jets in pp collisions provides an important test of the standard model (SM), as well as the opportunity to study major background processes to many searches for physics beyond the SM. The 13 TeV center-of-mass energy of the CERN LHC and the large integrated luminosity of 36 fb^{-1} , collected in 2016, are used to measure these processes in regions of phase space that were not previously accessible.

This paper presents a measurement of the differential production cross sections of $Z + \text{jets}$ and $\gamma + \text{jets}$, and their ratio for highly energetic bosons. It also provides the first measurement of a Z boson produced in close proximity (collinear) to an associated jet. Such measurements probe the SM for events with high boson transverse momentum (p_T), and collinear Z -jet emission, and provide precision tests of perturbative quantum chromodynamics (QCD) and electroweak (EW) calculations that are implemented in analytical calculations [1, 2] and Monte Carlo (MC) event generators. These measurements also provide constraints on parton distribution functions (PDFs) [3, 4], and are relevant in searches for physics beyond the SM, such as dark matter, supersymmetry, and invisible decays of the Higgs boson. The processes of $Z + \text{jets}$ and $\gamma + \text{jets}$ at high boson p_T are key for estimating backgrounds from a Z boson decaying to neutrinos ($Z \rightarrow \nu\bar{\nu}$), whereas the Z/γ ratio is a theoretical input using $\gamma + \text{jets}$ to predict contributions from $Z \rightarrow \nu\bar{\nu}$ [5]. An accurate modeling of these processes can improve the potential for discovering new physics.

The differential cross sections for $Z + \text{jets}$ and $\gamma + \text{jets}$ can constrain higher-order perturbative QCD and EW calculations that result in a nonnegligible dependence of the cross sections on boson p_T . The EW radiative corrections become large and negative at high energies, because of the presence of Sudakov logarithms that arise from the virtual exchange of soft or collinear massive gauge bosons [6–11]. The corrections are logarithmically enhanced at large energies and their impact has been discussed in the context of searches for dark matter [12], where the dependence of the EW corrections on p_T can lead to effects of the order of tens of percent at large boson p_T . Furthermore, developments in theory have led to improved predictions with automated next-to-leading order (NLO) QCD and EW corrections, for instance SHERPA + OPENLOOPS [13] and MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO [14]. The $Z + \text{jets}$ and $\gamma + \text{jets}$ cross sections, and their ratio, at high boson p_T , provide valuable information for probing the magnitude and dependence of these higher-order corrections on boson p_T . A differential measurement of the Z/γ cross section ratio at $\sqrt{s} = 8 \text{ TeV}$ has been performed by the CMS Collaboration using data corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 19.7 fb^{-1} [15]. The measurement presented here is the first measurement of this ratio at 13 TeV.

In contrast to corrections in quantum electrodynamics and QCD, where the massless gauge bosons lead to logarithms that are canceled by the corresponding real-emission corrections, the massive W and Z bosons act as infrared regulators and provide a physical cutoff for the calculations of their cross sections. The emission of a W or Z boson can contribute significantly to inclusive $W + \text{jets}$ and $Z + \text{jets}$ production at high energies [16–18]. Such events can be accessed by selecting a high- p_T event topology and studying the region of small angular separation between a W or Z boson and a jet. Measurements of the emission of W bosons with jets were performed by ATLAS at 8 TeV [19] and CMS at 13 TeV [20]. The fully reconstructable decay products from the Z boson (in this case decaying to muons) measured in this work, provide a direct measurement of the angular separation between the Z boson and the closest jet.

2 The CMS detector

The central feature of the CMS apparatus is a superconducting solenoid of 6 m internal diameter, providing a magnetic field of 3.8 T. Within the solenoid volume are a silicon pixel and strip tracker, a lead tungstate crystal electromagnetic calorimeter (ECAL), and a brass and scintillator hadron calorimeter (HCAL), each composed of a barrel and two endcap sections. The ECAL provides coverage in pseudorapidity $|\eta| < 1.48$ in the barrel region (EB), and $1.48 < |\eta| < 3.0$ in two endcap regions (EE). Forward calorimeters extend the pseudorapidity coverage provided by the barrel and endcap detectors. Muons are detected in gas-ionization chambers embedded in the steel flux-return yoke outside the solenoid.

Events of interest are selected using a two-tiered trigger system [21]. The first level, composed of custom hardware processors, uses information from the calorimeters and muon detectors to select events at a rate of around 100 kHz within a fixed latency period of less than $4 \mu\text{s}$. The second level, known as the high-level trigger, consists of a farm of processors running a version of the full event reconstruction software optimized for fast processing, and reduces the event rate to around 1 kHz before data storage.

A more detailed description of the CMS detector, together with a definition of the coordinate system used and the relevant kinematic variables, is reported in Ref. [22].

3 Event simulation

The production of $Z + \text{jets}$ and the decay to muons is simulated at NLO in QCD using the MC event generator MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO (v2.2.2) [23] interfaced with PYTHIA (v8.212) [24] for parton shower (PS) and hadronization. The QCD matrix element (ME) calculation includes up to three final-state partons. The ME-PS matching is performed following the FxFx prescription [25]. The cross section of $Z + \text{jets}$ production for $p_T^Z > 50 \text{ GeV}$, where p_T^Z is the transverse momentum of the Z boson, is computed at next-to-NLO (NNLO) with FEWZ (v3.1) [26]. The renormalization and factorization scales are both set to the sum of the transverse masses of all final state particles and partons.

The $\gamma + \text{jets}$ process is generated using the MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO generator at both leading order (LO) and NLO in perturbative QCD. For the LO samples, the ME calculation includes up to two final state partons and uses the k_T MLM matching scheme [27] with a matching parameter of 20 GeV to avoid double counting the final states arising from the ME calculations and PS evolution. The NLO samples are generated with up to one parton in the final state and the ME-PS matching is performed following the FxFx prescription. After correcting for the detector effects, the data are also compared with $\gamma + \text{jets}$ samples generated at NLO in QCD using the JETPHOX (v1.3.1) [28–30] generator with the Bourhis–Fontannaz–Guillet set II parton-to-photon fragmentation functions [31]. The choice for the renormalization, factorization, and fragmentation scales in JETPHOX are all set to the photon p_T : $\mu_R = \mu_F = \mu_f = p_T^\gamma$. A parton-level isolation criterion is also required by applying a 5 GeV threshold on the transverse energy (E_T), defined as the sum of all parton energies (each multiplied by the $\sin \theta$ of their polar angles), around the photon within a cone of radius $\Delta R = \sqrt{(\Delta\eta)^2 + (\Delta\phi)^2} = 0.4$, where η is the pseudorapidity and ϕ is the azimuthal angle.

The $Z + \text{jets}$ and $\gamma + \text{jets}$ processes are also generated using SHERPA + OPENLOOPS (v2.1.0) [32] with a matrix element calculation for up to 2 additional partons at NLO in QCD and up to 4 partons at LO in QCD and the approximate NLO EW calculation using the Comix [33] and OPENLOOPS [34] matrix element generators. This is merged with CSSHOWER [35], the default

parton shower in SHERPA, using the ME-PS matching implemented according to the MC@NLO method [36, 37]. The renormalization and factorization scales are both set to the METS scale setter [32].

The simulation of background processes contributing to the $Z + \text{jets}$ and $\gamma + \text{jets}$ channels are described in the following.

The production of a W boson in association with jets, where the W boson decays to a charged lepton and a neutrino, is also simulated with MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO and normalized to the cross section calculated at NNLO with FEWZ.

Top quark pair events are generated with MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO and normalized to the inclusive cross section calculated at NNLO together with next-to-next-to-leading logarithmic corrections [38, 39]. Single top quark processes are generated at LO with POWHEG (v2.0) [40–42] and normalized to the NLO cross sections for tW and t -channel production [43], whereas the s -channel production is generated at NLO with MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO.

The diboson production processes are generated at NLO as follows: WZ is generated with MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO; ZZ is generated with a mixture of POWHEG and MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO; WW is generated with POWHEG and normalized to the cross section calculated at NNLO; and $W\gamma$ and $Z\gamma$ are generated with MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO. Finally, multijet QCD events are generated with PYTHIA at LO.

The NNPDF3.0 LO, NLO, and NNLO PDFs [44] are used, respectively, with the LO, NLO, and NNLO codes described above. The PYTHIA program with the CUETP8M1 underlying event tune [45] is used to describe parton showering and hadronization for all simulated samples. The full detector response is simulated using the GEANT4 [46] package for all background and signal samples.

The presence of additional pp interactions in the same or nearby bunch crossings (pileup), corresponding to an average of 23 pileup pp collisions per event in the data, is incorporated into the simulated events. The additional collisions are simulated with PYTHIA using the NNPDF2.3 PDFs [47] and the CUETP8M1 tune. The simulated event samples are weighted to match the pileup distribution measured in data.

4 Event reconstruction and selection

The particle-flow (PF) algorithm [48] aims to reconstruct and identify each individual physics-object (PF candidate) in an event, with an optimized combination of information from the various elements of the CMS detector. The energy of photons is obtained from the ECAL measurement. The energy of electrons is determined from a combination of the electron momentum at the primary interaction vertex as measured by the tracker, the energy of the corresponding ECAL cluster, and the energy sum of all bremsstrahlung photons spatially compatible with originating from the electron track. The momentum of muons is obtained from the curvature of the corresponding track. The energy of charged hadrons is determined from a combination of their momentum measured in the tracker and the matching ECAL and HCAL energy deposits, corrected for zero-suppression effects and for the response function of the calorimeters to hadronic showers. Finally, the energy of neutral hadrons is obtained from the corresponding corrected ECAL and HCAL energies.

In the barrel section of the ECAL, an energy resolution of about 1% is achieved for unconverted or late-converting photons in the tens of GeV energy range. The remaining barrel photons have

a resolution of about 1.3% up to $|\eta| = 1$, increasing to about 2.5% at $|\eta| = 1.4$. In the endcaps, the resolution of unconverted or late-converting photons is about 2.5%, whereas the remaining endcap photons have a resolution between 3 and 4% [49, 50].

For each event, hadronic jets are clustered from PF candidates using the infrared- and collinear-safe anti- k_T algorithm [51, 52] with a distance parameter of $\Delta R = 0.4$. Jet momentum is determined as the vectorial sum of all particle candidate momenta in the jet, and is found from simulation to be, on average, within 5 to 10% of the true momentum over the entire p_T spectrum and detector acceptance. Pileup can contribute additional tracks and calorimetric energy depositions to the jet momentum. To mitigate this effect, tracks identified as originating from pileup vertices are discarded and an offset is applied to correct for the remaining contributions [53, 54]. Jet energy corrections are derived from simulation studies so that the average measured response of jets becomes identical to that of particle-level jets. Measurements of the momentum balance in dijet, $\gamma + \text{jet}$, $Z + \text{jet}$, and multijet events are used to correct for any residual differences in jet energy scale (JES) in data and simulation [55]. The jet energy resolution (JER) amounts typically to 15% at 10 GeV, 8% at 100 GeV, and 4% at 1 TeV [55]. Additional selection criteria are applied to each event to remove jets potentially dominated by anomalous contributions from various subdetector components or reconstruction failures.

The reconstructed vertex with the largest value of summed physics-object p_T^2 is the primary pp interaction vertex. The physics objects are the jets, clustered using the jet finding algorithm [51, 52] with the tracks assigned to the vertex as inputs.

Muons are measured in the range $|\eta| < 2.4$, with detection planes using three technologies: drift tubes, cathode strip chambers, and resistive-plate chambers. Matching muons to tracks measured in the silicon tracker results in a relative transverse momentum resolution of 1 (<7)% [56] in the barrel and 3% in the endcaps, for muons with p_T up to 100 (1000) GeV.

The Z bosons are identified by their decay into $\mu^+\mu^-$ pairs. Events for the Z + jets analysis are selected online using a high-level trigger that requires a loosely isolated muon with a minimum p_T threshold of 24 GeV. Offline, the muon candidates are required to be: reconstructed in the fiducial region $|\eta| < 2.4$; separated from any jets in the event by a distance of $\Delta R > 0.5$; and isolated, where the isolation is calculated from a scalar sum of all PF candidates within an isolation cone with radius $\Delta R = 0.4$, which is required to be <15% of the muon p_T .

Photon events are selected online with a trigger that requires at least one ECAL cluster with $E_T > 175$ GeV, and the ratio of energy deposited in the HCAL to that in the ECAL to be less than 0.15 (0.10) in the EB (EE) region. Offline, photon candidates are required: (i) to have $p_T > 200$ GeV and $|\eta| < 1.4$ to ensure the trigger is fully efficient; (ii) to pass a set of cut-based high-quality identification criteria based on the shape of the electromagnetic shower in the ECAL; and (iii) to have an isolation energy calculated from all PF candidates (charged hadrons, neutral hadrons, and photons) and corrected for pileup on an event-by-event basis within a cone of radius $\Delta R = 0.3$ [49, 50]. The photon isolation from charged hadrons, neutral hadrons, and photons is required to be less than: 0.202 , $0.264 + 0.0148p_T + 0.000017p_T^2$, and $2.362 + 0.0047p_T$, respectively, where the p_T is the photon p_T [49, 50].

Jets are required to have $p_T > 40$ GeV and $|\eta| < 2.4$. For both the Z + jets and $\gamma + \text{jets}$ channels, at least one jet is required to have $p_T > 100$ GeV.

Z bosons are selected by requiring two isolated muons of opposite electric charges. The dimuon invariant mass $m_{\mu\mu}$ is required to be compatible with the Z boson mass, in the range of $71 < m_{\mu\mu} < 111$ GeV. Z + jets events thus contain Z boson and off-peak Drell-Yan + jets production. In case more than one pair is selected, the highest p_T pair is chosen. The muons are each

required to have $p_T > 30$ GeV. In addition, to match the photon requirement in the differential cross section ratio of Z/γ , the dimuon system is required to have $p_T > 200$ GeV and a rapidity in the range $|y| < 1.4$.

The definitions of the fiducial region for the $Z + \text{jets}$ and $\gamma + \text{jets}$ selections closely follow the analysis requirements for the reconstructed objects. The $Z + \text{jets}$ selection requires the presence of two muons with opposite electric charges, whose four-vectors have been summed with all the generated photons and leptons within a cone of $\Delta R = 0.1$. The muons are each required to have $p_T > 30$ GeV and $|\eta| < 2.4$, with an invariant mass in the range $71 < m_{\mu\mu} < 111$ GeV. Both channels require the vector boson to have $p_T > 200$ GeV, $|\eta|$ or $|y| < 1.4$, and at least one jet with $p_T > 100$ GeV, where the jets are required to be separated from the muons or the photon by a distance of $\Delta R > 0.5$.

The selection of events for the collinear Z boson emission analysis follows that of the $Z + \text{jets}$ region, except that the requirements on the boson p_T and y are removed and instead the threshold on the leading jet p_T is raised to 300 GeV. The distribution of the angular separation between the Z boson and the closest jet ($\Delta R_{Z,j}$) from data is compared with theoretical predictions for two thresholds on the leading jet p_T : 300 and 500 GeV. The region $\Delta R_{Z,j} > 2.5$ is dominated by the back-to-back production of a Z boson and a jet, while $\Delta R_{Z,j} < 2.5$ is enhanced in the collinear production. The fiducial region for this analysis is defined by the presence of a Z boson reconstructed from muons with $p_T > 30$ GeV, $|\eta| < 2.4$, and one jet with $|\eta| < 2.4$ and p_T above 300 or 500 GeV.

5 Background estimation

5.1 The $Z + \text{jets}$ channel

The selection of $Z + \text{jets}$ events produces a relatively pure sample of Z bosons decaying to muons. Contributions from background processes in the fiducial region are estimated from simulation and subtracted in the results. The dominant contributions are from diboson events and vector boson fusion $Z + \text{jets}$ production, which is treated as a background in this analysis. These backgrounds contribute at the level of 2.5 and 1.5%, respectively, for the $Z + \text{jets}$ analysis and 3.2 and 3.1% for the collinear Z analysis with leading jet p_T above 300 GeV. The systematic uncertainty in the MC prediction is a quadratic sum of the uncertainties in the modeling of the muon selection efficiencies, simulation-based systematic uncertainties, and the statistical uncertainty due to the limited number of MC events.

5.2 The $\gamma + \text{jets}$ channel

The largest background contribution to the $\gamma + \text{jets}$ region is from QCD multijet processes in which an electron or hadron from a jet is misidentified as a photon candidate. The contribution from such misidentified photon events is estimated from the purity of $\gamma + \text{jets}$ events, defined as the fraction of isolated photons from the hard scattering over the number of all photon candidates after the full selection criteria is applied. A template fit method is used to extract a value for the photon purity in each p_T bin, by fitting the data with a sum of the signal and background templates, where the signal denotes the distribution from genuine photons and the background is the distribution from misidentified photons. The number of isolated photons emitted in the hard scattering is extracted from a fit to the shower shape variable $\sigma_{\eta\eta}$, which defines the extent of the shower along the η direction within a 5×5 array of ECAL crystals [49]. This variable provides discrimination between signal and background, owing to the respective narrow and wide lateral spreads in the showers observed from genuine and misidentified photons.

The signal template is obtained from simulated $\gamma + \text{jets}$ events generated at NLO using MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO, selecting all candidates passing the analysis selection criteria and matched to a particle-level isolated photon coming from the hard scattering. The particle-level photon is defined as a prompt photon with the scalar p_T sum of all additional generated stable particles (within a cone of $\Delta R = 0.4$ around the photon) required to be less than 5 GeV. The uncertainty in the shape of the signal template is estimated using an alternative MC simulation. A comparison is made between the signal $\sigma_{\eta\eta}$ distribution from the LO SHERPA prediction and the nominal distribution from MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO. The shape of the $\sigma_{\eta\eta}$ distribution from the two simulations are similar. The signal template obtained from SHERPA is provided as an alternative template to the fit.

A data region enriched in misidentified photons is selected using the isolation of the photon candidate, as determined by summing the transverse momenta of only charged hadrons (charged-hadron isolation I_{ch}). This region is used to obtain the background template; the presence of genuine photons can lead to a background template that looks like the signal distribution and skews the estimate of the purity. The value of I_{ch} used to define this background-enriched region is thus chosen following an optimization to reduce the contamination from signal events and, at the same time, provide a statistically sufficient sample of misidentified photons. The charged-hadron isolation is required to be in the range 10–15 GeV, following an optimization procedure described below. Any remaining residual contribution from genuine photons, which is under 6% for $\sigma_{\eta\eta} < 0.010$, is subtracted using simulation. Since this subtraction procedure relies on an accurate normalization of the MC prediction in this region of phase space, an additional cross-check is performed to validate it. The definition of the background-enriched region is varied, and the effect of this variation on the $\sigma_{\eta\eta}$ distribution is studied. The difference in the shape of this distribution in the nominal region and one with a different I_{ch} range is estimated by constructing a quantity $R^{\sigma_{\eta\eta}}$, defined as the ratio of the number of events in the signal region ($\sigma_{\eta\eta} < 0.010$) and background-dominated regions ($\sigma_{\eta\eta} > 0.014$); the latter being dominated by misidentified photons. The behaviour of $R^{\sigma_{\eta\eta}}$ is studied for a large number of possible background-enriched regions defined within the I_{ch} range of 1–20 GeV. The ratio is most stable around a range where the lower threshold on the I_{ch} is sufficiently far away from the signal region to be least affected by the contamination from signal events. The optimal background-enriched region is found to be $10 < I_{\text{ch}} < 15$ GeV. A systematic uncertainty from the choice of this region is determined from the maximum variation of the background template across all possible regions that produce a value for $R^{\sigma_{\eta\eta}}$ that does not vary with the amount of signal contamination. This shape difference is small, within the statistical uncertainty associated with the number of events in the sideband region.

A binned maximum-likelihood fit is performed to the $\sigma_{\eta\eta}$ distribution in data to extract the fraction of genuine photons. Statistical uncertainties in the templates are included in the fit as nuisance parameters using the Barlow–Beeston approach [57]. The purity fraction is estimated by integrating the fitted template over the photon $\sigma_{\eta\eta}$ fiducial region of $\sigma_{\eta\eta} < 0.010$. Figure 1 shows the results of the fit to the $\sigma_{\eta\eta}$ distribution for the p_T bin 300–350 GeV, and the purity values extracted from a similar fit in each p_T bin. The purity as a function of photon p_T is then fitted with a functional form and used to extract the purity values for the subsequent unfolding procedure. Also shown in Fig. 1 is the associated uncertainty in the purity, including both the statistical uncertainty from the fit and systematic contributions from the alternative signal template, choice of background-enriched region, discrepancies in modeling of the $\sigma_{\eta\eta}$ distribution, and photon selection efficiencies. The purity for photons with $p_T > 200$ (400) GeV is above 98 (99)% and approaches 100% at high p_T .




Figure 1: A fit to the $\sigma_{\eta\eta}$ distribution using signal and background templates to extract a value for the purity in the photon p_T bin of 300–350 GeV. The signal region is to the left of the vertical dashed line (left). Purity as a function of photon p_T , as extracted from a fit to the $\sigma_{\eta\eta}$ distribution in each p_T bin. The error bars show the total statistical and systematic uncertainty and the solid line is the fit to the data points (right).

6 Corrections for detector effects

The reconstructed distributions are corrected for the event selection efficiency and detector resolution effects using an unfolding technique that employs a response matrix to map the reconstructed observables onto the generator-level values. This is performed using the TUNFOLD software package [58], which is based on a least squares fit and includes the option for a possible Tikhonov regularization term [59]. The strength of the regularization parameter is determined with the L -curve scan method [60] and is negligible. Hence, no regularization is applied to the distributions.

The simulation used to build the response matrix correcting for Z + jets and γ + jets events is based on NLO MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO. To build the response matrix, the bosons in each generator-level event passing the fiducial requirements described in Section 4 are matched to the corresponding reconstruction-level objects. When the generator-level bosons match the reconstruction-level objects, the response matrix is populated with both events, whereas generated events in the fiducial region without a matching reconstructed boson candidate are used to determine the selection efficiency. Conversely, a reconstructed boson candidate in the fiducial region not matched to a generator-level boson is considered as a further background source.

The unfolding of the $\Delta R_{Z,j}$ distribution is also performed using the NLO MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO simulation. For this distribution, an additional matching procedure is performed between the closest jet to the reconstructed Z boson and a generator-level jet. The response matrix is then built similarly to the Z + jets and γ + jets cases.

After the unfolding procedure, the fiducial region event yield is obtained and the corresponding measured fiducial cross sections are compared with different theoretical predictions.

7 Systematic uncertainties

Systematic uncertainties associated with the measurement of the cross sections are propagated by varying the parameter representing the source of each uncertainty by one standard devia-

tion up and down ($\pm 1\sigma$) and recomputing the response matrix for each variation.

The systematic uncertainty in the efficiency of selecting muons or photons is determined by comparing the efficiency expected from simulation and measured in data with the “tag-and-probe” method [61] as a function of the p_T and η of the relevant object. For photons, this is derived using a sample of electrons from Z decays [49], reconstructed as photons without the electron-veto requirement. This uncertainty is applied as a scale factor on an event-by-event basis and implemented in the unfolding procedure as alternative MC distributions for each $\pm 1\sigma$ variation on the efficiencies. The statistical (systematic) component of the uncertainty is treated as uncorrelated (correlated) across the boson p_T bins. The uncertainty in the muon selection efficiency, which includes the identification, isolation and tracking efficiency, contributes at the 0.8–1.0% level to the $Z + \text{jets}$ cross section, whereas the uncertainty in the photon selection efficiency, which includes the identification and isolation efficiency, contributes at the 2.5–2.6% level on the $\gamma + \text{jets}$ cross section across the full p_T range.

The systematic uncertainty in the muon momentum scale is the dominant systematic uncertainty in the $Z + \text{jets}$ cross section. The uncertainty in the scale of up to 1 (7)% at $p_T < 100$ (1000) GeV for each muon results in an uncertainty in the cross section ranging from 1.7% at low p_T up to 22% at high p_T . The uncertainty in the photon energy scale and resolution of 1–2% results in an uncertainty in the cross section of ($\leq 1\%$) at low p_T and up to 8.6% at high p_T , becoming the dominant systematic uncertainty.

The effect on the measurement from the uncertainty in the JES and JER is evaluated by varying the jet four-momenta using the uncertainties in the correction factors that depend on the jet p_T and η for the JES, and jet η for the JER. The uncertainties from the JES and JER are subdominant (below or at the 1% level) for all three event categories, because of the high- p_T threshold of the leading jet.

The sources of systematic uncertainty associated with the estimation of the photon purity are described in more detail in Section 5.2, and contribute up to 1.1% at low photon p_T and down to 0.2% at high p_T .

A correction is applied to account for the difference in pileup between data and simulation. It has a negligible (less than 1%) effect on the $Z + \text{jets}$ and $\gamma + \text{jets}$ cross sections. A 2.5% uncertainty in the total integrated luminosity [62] is applied to the unfolded data distribution.

Uncertainties are included in the unfolding procedure from the statistical size of the simulation sample used to build the response matrix and from the difference between the LO and NLO MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO samples. The overall unfolding uncertainty is the quadratic sum of these two contributions, with the dominant uncertainty being the statistical size of the simulation samples. The uncertainty in the unfolding is the dominant uncertainty at high boson p_T for the $Z + \text{jets}$ cross section, contributing up to 19% in the highest Z boson p_T bin, and a lower uncertainty in the $\gamma + \text{jets}$ cross section, contributing up to 6.4% at high photon p_T . The uncertainty in the unfolding for the $\Delta R_{Z,j}$ distribution is among the largest uncertainties.

A summary of the contributions from each uncertainty source to the differential cross section measurements of $Z + \text{jets}$, $\gamma + \text{jets}$, Z/γ ratio, and Z -jet angular separation for a leading jet p_T threshold of 300 GeV is shown in Table 1. Common sources of systematic uncertainties such as those from JES, JER, and integrated luminosity are treated as correlated between $Z + \text{jets}$ and $\gamma + \text{jets}$ and therefore mostly cancel in the Z/γ ratio, whereas sources of uncertainty such as the lepton efficiency, trigger, and photon purity are treated as uncorrelated.

Table 1: The contributions to the uncertainty in the differential cross section measurements for the $Z + \text{jets}$ and $\gamma + \text{jets}$ processes, the Z/γ ratio, and the $\Delta R_{Z,j}$ region. The uncertainties are expressed in percent, and a range represents the minimum and maximum effect observed.

Systematic source	Z + jets [%]	$\gamma + \text{jets}$ [%]	(Z + jets)/($\gamma + \text{jets}$) [%]	$\Delta R_{Z,j}$ region [%]
Trigger	0.0	0.2–2.2	0.2–2.2	0.0–0.2
Muon reconstruction and selection	0.8–1.0	—	0.8–1.0	0.9–1.1
Photon reconstruction and selection	—	2.5–2.6	2.5–2.6	—
Photon energy scale	—	0.5–8.6	0.5–8.6	—
Muon momentum scale	1.7–22	—	1.7–22	0.1–12
Photon purity	—	0.2–1.1	0.2–1.1	—
Background yields	0.7–1.5	—	0.5–1.6	0.9–11
Pileup	0.0–0.7	0.0–0.3	0.0–0.4	0.2–0.9
Integrated luminosity	2.5	2.5	0.0	2.5
Unfolding	0.3–19	1.1–6.4	1.1–20	1.2–11
JES/JER	0.0–0.2	0.0–0.2	≤ 0.04	0.3–1.5
Total	3.3–29	4.0–12	4.4–31	3.5–17

8 Results

A comparison of the unfolded cross section of $Z + \text{jets}$ events, as a function of the Z boson p_T , with several theoretical predictions is shown in Fig. 2 left (upper and lower panels). The unfolded data are compared with the LO and NLO predictions from MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO and the NLO QCD+EW prediction from SHERPA + OPENLOOPS. The predictions from MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO at LO are normalized to the NNLO cross section from FEWZ. Statistical uncertainties associated with the MC are shown for the LO and NLO predictions in the lower panel. Additionally, the NLO prediction from MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO is shown with the uncertainties from the variation in the PDFs, and in μ_R and μ_F . The PDF uncertainty is evaluated by taking the one sigma uncertainty band from the different PDF replicas and the scale uncertainty is evaluated by independently varying the scales up and down by a factor of two, with the condition that $0.5 < \mu_F/\mu_R < 2.0$, and taking the largest cross section variation as the uncertainty.

The statistical uncertainty in the data is shown with the error bars, and the combined statistical and systematic uncertainty is represented by the shaded band. Systematic uncertainties from the integrated luminosity and the muon selection efficiency determination dominate the low- p_T region, whereas the major source of the systematic uncertainty in the high- p_T region comes from the unfolding. The precision in the high- p_T region is limited by both the statistical uncertainties in the data and also by the limited size of the MC samples. The data show agreement within uncertainties with all predictions across almost the entire p_T range. A difference of 1.7 standard deviations is observed between the data and the prediction from MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO in the 950–1200 GeV bin.

The distribution of the unfolded photon p_T is compared with theoretical predictions from JETPHOX, SHERPA + OPENLOOPS, and MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO in Fig. 2 right (upper and lower panels). The LO prediction from MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO shows a 10–30% disagreement in the shape of the photon p_T distribution, in particular for p_T values below ≈ 600 GeV. The corresponding NLO calculation shows agreement within uncertainties across the full range of p_T . The SHERPA + OPENLOOPS calculation overpredicts the data by 20–30% in the p_T region below 500 GeV and is consistent within uncertainties for the rest of the p_T range. The NLO prediction from JETPHOX is shown with the uncertainties from the variation in PDFs and in μ_R , μ_F and μ_f . The prediction is mostly consistent with data within uncertainties with a general overprediction at the level of $\approx 20\%$ for $p_T < 500$ GeV. Since the experimental uncertainties are smaller




Figure 2: Measured differential cross sections as a function of the boson p_T for $Z + \text{jets}$ (left) and $\gamma + \text{jets}$ (right) and their comparisons with several theoretical predictions. The LO MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO prediction for $Z + \text{jets}$ has been normalized to the NNLO cross section (denoted by k_{NNLO}). The vertical bars in the upper panels represent the statistical uncertainty in the measurement and the hatched band in the lower and upper panels is the sum in quadrature of the statistical and systematic uncertainty components in the measurement. The lower panels show the ratios of the theoretical predictions to the unfolded data. The shaded band in the LO MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO and SHERPA + OPENLOOPS calculations shows the statistical uncertainty. The dark (light) shaded band on the NLO prediction from MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO and the JETPHOX prediction represents the PDF (scale) uncertainties, whereas the statistical uncertainties are barely visible.

than or comparable with the theoretical uncertainties for low and intermediate photon p_T , this analysis can be useful to constrain the proton PDF [3].

The ratio of differential cross sections for the two processes, $Z + \text{jets}$ over $\gamma + \text{jets}$, is shown in Fig. 3 and compared with the theoretical prediction at NLO from MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO and NLO QCD+EW from SHERPA + OPENLOOPS. The comparison with MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO shows consistency within the uncertainties across the entire p_T range, whereas SHERPA + OPENLOOPS underpredicts the data by 10–20% at low p_T but is consistent with data within uncertainties for $p_T > 300 \text{ GeV}$.




Figure 3: Differential cross section ratio of Z + jets to γ + jets as a function of the vector boson (V) transverse momentum compared with the theoretical prediction from MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO and SHERPA + OPENLOOPS. Only vector bosons produced centrally, with $|y| < 1.4$, in association with one or more jets are considered. The lower panel shows the ratio of the theoretical prediction to the unfolded data. The vertical bars in the upper panel represent the statistical uncertainty in the measurement and the hatched band in the lower and upper panels is the sum in quadrature of the statistical and systematic uncertainty components in the measurement. The dark (light) shaded band on the NLO prediction from MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO represents the PDF (scale) uncertainties, which are treated as uncorrelated between Z + jets and γ + jets, whereas the statistical uncertainties are barely visible. The shaded band on the SHERPA + OPENLOOPS calculation is the statistical uncertainty.

The unfolded distribution for the angular separation between the Z boson and the closest jet is shown in Fig. 4 and compared with predictions from MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO and SHERPA + OPENLOOPS. The peak around $\Delta R_{Z,j} = 3.4$ corresponds to the back-to-back production of a Z boson and a jet, whereas the region below $\Delta R_{Z,j} \approx 2.5$ is enhanced in the collinear emission of a Z boson close to a jet. The theoretical predictions are generally consistent with the data within the uncertainties for the case where the leading jet p_T is above 500 GeV. The LO prediction from MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO underpredicts the data for $\Delta R_{Z,j} > 1.8$, whereas the NLO prediction is consistent within uncertainties for the bulk of the distribution with the largest discrepancy for $\Delta R_{Z,j}$ below 0.8 for leading jet $p_T > 300$ GeV, the region dominated by collinear production. The SHERPA + OPENLOOPS prediction is typically higher than the data for the region below $\Delta R_{Z,j} \approx 1.8$, but has a large statistical uncertainty and is mostly consistent with the data within these uncertainties.




Figure 4: Measured differential cross section of Z + jets as a function of the angular separation between the Z boson and the closest jet, compared with theoretical predictions from MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO and SHERPA + OPENLOOPS, where the leading jet p_T is above 300 (left) and 500 (right) GeV. The vertical bars in the upper panel represent the statistical uncertainty in the measurement and the hatched band in the lower and upper panels is the sum in quadrature of the statistical and systematic uncertainty components in the measurement. The lower panels show the ratio of the theoretical predictions to the unfolded data. The shaded band on the LO MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO and SHERPA + OPENLOOPS calculations is the statistical uncertainty. The dark (light) shaded band on the NLO prediction from MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO represents the PDF (scale) uncertainties.

9 Summary

This paper presents measurements of standard model processes that probe regions of phase space characterized by the production of Z + jets and γ + jets at large boson transverse momentum (p_T), and of a Z boson in association with at least one very high p_T jet.

The measurements utilize data recorded with the CMS detector in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV at the LHC that correspond to an integrated luminosity of 35.9 fb^{-1} . Comparisons are made between the unfolded data and several theory predictions.

The Z + jets and γ + jets cross sections as a function of boson p_T are presented for p_T above

200 GeV and compared with predictions from (i) the leading-order (LO) and next-to-leading-order (NLO) calculations from MADGRAPH5.aMC@NLO, and (ii) the NLO quantum chromodynamics and electroweak (QCD+EW) calculation from SHERPA + OPENLOOPS. In addition, the γ + jets measurement is compared with NLO JETPHOX predictions. The data are consistent with theory for both the γ and Z boson final states, although in some regions of phase space a few tens of percent deviations are observed. In general, the perturbative NLO corrections exhibit a better agreement with the measurements.

This is the first measurement at 13 TeV of the ratio of cross sections for Z + jets to γ + jets as a function of boson p_T . This ratio is compared with the NLO calculation from MADGRAPH5.aMC@NLO and the NLO QCD+EW prediction from SHERPA + OPENLOOPS; and it probes the region up to 1.5 TeV in boson p_T . The data are generally in agreement with theory within the uncertainties over the full range of boson p_T . This ratio provides an important theoretical input for the estimation, based on the γ + jets process, of the $Z \rightarrow \nu\bar{\nu}$ background relevant in searches for new physics.

The measurement of the emission of a Z boson collinear to a jet represents the first explicit study of this topology at the LHC. It is accessed through the production of a Z boson in association with at least one high- p_T jet (>300 or >500 GeV), and the differential cross section is measured as a function of the angular separation between the Z boson and the closest jet ($\Delta R_{Z,j}$). The unfolded data are compared with the LO and NLO calculations from MADGRAPH5.aMC@NLO, and the NLO QCD+EW prediction from SHERPA + OPENLOOPS. The NLO MADGRAPH shows agreement over most of the measured distribution, but underpredicts it for the $\Delta R_{Z,j}$ region below 0.8, which is dominated by events with the emission of a Z boson in close proximity to a jet. The prediction from SHERPA is also generally consistent with the measurement.

The measurements presented in this paper will become increasingly important in current and future runs of the LHC, where the higher \sqrt{s} and larger integrated luminosity will push the LHC program into new territory, necessitating an understanding of standard model processes in regions of previously unexplored phase space.

Acknowledgments

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

Individuals have received support from the Marie-Curie program and the European Research Council and Horizon 2020 Grant, contract Nos. 675440, 724704, 752730, and 765710 (European Union); the Leventis Foundation; the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation; the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation; the Belgian Federal Science Policy Office; the Fonds pour la Formation à la Recherche dans l'Industrie et dans l'Agriculture (FRIA-Belgium); the Agentschap voor Innovatie door Wetenschap en Technologie (IWT-Belgium); the F.R.S.-FNRS and FWO (Belgium) under the "Excellence of Science – EOS" – be.h project n. 30820817; the Beijing Municipal Science & Technology Commission, No. Z191100007219010; the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (MEYS) of the Czech Republic; the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG), under Germany's Excellence Strategy – EXC 2121 "Quantum Universe" – 390833306, and under project number 400140256 - GRK2497; the Lendület ("Momentum") Program and the János Bolyai Research Scholarship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, the New National Excellence Program ÚNKP, the NKFI research grants 123842, 123959, 124845, 124850, 125105, 128713, 128786, and 129058 (Hungary); the Council of Science and Industrial Research, India; the Lebanese CNRS and the Lebanese University (Lebanon); the HOMING PLUS program of the Foundation for Polish Science, cofinanced from European Union, Regional Development Fund, the Mobility Plus program of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education, the National Science Center (Poland), contracts Harmonia 2014/14/M/ST2/00428, Opus 2014/13/B/ST2/02543, 2014/15/B/ST2/03998, and 2015/19/B/ST2/02861, Sonata-bis 2012/07/E/ST2/01406; the National Priorities Research Program by Qatar National Research Fund; the Ministry of Science and Higher Education, project no. 0723-2020-0041 (Russia); the Programa Estatal de Fomento de la Investigación Científica y Técnica de Excelencia María de Maeztu, grant MDM-2015-0509 and the Programa Severo Ochoa del Principado de Asturias; the Thalís and Aristeia programs cofinanced by EU-ESF and the Greek NSRF; the Rachadapisek Sompot Fund for Postdoctoral Fellowship, Chulalongkorn University and the Chulalongkorn Academic into Its 2nd Century Project Advancement Project (Thailand); the Kavli Foundation; the Nvidia Corporation; the SuperMicro Corporation; the Welch Foundation, contract C-1845; and the Weston Havens Found-

dation (USA).

References

- [1] A. Gehrmann-De Ridder et al., “Precise QCD predictions for the production of a Z boson in association with a hadronic jet”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117** (2016) 022001, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.117.022001, arXiv:1507.02850.
- [2] R. Boughezal et al., “Z-boson production in association with a jet at next-to-next-to-leading order in perturbative QCD”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116** (2016) 152001, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.152001, arXiv:1512.01291.
- [3] L. Carminati et al., “Sensitivity of the LHC isolated-gamma+jet data to the parton distribution functions of the proton”, *EPL* **101** (2013) 61002, doi:10.1209/0295-5075/101/61002, arXiv:1212.5511.
- [4] R. Boughezal, A. Guffanti, F. Petriello, and M. Ubiali, “The impact of the LHC Z-boson transverse momentum data on PDF determinations”, *JHEP* **07** (2017) 130, doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2017)130, arXiv:1705.00343.
- [5] CMS Collaboration, “Search for new physics in final states with an energetic jet or a hadronically decaying W or Z boson and transverse momentum imbalance at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV”, *Phys. Rev. D* **97** (2018) 092005, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.97.092005, arXiv:1712.02345.
- [6] W. J. Stirling and E. Vryonidou, “Electroweak corrections and Bloch-Nordsieck violations in 2-to-2 processes at the LHC”, *JHEP* **04** (2013) 155, doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2013)155, arXiv:1212.6537.
- [7] A. Denner, S. Dittmaier, T. Kasprzik, and A. Mück, “Electroweak corrections to W + jet hadroproduction including leptonic W-boson decays”, *JHEP* **08** (2009) 075, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2009/08/075, arXiv:0906.1656.
- [8] A. Denner, S. Dittmaier, T. Kasprzik, and A. Mück, “Electroweak corrections to dilepton + jet production at hadron colliders”, *JHEP* **06** (2011) 069, doi:10.1007/JHEP06(2011)069, arXiv:1103.0914.
- [9] A. Denner, S. Dittmaier, T. Kasprzik, and A. Mück, “Electroweak corrections to monojet production at the LHC”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **73** (2013) 2297, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-013-2297-x, arXiv:1211.5078.
- [10] A. Denner, L. Hofer, A. Scharf, and S. Uccirati, “Electroweak corrections to lepton pair production in association with two hard jets at the LHC”, *JHEP* **01** (2015) 094, doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2015)094, arXiv:1411.0916.
- [11] S. Kallweit et al., “NLO QCD+EW predictions for V+jets including off-shell vector-boson decays and multijet merging”, *JHEP* **04** (2016) 021, doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2016)021, arXiv:1511.08692.
- [12] J. M. Lindert et al., “Precise predictions for V+jets dark matter backgrounds”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77** (2017) 829, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-5389-1, arXiv:1705.04664.

-
- [13] M. Schönherr et al., “NLO QCD+EW for V+jets”, in *Proceedings of the 4th Large Hadron Collider Physics Conference (LHCP 2016)*, p. 58. 2016. arXiv:1609.01445.
doi:10.22323/1.276.0058.
- [14] R. Frederix et al., “The automation of next-to-leading order electroweak calculations”, *JHEP* **07** (2018) 185, doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2018)185, arXiv:1804.10017.
- [15] CMS Collaboration, “Comparison of the $Z/\gamma^* + \text{jets}$ to $\gamma + \text{jets}$ cross sections in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8 \text{ TeV}$ ”, *JHEP* **10** (2015) 128, doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2016)010, arXiv:1505.06520.
- [16] U. Baur, “Weak boson emission in hadron collider processes”, *Phys. Rev. D* **75** (2007) 013005, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.75.013005, arXiv:hep-ph/0611241.
- [17] J. R. Christiansen and T. Sjöstrand, “Weak gauge boson radiation in parton showers”, *JHEP* **04** (2014) 115, doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2014)115, arXiv:1401.5238.
- [18] F. Krauss, P. Petrov, M. Schönherr, and M. Spannowsky, “Measuring collinear W emissions inside jets”, *Phys. Rev. D* **89** (2014) 114006, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.89.114006, arXiv:1403.4788.
- [19] ATLAS Collaboration, “Measurement of W boson angular distributions in events with high transverse momentum jets at $\sqrt{s} = 8 \text{ TeV}$ using the ATLAS detector”, *Phys. Lett. B* **765** (2017) 132, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2016.12.005, arXiv:1609.07045.
- [20] CMS Collaboration, “Measurement of the differential cross sections for the associated production of a W boson and jets in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13 \text{ TeV}$ ”, *Phys. Rev. D* **96** (2017) 072005, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.96.072005, arXiv:1707.05979.
- [21] CMS Collaboration, “The CMS trigger system”, *JINST* **12** (2017) P01020, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/12/01/P01020, arXiv:1609.02366.
- [22] CMS Collaboration, “The CMS experiment at the CERN LHC”, *JINST* **3** (2008) S08004, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08004.
- [23] J. Alwall et al., “The automated computation of tree-level and next-to-leading order differential cross sections, and their matching to parton shower simulations”, *JHEP* **07** (2014) 079, doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2014)079, arXiv:1405.0301.
- [24] T. Sjöstrand et al., “An introduction to PYTHIA 8.2”, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **191** (2015) 159, doi:10.1016/j.cpc.2015.01.024, arXiv:1410.3012.
- [25] R. Frederix and S. Frixione, “Merging meets matching in MC@NLO”, *JHEP* **12** (2012) 061, doi:10.1007/JHEP12(2012)061, arXiv:1209.6215.
- [26] K. Melnikov and F. Petriello, “Electroweak gauge boson production at hadron colliders through $\mathcal{O}(\alpha(s)^2)$ ”, *Phys. Rev. D* **74** (2006) 114017, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.74.114017, arXiv:hep-ph/0609070.
- [27] J. Alwall et al., “Comparative study of various algorithms for the merging of parton showers and matrix elements in hadronic collisions”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **53** (2008) 473, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-007-0490-5, arXiv:0706.2569.
- [28] S. Catani, M. Fontannaz, J. P. Guillet, and E. Pilon, “Cross-section of isolated prompt photons in hadron-hadron collisions”, *JHEP* **05** (2002) 028, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2002/05/028, arXiv:hep-ph/0204023.

- [29] P. Aurenche et al., “A new critical study of photon production in hadronic collisions”, *Phys. Rev. D* **73** (2006) 094007, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.73.094007, arXiv:hep-ph/0602133.
- [30] Z. Belghobsi et al., “Photon-jet correlations and constraints on fragmentation functions”, *Phys. Rev. D* **79** (2009) 114024, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.79.114024, arXiv:0903.4834.
- [31] L. Bourhis, M. Fontannaz, and J. P. Guillet, “Quark and gluon fragmentation functions into photons”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **2** (1998) 529, doi:10.1007/s100520050158, arXiv:hep-ph/9704447.
- [32] E. Bothmann et al., “Event generation with Sherpa 2.2”, *SciPost Phys.* **7** (2019) 034, doi:10.21468/SciPostPhys.7.3.034, arXiv:1905.09127.
- [33] T. Gleisberg and S. Hoeche, “Comix, a new matrix element generator”, *JHEP* **12** (2008) 039, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2008/12/039, arXiv:0808.3674.
- [34] F. Buccioni et al., “Openloops 2”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79** (2019) 866, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-019-7306-2, arXiv:1907.13071.
- [35] S. Schumann and F. Krauss, “A parton shower algorithm based on Catani-Seymour dipole factorisation”, *JHEP* **03** (2008) 038, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2008/03/038, arXiv:0709.1027.
- [36] S. Hoeche, F. Krauss, M. Schönherr, and F. Siegert, “A critical appraisal of NLO+PS matching methods”, *JHEP* **09** (2012) 049, doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2012)049, arXiv:1111.1220.
- [37] S. Frixione and B. R. Webber, “Matching NLO QCD computations and parton shower simulations”, *JHEP* **06** (2002) 029, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2002/06/029, arXiv:hep-ph/0204244.
- [38] N. Kidonakis, “Differential and total cross sections for top pair and single top production”, in *20th International Workshop on Deep-Inelastic Scattering and Related Subjects*, p. 40. 2012. arXiv:1205.3453. doi:10.3204/DESY-PROC-2012-02/251.
- [39] M. Czakon, P. Fiedler, and A. Mitov, “Total top-quark pair-production cross section at hadron colliders through $O(\alpha_s^4)$ ”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110** (2013) 252004, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.110.252004, arXiv:1303.6254.
- [40] P. Nason, “A new method for combining NLO QCD with shower Monte Carlo algorithms”, *JHEP* **11** (2004) 040, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2004/11/040, arXiv:hep-ph/0409146.
- [41] S. Frixione, P. Nason, and C. Oleari, “Matching NLO QCD computations with parton shower simulations: the POWHEG method”, *JHEP* **11** (2007) 070, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2007/11/070, arXiv:0709.2092.
- [42] S. Alioli, P. Nason, C. Oleari, and E. Re, “A general framework for implementing NLO calculations in shower Monte Carlo programs: the POWHEG BOX”, *JHEP* **06** (2010) 043, doi:10.1007/JHEP06(2010)043, arXiv:1002.2581.

-
- [43] E. Re, “Single-top Wt -channel production matched with parton showers using the POWHEG method”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **71** (2011) 1547, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-011-1547-z, arXiv:1009.2450.
- [44] NNPDF Collaboration, “Parton distributions for the LHC Run 2”, *JHEP* **04** (2015) 040, doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2015)040, arXiv:1410.8849.
- [45] CMS Collaboration, “Event generator tunes obtained from underlying event and multiparton scattering measurements”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76** (2016) 155, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-3988-x, arXiv:1512.00815.
- [46] GEANT4 Collaboration, “GEANT4: A simulation toolkit”, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **506** (2003) 250, doi:10.1016/S0168-9002(03)01368-8.
- [47] R. D. Ball et al., “Parton distributions with LHC data”, *Nucl. Phys. B* **867** (2013) 244, doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2012.10.003, arXiv:1207.1303.
- [48] CMS Collaboration, “Particle-flow reconstruction and global event description with the CMS detector”, *JINST* **12** (2017) P10003, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/12/10/P10003, arXiv:1706.04965.
- [49] CMS Collaboration, “Performance of photon reconstruction and identification with the CMS detector in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV”, *JINST* **10** (2015) P08010, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/10/08/P08010, arXiv:1502.02702.
- [50] CMS Collaboration, “Electron and photon reconstruction and identification with the CMS experiment at the CERN LHC”, (12, 2020). arXiv:2012.06888.
- [51] M. Cacciari, G. P. Salam, and G. Soyez, “The anti- k_T jet clustering algorithm”, *JHEP* **04** (2008) 063, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2008/04/063, arXiv:0802.1189.
- [52] M. Cacciari, G. P. Salam, and G. Soyez, “FastJet user manual”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **72** (2012) 1896, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-012-1896-2, arXiv:1111.6097.
- [53] M. Cacciari and G. P. Salam, “Pileup subtraction using jet areas”, *Phys. Lett. B* **659** (2008) 119, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2007.09.077, arXiv:0707.1378.
- [54] CMS Collaboration, “Determination of jet energy calibration and transverse momentum resolution in CMS”, *JINST* **6** (2011) P11002, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/6/11/p11002, arXiv:1107.4277.
- [55] CMS Collaboration, “Jet energy scale and resolution in the CMS experiment in pp collisions at 8 TeV”, *JINST* **12** (2017) P02014, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/12/02/P02014, arXiv:1607.03663.
- [56] CMS Collaboration, “Performance of the CMS muon detector and muon reconstruction with proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV”, *JINST* **13** (2018) P06015, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/13/06/P06015, arXiv:1804.04528.
- [57] R. J. Barlow and C. Beeston, “Fitting using finite Monte Carlo samples”, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **77** (1993) 90005, doi:10.1016/0010-4655(93)90005-w.
- [58] S. Schmitt, “TUnfold: an algorithm for correcting migration effects in high energy physics”, *JINST* **7** (2012) T10003, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/7/10/T10003, arXiv:1205.6201.

-
- [59] A. N. Tikhonov, "Solution of incorrectly formulated problems and the regularization method", *Soviet Math. Dokl.* **4** (1963) 1035.
- [60] P. C. Hansen, "The L-curve and its use in the numerical treatment of inverse problems", in *Computational Inverse Problems in Electrocardiology*, ed. P. Johnston, *Advances in Computational Bioengineering*, p. 119. WIT Press, 2000.
- [61] CMS Collaboration, "Measurement of the inclusive W and Z production cross sections in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV", *JHEP* **10** (2011) 132, doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2011)132, arXiv:1107.4789.
- [62] CMS Collaboration, "CMS luminosity measurements for the 2016 data taking period", CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-LUM-17-001, 2017.

A The CMS Collaboration

Yerevan Physics Institute, Yerevan, Armenia

A.M. Sirunyan[†], A. Tumasyan

Institut für Hochenergiephysik, Wien, Austria

W. Adam, F. Ambrogio, T. Bergauer, M. Dragicevic, J. Erö, A. Escalante Del Valle, R. Frühwirth¹, M. Jeitler¹, N. Krammer, L. Lechner, D. Liko, T. Madlener, I. Mikulec, F.M. Pitters, N. Rad, J. Schieck¹, R. Schöfbeck, M. Spanring, S. Templ, W. Waltenberger, C.-E. Wulz¹, M. Zarucki

Institute for Nuclear Problems, Minsk, Belarus

V. Chekhovskiy, A. Litomin, V. Makarenko, J. Suarez Gonzalez

Universiteit Antwerpen, Antwerpen, Belgium

M.R. Darwish², E.A. De Wolf, D. Di Croce, X. Janssen, T. Kello³, A. Lelek, M. Pieters, H. Rejeb Sfar, H. Van Haevermaet, P. Van Mechelen, S. Van Putte, N. Van Remortel

Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussel, Belgium

F. Blekman, E.S. Bols, S.S. Chhibra, J. D'Hondt, J. De Clercq, D. Lontkovskiy, S. Lowette, I. Marchesini, S. Moortgat, A. Morton, Q. Python, S. Tavernier, W. Van Doninck, P. Van Mulders

Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium

D. Beghin, B. Bilin, B. Clerboux, G. De Lentdecker, B. Dorney, L. Favart, A. Grebenyuk, A.K. Kalsi, I. Makarenko, L. Moureaux, L. Pétré, A. Popov, N. Postiau, E. Starling, L. Thomas, C. Vander Velde, P. Vanlaer, D. Vannerom, L. Wezenbeek

Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

T. Cornelis, D. Dobur, M. Gruchala, I. Khvastunov⁴, M. Niedziela, C. Roskas, K. Skovpen, M. Tytgat, W. Verbeke, B. Vermassen, M. Vit

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

G. Bruno, F. Bury, C. Caputo, P. David, C. Delaere, M. Delcourt, I.S. Donertas, A. Giammanco, V. Lemaitre, K. Mondal, J. Prisciandaro, A. Taliencio, M. Teklishyn, P. Vischia, S. Wuyckens, J. Zobec

Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Físicas, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

G.A. Alves, G. Correia Silva, C. Hensel, A. Moraes

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

W.L. Aldá Júnior, E. Belchior Batista Das Chagas, H. BRANDAO MALBOUISSON, W. Carvalho, J. Chinellato⁵, E. Coelho, E.M. Da Costa, G.G. Da Silveira⁶, D. De Jesus Damiao, S. Fonseca De Souza, J. Martins⁷, D. Matos Figueiredo, M. Medina Jaime⁸, M. Melo De Almeida, C. Mora Herrera, L. Mundim, H. Nogima, P. Rebello Teles, L.J. Sanchez Rosas, A. Santoro, S.M. Silva Do Amaral, A. Sznajder, M. Thiel, E.J. Tonelli Manganote⁵, F. Torres Da Silva De Araujo, A. Vilela Pereira

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

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

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

A. Aleksandrov, G. Antchev, I. Atanasov, R. Hadjiiska, P. Iaydjiev, M. Misheva, M. Rodozov, M. Shopova, G. Sultanov

University of Sofia, Sofia, Bulgaria

M. Bonchev, A. Dimitrov, T. Ivanov, L. Litov, B. Pavlov, P. Petkov, A. Petrov

Beihang University, Beijing, China

W. Fang³, Q. Guo, H. Wang, L. Yuan

Department of Physics, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China

M. Ahmad, Z. Hu, Y. Wang

Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing, China

E. Chapon, G.M. Chen⁹, H.S. Chen⁹, M. Chen, A. Kapoor, D. Leggat, H. Liao, Z. Liu, R. Sharma, A. Spiezia, J. Tao, J. Thomas-wilsker, J. Wang, H. Zhang, S. Zhang⁹, J. Zhao

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

A. Agapitos, Y. Ban, C. Chen, A. Levin, Q. Li, M. Lu, X. Lyu, Y. Mao, S.J. Qian, D. Wang, Q. Wang, J. Xiao

Sun Yat-Sen University, Guangzhou, China

Z. You

Institute of Modern Physics and Key Laboratory of Nuclear Physics and Ion-beam Application (MOE) - Fudan University, Shanghai, China

X. Gao³

Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China

M. Xiao

Universidad de Los Andes, Bogota, Colombia

C. Avila, A. Cabrera, C. Florez, J. Fraga, A. Sarkar, M.A. Segura Delgado

Universidad de Antioquia, Medellin, Colombia

J. Jaramillo, J. Mejia Guisao, F. Ramirez, J.D. Ruiz Alvarez, C.A. Salazar González, N. Vanegas Arbelaez

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

D. Giljanovic, N. Godinovic, D. Lelas, I. Puljak, T. Sculac

University of Split, Faculty of Science, Split, Croatia

Z. Antunovic, M. Kovac

Institute Rudjer Boskovic, Zagreb, Croatia

V. Brigljevic, D. Ferencek, D. Majumder, M. Roguljic, A. Starodumov¹⁰, T. Susa

University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus

M.W. Ather, A. Attikis, E. Erodotou, A. Ioannou, G. Kole, M. Kolosova, S. Konstantinou, G. Mavromanolakis, J. Mousa, C. Nicolaou, F. Ptochos, P.A. Razis, H. Rykaczewski, H. Saka, D. Tsiakkouri

Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

M. Finger¹¹, M. Finger Jr.¹¹, A. Kveton, J. Tomsa

Escuela Politecnica Nacional, Quito, Ecuador

E. Ayala

Universidad San Francisco de Quito, Quito, Ecuador

E. Carrera Jarrin

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

A.A. Abdelalim^{12,13}, S. Elgammal¹⁴, A. Ellithi Kamel¹⁵

Center for High Energy Physics (CHEP-FU), Fayoum University, El-Fayoum, Egypt

M.A. Mahmoud, Y. Mohammed¹⁶

National Institute of Chemical Physics and Biophysics, Tallinn, Estonia

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

Department of Physics, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

P. Eerola, L. Forthomme, H. Kirschenmann, K. Osterberg, M. Voutilainen

Helsinki Institute of Physics, Helsinki, Finland

E. Brücken, F. Garcia, J. Havukainen, V. Karimäki, M.S. Kim, R. Kinnunen, T. Lampén, K. Lassila-Perini, S. Laurila, S. Lehti, T. Lindén, H. Siikonen, E. Tuominen, J. Tuominiemi

Lappeenranta University of Technology, Lappeenranta, Finland

P. Luukka, T. Tuuva

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

C. Amendola, M. Besancon, F. Couderc, M. Dejardin, D. Denegri, J.L. Faure, F. Ferri, S. Ganjour, A. Givernaud, P. Gras, G. Hamel de Monchenault, P. Jarry, B. Lenzi, E. Locci, J. Malcles, J. Rander, A. Rosowsky, M.Ö. Sahin, A. Savoy-Navarro¹⁷, M. Titov, G.B. Yu

Laboratoire Leprince-Ringuet, CNRS/IN2P3, Ecole Polytechnique, Institut Polytechnique de Paris, Palaiseau, France

S. Ahuja, F. Beaudette, M. Bonanomi, A. Buchot Perraguin, P. Busson, C. Charlot, O. Davignon, B. Diab, G. Falmagne, R. Granier de Cassagnac, A. Hakimi, I. Kucher, A. Lobanov, C. Martin Perez, M. Nguyen, C. Ochando, P. Paganini, J. Rembser, R. Salerno, J.B. Sauvan, Y. Sirois, A. Zabi, A. Zghiche

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

J.-L. Agram¹⁸, J. Andrea, D. Bloch, G. Bourgatte, J.-M. Brom, E.C. Chabert, C. Collard, J.-C. Fontaine¹⁸, D. Gelé, U. Goerlach, C. Grimault, A.-C. Le Bihan, P. Van Hove

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

E. Asilar, S. Beauceron, C. Bernet, G. Boudoul, C. Camen, A. Carle, N. Chanon, D. Contardo, P. Depasse, H. El Mamouni, J. Fay, S. Gascon, M. Gouzevitch, B. Ille, Sa. Jain, I.B. Laktineh, H. Lattaud, A. Lesauvage, M. Lethuillier, L. Mirabito, L. Torterotot, G. Touquet, M. Vander Donckt, S. Viret

Georgian Technical University, Tbilisi, Georgia

A. Khvedelidze¹¹, Z. Tsamalaidze¹¹

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

L. Feld, K. Klein, M. Lipinski, D. Meuser, A. Pauls, M. Preuten, M.P. Rauch, J. Schulz, M. Teroerde

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

D. Eliseev, M. Erdmann, P. Fackeldey, B. Fischer, S. Ghosh, T. Hebbeker, K. Hoepfner, H. Keller, L. Mastrolorenzo, M. Merschmeyer, A. Meyer, P. Millet, G. Mocellin, S. Mondal, S. Mukherjee,

D. Noll, A. Novak, T. Pook, A. Pozdnyakov, T. Quast, M. Radziej, Y. Rath, H. Reithler, J. Roemer, A. Schmidt, S.C. Schuler, A. Sharma, S. Wiedenbeck, S. Zaleski

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

C. Dziwok, G. Flügge, W. Haj Ahmad¹⁹, O. Hlushchenko, T. Kress, A. Nowack, C. Pistone, O. Pooth, D. Roy, H. Sert, A. Stahl²⁰, T. Ziemons

Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Hamburg, Germany

H. Aarup Petersen, M. Aldaya Martin, P. Asmuss, I. Babounikau, S. Baxter, O. Behnke, A. Bermúdez Martínez, A.A. Bin Anuar, K. Borrás²¹, V. Botta, D. Brunner, A. Campbell, A. Cardini, P. Connor, S. Consuegra Rodríguez, V. Danilov, A. De Wit, M.M. Defranchis, L. Didukh, D. Domínguez Damiani, G. Eckerlin, D. Eckstein, T. Eichhorn, L.I. Estevez Banos, E. Gallo²², A. Geiser, A. Giraldi, A. Grohsjean, M. Guthoff, A. Harb, A. Jafari²³, N.Z. Jomhari, H. Jung, A. Kasem²¹, M. Kasemann, H. Kaveh, C. Kleinwort, J. Knolle, D. Krücker, W. Lange, T. Lenz, J. Lidrych, K. Lipka, W. Lohmann²⁴, R. Mankel, I.-A. Melzer-Pellmann, J. Metwally, A.B. Meyer, M. Meyer, M. Missiroli, J. Mnich, A. Mussgiller, V. Myronenko, Y. Otari, D. Pérez Adán, S.K. Pflitsch, D. Pitzl, A. Raspereza, A. Saggio, A. Saibel, M. Savitskyi, V. Scheurer, P. Schütze, C. Schwanenberger, A. Singh, R.E. Sosa Ricardo, N. Tonon, O. Turkot, A. Vagnerini, M. Van De Klundert, R. Walsh, D. Walter, Y. Wen, K. Wichmann, C. Wissing, S. Wuchterl, O. Zenaiev, R. Zlebick

University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany

R. Aggleton, S. Bein, L. Benato, A. Benecke, K. De Leo, T. Dreyer, A. Ebrahimi, M. Eich, F. Feindt, A. Fröhlich, C. Garbers, E. Garutti, P. Gunnellini, J. Haller, A. Hinzmann, A. Karavdina, G. Kasieczka, R. Klanner, R. Kogler, V. Kutzner, J. Lange, T. Lange, A. Malara, C.E.N. Niemeyer, A. Nigamova, K.J. Pena Rodriguez, O. Rieger, P. Schleper, S. Schumann, J. Schwandt, D. Schwarz, J. Sonneveld, H. Stadie, G. Steinbrück, B. Vormwald, I. Zoi

Karlsruher Institut fuer Technologie, Karlsruhe, Germany

M. Baselga, S. Baur, J. Bechtel, T. Berger, E. Butz, R. Caspart, T. Chwalek, W. De Boer, A. Dierlamm, A. Droll, K. El Morabit, N. Faltermann, K. Flöh, M. Giffels, A. Gottmann, F. Hartmann²⁰, C. Heidecker, U. Husemann, M.A. Iqbal, I. Katkov²⁵, P. Keicher, R. Koppenhöfer, S. Maier, M. Metzler, S. Mitra, D. Müller, Th. Müller, M. Musich, G. Quast, K. Rabbertz, J. Rauser, D. Savoii, D. Schäfer, M. Schnepf, M. Schröder, D. Seith, I. Shvetsov, H.J. Simonis, R. Ulrich, M. Wassmer, M. Weber, R. Wolf, S. Wozniowski

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

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

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece

M. Diamantopoulou, D. Karasavvas, G. Karathanasis, P. Kontaxakis, C.K. Koraka, A. Manousakis-katsikakis, A. Panagiotou, I. Papavergou, N. Saoulidou, K. Theofilatos, K. Vellidis, E. Vourliotis

National Technical University of Athens, Athens, Greece

G. Bakas, K. Kousouris, I. Papakrivopoulos, G. Tsipolitis, A. Zacharopoulou

University of Ioánnina, Ioánnina, Greece

I. Evangelou, C. Foudas, P. Giannelis, P. Katsoulis, P. Kokkas, S. Mallios, K. Manitaras, N. Manthos, I. Papadopoulos, J. Strolagos

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

M. Bartók²⁶, R. Chudasama, M. Csanad, M.M.A. Gadallah²⁷, S. Lökös²⁸, P. Major, K. Mandal, A. Mehta, G. Pasztor, O. Surányi, G.I. Veres

Wigner Research Centre for Physics, Budapest, Hungary

G. Bencze, C. Hajdu, D. Horvath²⁹, F. Sikler, V. Veszpremi, G. Vesztergombi[†]

Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary

S. Czellar, J. Karancsi²⁶, J. Molnar, Z. Szillasi, D. Teyssier

Institute of Physics, University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary

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

Eszterhazy Karoly University, Karoly Robert Campus, Gyongyos, Hungary

T. Csorgo, F. Nemes, T. Novak

Indian Institute of Science (IISc), Bangalore, India

S. Choudhury, J.R. Komaragiri, D. Kumar, L. Panwar, P.C. Tiwari

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

S. Bahinipati³⁰, D. Dash, C. Kar, P. Mal, T. Mishra, V.K. Muraleedharan Nair Bindhu, A. Nayak³¹, D.K. Sahoo³⁰, N. Sur, S.K. Swain

Panjab University, Chandigarh, India

S. Bansal, S.B. Beri, V. Bhatnagar, S. Chauhan, N. Dhingra³², R. Gupta, A. Kaur, S. Kaur, P. Kumari, M. Lohan, M. Meena, K. Sandeep, S. Sharma, J.B. Singh, A.K. Viridi

University of Delhi, Delhi, India

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

Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, HBNI, Kolkata, India

M. Bharti³³, R. Bhattacharya, S. Bhattacharya, D. Bhowmik, S. Dutta, S. Ghosh, B. Gomber³⁴, M. Maity³⁵, S. Nandan, P. Palit, A. Purohit, P.K. Rout, G. Saha, S. Sarkar, M. Sharan, B. Singh³³, S. Thakur³³

Indian Institute of Technology Madras, Madras, India

P.K. Behera, S.C. Behera, P. Kalbhor, A. Muhammad, R. Pradhan, P.R. Pujahari, A. Sharma, A.K. Sikdar

Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, Mumbai, India

D. Dutta, V. Kumar, K. Naskar³⁶, P.K. Netrakanti, L.M. Pant, P. Shukla

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-A, Mumbai, India

T. Aziz, M.A. Bhat, S. Dugad, R. Kumar Verma, G.B. Mohanty, U. Sarkar

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-B, Mumbai, India

S. Banerjee, S. Bhattacharya, S. Chatterjee, M. Guchait, S. Karmakar, S. Kumar, G. Majumder, K. Mazumdar, S. Mukherjee, D. Roy, N. Sahoo

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

S. Dube, B. Kansal, K. Kothekar, S. Pandey, A. Rane, A. Rastogi, S. Sharma

Department of Physics, Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, Iran

H. Bakhshiansohi³⁷

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

S. Chenarani³⁸, S.M. Etesami, M. Khakzad, M. Mohammadi Najafabadi

University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland

M. Felcini, M. Grunewald

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

M. Abbrescia^{a,b}, R. Aly^{a,b,39}, C. Aruta^{a,b}, A. Colaleo^a, D. Creanza^{a,c}, N. De Filippis^{a,c}, M. De Palma^{a,b}, A. Di Florio^{a,b}, A. Di Pilato^{a,b}, W. Elmetenawee^{a,b}, L. Fiore^a, A. Gelmi^{a,b}, M. Gul^a, G. Iaselli^{a,c}, M. Ince^{a,b}, S. Lezki^{a,b}, G. Maggi^{a,c}, M. Maggi^a, I. Margjeka^{a,b}, V. Mastrapasqua^{a,b}, J.A. Merlin^a, S. My^{a,b}, S. Nuzzo^{a,b}, A. Pompili^{a,b}, G. Pugliese^{a,c}, A. Ranieri^a, G. Selvaggi^{a,b}, L. Silvestris^a, F.M. Simone^{a,b}, R. Venditti^a, P. Verwilligen^a

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

G. Abbiendi^a, C. Battilana^{a,b}, D. Bonacorsi^{a,b}, L. Borgonovi^{a,b}, S. Braibant-Giacomelli^{a,b}, R. Campanini^{a,b}, P. Capiluppi^{a,b}, A. Castro^{a,b}, F.R. Cavallo^a, C. Ciocca^a, M. Cuffiani^{a,b}, G.M. Dallavalle^a, T. Diotallevi^{a,b}, F. Fabbri^a, A. Fanfani^{a,b}, E. Fontanesi^{a,b}, P. Giacomelli^a, L. Giommi^{a,b}, C. Grandi^a, L. Guiducci^{a,b}, F. Iemmi^{a,b}, S. Lo Meo^{a,40}, S. Marcellini^a, G. Masetti^a, F.L. Navarria^{a,b}, A. Perrotta^a, F. Primavera^{a,b}, T. Rovelli^{a,b}, G.P. Siroli^{a,b}, N. Tosi^a

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

S. Albergo^{a,b,41}, S. Costa^{a,b,41}, A. Di Mattia^a, R. Potenza^{a,b}, A. Tricomi^{a,b,41}, C. Tuve^{a,b}

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

G. Barbagli^a, A. Cassese^a, R. Ceccarelli^{a,b}, V. Ciulli^{a,b}, C. Civinini^a, R. D'Alessandro^{a,b}, F. Fiori^a, E. Focardi^{a,b}, G. Latino^{a,b}, P. Lenzi^{a,b}, M. Lizzo^{a,b}, M. Meschini^a, S. Paoletti^a, R. Seidita^{a,b}, G. Sguazzoni^a, L. Viliani^a

INFN Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, Frascati, Italy

L. Benussi, S. Bianco, D. Piccolo

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

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

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

A. Benaglia^a, A. Beschi^{a,b}, F. Brivio^{a,b}, F. Cetorelli^{a,b}, V. Ciriolo^{a,b,20}, F. De Guio^{a,b}, M.E. Dinardo^{a,b}, P. Dini^a, S. Gennai^a, A. Ghezzi^{a,b}, P. Govoni^{a,b}, L. Guzzi^{a,b}, M. Malberti^a, S. Malvezzi^a, D. Menasce^a, F. Monti^{a,b}, L. Moroni^a, M. Paganoni^{a,b}, D. Pedrini^a, S. Ragazzi^{a,b}, T. Tabarelli de Fatis^{a,b}, D. Valsecchi^{a,b,20}, D. Zuolo^{a,b}

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

S. Buontempo^a, N. Cavallo^{a,c}, A. De Iorio^{a,b}, F. Fabozzi^{a,c}, F. Fienga^a, A.O.M. Iorio^{a,b}, L. Lista^{a,b}, S. Meola^{a,d,20}, P. Paolucci^{a,20}, B. Rossi^a, C. Sciacca^{a,b}, E. Voevodina^{a,b}

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

P. Azzi^a, N. Bacchetta^a, D. Bisello^{a,b}, A. Boletti^{a,b}, A. Bragagnolo^{a,b}, R. Carlin^{a,b}, P. Checchia^a, P. De Castro Manzano^a, T. Dorigo^a, F. Gasparini^{a,b}, U. Gasparini^{a,b}, S.Y. Hoh^{a,b}, L. Layer^{a,42}, M. Margoni^{a,b}, A.T. Meneguzzo^{a,b}, M. Presilla^b, P. Ronchese^{a,b}, R. Rossin^{a,b}, F. Simonetto^{a,b}, G. Strong, A. Tiko^a, M. Tosi^{a,b}, H. YARAR^{a,b}, M. Zanetti^{a,b}, P. Zotto^{a,b}, A. Zucchetta^{a,b}, G. Zumerle^{a,b}

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

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

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

M. Biasini^{a,b}, G.M. Bilei^a, D. Ciangottini^{a,b}, L. Fanò^{a,b}, P. Lariccia^{a,b}, G. Mantovani^{a,b}, V. Mariani^{a,b}, M. Menichelli^a, F. Moscatelli^a, A. Piccinelli^{a,b}, A. Rossi^{a,b}, A. Santocchia^{a,b}, D. Spiga^a, T. Tedeschi^{a,b}

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

K. Androsov^a, P. Azzurri^a, G. Bagliesi^a, V. Bertacchi^{a,c}, L. Bianchini^a, T. Boccali^a, R. Castaldi^a, M.A. Ciocci^{a,b}, R. Dell'Orso^a, M.R. Di Domenico^{a,d}, S. Donato^a, L. Giannini^{a,c}, A. Giassi^a, M.T. Grippo^a, F. Ligabue^{a,c}, E. Manca^{a,c}, G. Mandorli^{a,c}, A. Messineo^{a,b}, F. Palla^a, G. Ramirez-Sanchez^{a,c}, A. Rizzi^{a,b}, G. Rolandi^{a,c}, S. Roy Chowdhury^{a,c}, A. Scribano^a, N. Shafiei^{a,b}, P. Spagnolo^a, R. Tenchini^a, G. Tonelli^{a,b}, N. Turini^{a,d}, A. Venturi^a, P.G. Verdini^a

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

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

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

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

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

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

Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea

S. Dogra, C. Huh, B. Kim, D.H. Kim, G.N. Kim, J. Lee, S.W. Lee, C.S. Moon, Y.D. Oh, S.I. Pak, B.C. Radburn-Smith, S. Sekmen, Y.C. Yang

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

H. Kim, D.H. Moon

Hanyang University, Seoul, Korea

B. Francois, T.J. Kim, J. Park

Korea University, Seoul, Korea

S. Cho, S. Choi, Y. Go, S. Ha, B. Hong, K. Lee, K.S. Lee, J. Lim, J. Park, S.K. Park, J. Yoo

Kyung Hee University, Department of Physics, Seoul, Republic of Korea

J. Goh, A. Gurtu

Sejong University, Seoul, Korea

H.S. Kim, Y. Kim

Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea

J. Almond, J.H. Bhyun, J. Choi, S. Jeon, J. Kim, J.S. Kim, S. Ko, H. Kwon, H. Lee, K. Lee, S. Lee, K. Nam, B.H. Oh, M. Oh, S.B. Oh, H. Seo, U.K. Yang, I. Yoon

University of Seoul, Seoul, Korea

D. Jeon, J.H. Kim, B. Ko, J.S.H. Lee, I.C. Park, Y. Roh, D. Song, I.J. Watson

Yonsei University, Department of Physics, Seoul, Korea

H.D. Yoo

Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon, Korea

Y. Choi, C. Hwang, Y. Jeong, H. Lee, Y. Lee, I. Yu

College of Engineering and Technology, American University of the Middle East (AUM), Dasman, Kuwait

Y. Maghrbi

Riga Technical University, Riga, Latvia

V. Veckalns⁴³

The Lebanese University, Beirut, Lebanon

N. Barakat, H. Zaraket

Vilnius University, Vilnius, Lithuania

A. Juodagalvis, A. Rinkevicius, G. Tamulaitis

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

W.A.T. Wan Abdullah, M.N. Yusli, Z. Zolkapli

Universidad de Sonora (UNISON), Hermosillo, Mexico

J.F. Benitez, A. Castaneda Hernandez, J.A. Murillo Quijada, L. Valencia Palomo

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

H. Castilla-Valdez, E. De La Cruz-Burelo, I. Heredia-De La Cruz⁴⁴, R. Lopez-Fernandez, A. Sanchez-Hernandez

Universidad Iberoamericana, Mexico City, Mexico

S. Carrillo Moreno, C. Oropeza Barrera, M. Ramirez-Garcia, F. Vazquez Valencia

Benemerita Universidad Autonoma de Puebla, Puebla, Mexico

J. Eysermans, I. Pedraza, H.A. Salazar Ibarquen, C. Uribe Estrada

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

A. Morelos Pineda

University of Montenegro, Podgorica, Montenegro

J. Mijuskovic⁴, N. Raicevic

University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

D. Krofcheck

University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand

S. Bheesette, P.H. Butler

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

A. Ahmad, M.I. Asghar, M.I.M. Awan, H.R. Hoorani, W.A. Khan, M.A. Shah, M. Shoaib, M. Waqas

AGH University of Science and Technology Faculty of Computer Science, Electronics and Telecommunications, Krakow, Poland

V. Avati, L. Grzanka, M. Malawski

National Centre for Nuclear Research, Swierk, Poland

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

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

K. Bunkowski, A. Byszuk⁴⁵, K. Doroba, A. Kalinowski, M. Konecki, J. Krolikowski, M. Olszewski, M. Walczak

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

M. Araujo, P. Bargassa, D. Bastos, P. Faccioli, M. Gallinaro, J. Hollar, N. Leonardo, T. Niknejad, J. Seixas, K. Shchelina, O. Toldaiev, J. Varela

Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia

S. Afanasiev, A. Baginyan, P. Bunin, Y. Ershov, M. Gavrilenko, A. Golunov, I. Golutvin, N. Gorbounov, I. Gorbunov, V. Karjavine, A. Lanev, A. Malakhov, V. Matveev^{46,47}, P. Moisezenz, V. Palichik, V. Perelygin, M. Savina, V. Shalaev, S. Shmatov, S. Shulha, O. Teryaev, A. Zarubin, I. Zhizhin

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

G. Gavrilov, V. Golovtsov, Y. Ivanov, V. Kim⁴⁸, E. Kuznetsova⁴⁹, V. Murzin, V. Oreshkin, I. Smirnov, D. Sosnov, V. Sulimov, L. Uvarov, S. Volkov, A. Vorobyev

Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia

Yu. Andreev, A. Dermenev, S. Gninenko, N. Golubev, A. Karneyeu, M. Kirsanov, N. Krasnikov, A. Pashenkov, G. Pivovarov, D. Tlisov[†], A. Toropin

Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics named by A.I. Alikhanov of NRC 'Kurchatov Institute', Moscow, Russia

V. Epshteyn, V. Gavrilov, N. Lychkovskaya, A. Nikitenko⁵⁰, V. Popov, G. Safronov, A. Spiridonov, A. Stepenov, M. Toms, E. Vlasov, A. Zhokin

Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Moscow, Russia

T. Aushev

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

O. Bychkova, M. Chadeeva⁵¹, D. Philippov, E. Popova, V. Rusinov

P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia

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

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

A. Belyaev, E. Boos, M. Dubinin⁵², L. Dudko, A. Ershov, A. Gribushin, V. Klyukhin, O. Kodolova, I. Lokhtin, S. Obraztsov, S. Petrushanko, V. Savrin, A. Snigirev

Novosibirsk State University (NSU), Novosibirsk, Russia

V. Blinov⁵³, T. Dimova⁵³, L. Kardapoltsev⁵³, I. Ovtin⁵³, Y. Skovpen⁵³

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

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

National Research Tomsk Polytechnic University, Tomsk, Russia

A. Babaev, A. Iuzhakov, V. Okhotnikov, L. Sukhikh

Tomsk State University, Tomsk, Russia

V. Borchsh, V. Ivanchenko, E. Tcherniaev

University of Belgrade: Faculty of Physics and VINCA Institute of Nuclear Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia

P. Adzic⁵⁴, P. Cirkovic, M. Dordevic, P. Milenovic, J. Milosevic

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

M. Aguilar-Benitez, J. Alcaraz Maestre, A. Álvarez Fernández, I. Bachiller, M. Barrio Luna, Cristina F. Bedoya, J.A. Brochero Cifuentes, C.A. Carrillo Montoya, M. Cepeda, M. Cerrada, N. Colino, B. De La Cruz, A. Delgado Peris, J.P. Fernández Ramos, J. Flix, M.C. Fouz, A. García Alonso, O. Gonzalez Lopez, S. Goy Lopez, J.M. Hernandez, M.I. Josa, J. León Holgado, D. Moran, Á. Navarro Tobar, A. Pérez-Calero Yzquierdo, J. Puerta Pelayo, I. Redondo, L. Romero, S. Sánchez Navas, M.S. Soares, A. Triossi, L. Urda Gómez, C. Willmott

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain

C. Albajar, J.F. de Trocóniz, R. Reyes-Almanza

Universidad de Oviedo, Instituto Universitario de Ciencias y Tecnologías Espaciales de Asturias (ICTEA), Oviedo, Spain

B. Alvarez Gonzalez, J. Cuevas, C. Erice, J. Fernandez Menendez, S. Folgueras, I. Gonzalez Caballero, E. Palencia Cortezon, C. Ramón Álvarez, J. Ripoll Sau, V. Rodríguez Bouza, S. Sanchez Cruz, A. Trapote

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

I.J. Cabrillo, A. Calderon, B. Chazin Quero, J. Duarte Campderros, M. Fernandez, P.J. Fernández Manteca, G. Gomez, C. Martinez Rivero, P. Martinez Ruiz del Arbol, F. Matorras, J. Piedra Gomez, C. Prieels, F. Ricci-Tam, T. Rodrigo, A. Ruiz-Jimeno, L. Scodellaro, I. Vila, J.M. Vizan Garcia

University of Colombo, Colombo, Sri Lanka

MK Jayananda, B. Kailasapathy⁵⁵, D.U.J. Sonnadara, DDC Wickramarathna

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

W.G.D. Dharmaratna, K. Liyanage, N. Perera, N. Wickramage

CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland

T.K. Aarrestad, D. Abbaneo, B. Akgun, E. Auffray, G. Auzinger, J. Baechler, P. Baillon, A.H. Ball, D. Barney, J. Bendavid, N. Beni, M. Bianco, A. Bocci, P. Bortignon, E. Bossini, E. Brondolin, T. Camporesi, G. Cerminara, L. Cristella, D. d'Enterria, A. Dabrowski, N. Daci, V. Daponte, A. David, A. De Roeck, M. Deile, R. Di Maria, M. Dobson, M. Dünser, N. Dupont, A. Elliott-Peisert, N. Emriskova, F. Fallavollita⁵⁶, D. Fasanella, S. Fiorendi, G. Franzoni, J. Fulcher, W. Funk, S. Giani, D. Gigi, K. Gill, F. Glege, L. Gouskos, M. Guilbaud, D. Gulhan, M. Haranko, J. Hegeman, Y. Iiyama, V. Innocente, T. James, P. Janot, J. Kaspar, J. Kieseler, M. Komm, N. Kratochwil, C. Lange, P. Lecoq, K. Long, C. Lourenço, L. Malgeri, M. Mannelli, A. Massironi,

F. Meijers, S. Mersi, E. Meschi, F. Moortgat, M. Mulders, J. Ngadiuba, J. Niedziela, S. Orfanelli, L. Orsini, F. Pantaleo²⁰, L. Pape, E. Perez, M. Peruzzi, A. Petrilli, G. Petrucciani, A. Pfeiffer, M. Pierini, D. Rabaday, A. Racz, M. Rieger, M. Rovere, H. Sakulin, J. Salfeld-Nebgen, S. Scarfi, C. Schäfer, C. Schwick, M. Selvaggi, A. Sharma, P. Silva, W. Snoeys, P. Sphicas⁵⁷, J. Steggemann, S. Summers, V.R. Tavolaro, D. Treille, A. Tsirou, G.P. Van Onsem, A. Vartak, M. Verzetti, K.A. Wozniak, W.D. Zeuner

Paul Scherrer Institut, Villigen, Switzerland

L. Caminada⁵⁸, W. Erdmann, R. Horisberger, Q. Ingram, H.C. Kaestli, D. Kotlinski, U. Langenegger, T. Rohe

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

M. Backhaus, P. Berger, A. Calandri, N. Chernyavskaya, A. De Cosa, G. Dissertori, M. Dittmar, M. Donegà, C. Dorfer, T. Gadek, T.A. Gómez Espinosa, C. Grab, D. Hits, W. Luster, M. M. Lyon, R.A. Manzoni, M.T. Meinhard, F. Micheli, F. Nessi-Tedaldi, F. Pauss, V. Perovic, G. Perrin, L. Perrozzi, S. Pigazzini, M.G. Ratti, M. Reichmann, C. Reissel, T. Reitenspiess, B. Ristic, D. Ruini, D.A. Sanz Becerra, M. Schönenberger, V. Stampf, M.L. Vesterbacka Olsson, R. Wallny, D.H. Zhu

Universität Zürich, Zurich, Switzerland

C. AMSLER⁵⁹, C. Botta, D. Brzhechko, M.F. Canelli, R. Del Burgo, J.K. Heikkilä, M. Huwiler, A. Jofrehei, B. Kilminster, S. Leontsinis, A. Macchiolo, P. Meiring, V.M. Mikuni, U. Molinatti, I. Neutelings, G. Rauco, A. Reimers, P. Robmann, K. Schweiger, Y. Takahashi, S. Wertz

National Central University, Chung-Li, Taiwan

C. Adloff⁶⁰, C.M. Kuo, W. Lin, A. Roy, T. Sarkar³⁵, S.S. Yu

National Taiwan University (NTU), Taipei, Taiwan

L. Ceard, P. Chang, Y. Chao, K.F. Chen, P.H. Chen, W.-S. Hou, Y.y. Li, R.-S. Lu, E. Paganis, A. Psallidas, A. Steen, E. Yazgan

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

B. Asavapibhop, C. Asawatangtrakuldee, N. Srimanobhas

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

F. Boran, S. Damarseckin⁶¹, Z.S. Demiroglu, F. Dolek, C. Dozen⁶², I. Dumanoglu⁶³, E. Eskut, G. Gokbulut, Y. Guler, E. Gurpinar Guler⁶⁴, I. Hos⁶⁵, C. Isik, E.E. Kangal⁶⁶, O. Kara, A. Kayis Topaksu, U. Kiminsu, G. Onengut, K. Ozdemir⁶⁷, A. Polatoz, A.E. Simsek, B. Tali⁶⁸, U.G. Tok, S. Turkcapar, I.S. Zorbakir, C. Zorbilmez

Middle East Technical University, Physics Department, Ankara, Turkey

B. Isildak⁶⁹, G. Karapinar⁷⁰, K. Ocalan⁷¹, M. Yalvac⁷²

Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey

I.O. Atakisi, E. Gülmez, M. Kaya⁷³, O. Kaya⁷⁴, Ö. Özçelik, S. Tekten⁷⁵, E.A. Yetkin⁷⁶

Istanbul Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey

A. Cakir, K. Cankocak⁶³, Y. Komurcu, S. Sen⁷⁷

Istanbul University, Istanbul, Turkey

F. Aydogmus Sen, S. Cerci⁶⁸, B. Kaynak, S. Ozkorucuklu, D. Sunar Cerci⁶⁸

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

B. Grynyov

National Scientific Center, Kharkov Institute of Physics and Technology, Kharkov, Ukraine
L. Levchuk

University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom

E. Bhal, S. Bologna, J.J. Brooke, E. Clement, D. Cussans, H. Flacher, J. Goldstein, G.P. Heath, H.F. Heath, L. Kreczko, B. Krikler, S. Paramesvaran, T. Sakuma, S. Seif El Nasr-Storey, V.J. Smith, J. Taylor, A. Titterton

Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom

K.W. Bell, A. Belyaev⁷⁸, C. Brew, R.M. Brown, D.J.A. Cockerill, K.V. Ellis, K. Harder, S. Harper, J. Linacre, K. Manolopoulos, D.M. Newbold, E. Olaiya, D. Petyt, T. Reis, T. Schuh, C.H. Shepherd-Themistocleous, A. Thea, I.R. Tomalin, T. Williams

Imperial College, London, United Kingdom

R. Bainbridge, P. Bloch, S. Bonomally, J. Borg, S. Breeze, O. Buchmuller, A. Bundock, V. Cepaitis, G.S. Chahal⁷⁹, D. Colling, P. Dauncey, G. Davies, M. Della Negra, G. Fedi, G. Hall, G. Iles, J. Langford, L. Lyons, A.-M. Magnan, S. Malik, A. Martelli, V. Milosevic, J. Nash⁸⁰, V. Palladino, M. Pesaresi, D.M. Raymond, A. Richards, A. Rose, E. Scott, C. Seez, A. Shtipliyski, M. Stoye, A. Tapper, K. Uchida, T. Virdee²⁰, N. Wardle, S.N. Webb, D. Winterbottom, A.G. Zecchinelli

Brunel University, Uxbridge, United Kingdom

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

Baylor University, Waco, USA

A. Brinkerhoff, K. Call, B. Caraway, J. Dittmann, K. Hatakeyama, A.R. Kanuganti, C. Madrid, B. McMaster, N. Pastika, S. Sawant, C. Smith, J. Wilson

Catholic University of America, Washington, DC, USA

R. Bartek, A. Dominguez, R. Uniyal, A.M. Vargas Hernandez

The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, USA

A. Buccilli, O. Charaf, S.I. Cooper, S.V. Gleyzer, C. Henderson, P. Rumerio, C. West

Boston University, Boston, USA

A. Akpinar, A. Albert, D. Arcaro, C. Cosby, Z. Demiragli, D. Gastler, C. Richardson, J. Rohlf, K. Salyer, D. Sperka, D. Spitzbart, I. Suarez, S. Yuan, D. Zou

Brown University, Providence, USA

G. Benelli, B. Burkle, X. Coubez²¹, D. Cutts, Y.t. Duh, M. Hadley, U. Heintz, J.M. Hogan⁸¹, K.H.M. Kwok, E. Laird, G. Landsberg, K.T. Lau, J. Lee, M. Narain, S. Sagir⁸², R. Syarif, E. Usai, W.Y. Wong, D. Yu, W. Zhang

University of California, Davis, Davis, USA

R. Band, C. Brainerd, R. Breedon, M. Calderon De La Barca Sanchez, M. Chertok, J. Conway, R. Conway, P.T. Cox, R. Erbacher, C. Flores, G. Funk, F. Jensen, W. Ko[†], O. Kukral, R. Lander, M. Mulhearn, D. Pellett, J. Pilot, M. Shi, D. Taylor, K. Tos, M. Tripathi, Y. Yao, F. Zhang

University of California, Los Angeles, USA

M. Bachtis, R. Cousins, A. Dasgupta, A. Florent, D. Hamilton, J. Hauser, M. Ignatenko, T. Lam, N. Mccoll, W.A. Nash, S. Regnard, D. Saltzberg, C. Schnaible, B. Stone, V. Valuev

University of California, Riverside, Riverside, USA

K. Burt, Y. Chen, R. Clare, J.W. Gary, S.M.A. Ghiasi Shirazi, G. Hanson, G. Karapostoli, O.R. Long, N. Manganeli, M. Olmedo Negrete, M.I. Paneva, W. Si, S. Wimpenny, Y. Zhang

University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, USA

J.G. Branson, P. Chang, S. Cittolin, S. Cooperstein, N. Deelen, M. Derdzinski, J. Duarte, R. Gerosa, D. Gilbert, B. Hashemi, V. Krutelyov, J. Letts, M. Masciovecchio, S. May, S. Padhi, M. Pieri, V. Sharma, M. Tadel, F. Würthwein, A. Yagil

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

N. Amin, C. Campagnari, M. Citron, A. Dorsett, V. Dutta, J. Incandela, B. Marsh, H. Mei, A. Ovcharova, H. Qu, M. Quinnan, J. Richman, U. Sarica, D. Stuart, S. Wang

California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA

D. Anderson, A. Bornheim, O. Cerri, I. Dutta, J.M. Lawhorn, N. Lu, J. Mao, H.B. Newman, T.Q. Nguyen, J. Pata, M. Spiropulu, J.R. Vlimant, S. Xie, Z. Zhang, R.Y. Zhu

Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, USA

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

University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, USA

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

Cornell University, Ithaca, USA

J. Alexander, Y. Cheng, J. Chu, D.J. Cranshaw, A. Datta, A. Frankenthal, K. Mcdermott, J. Monroy, J.R. Patterson, D. Quach, A. Ryd, W. Sun, S.M. Tan, Z. Tao, J. Thom, P. Wittich, M. Zientek

Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, USA

S. Abdullin, M. Albrow, M. Alyari, G. Apollinari, A. Apresyan, A. Apyan, S. Banerjee, L.A.T. Bauerdick, A. Beretvas, D. Berry, J. Berryhill, P.C. Bhat, K. Burkett, J.N. Butler, A. Canepa, G.B. Cerati, H.W.K. Cheung, F. Chlebana, M. Cremonesi, V.D. Elvira, J. Freeman, Z. Gecse, E. Gottschalk, L. Gray, D. Green, S. Grünendahl, O. Gutsche, R.M. Harris, S. Hasegawa, R. Heller, T.C. Herwig, J. Hirschauer, B. Jayatilaka, S. Jindariani, M. Johnson, U. Joshi, P. Klabbers, T. Klijnsma, B. Klima, M.J. Kortelainen, S. Lammel, D. Lincoln, R. Lipton, M. Liu, T. Liu, J. Lykken, K. Maeshima, D. Mason, P. McBride, P. Merkel, S. Mrenna, S. Nahn, V. O'Dell, V. Papadimitriou, K. Pedro, C. Pena⁵², O. Prokofyev, F. Ravera, A. Reinsvold Hall, L. Ristori, B. Schneider, E. Sexton-Kennedy, N. Smith, A. Soha, W.J. Spalding, L. Spiegel, S. Stoynev, J. Strait, L. Taylor, S. Tkaczyk, N.V. Tran, L. Uplegger, E.W. Vaandering, H.A. Weber, A. Woodard

University of Florida, Gainesville, USA

D. Acosta, P. Avery, D. Bourilkov, L. Cadamuro, V. Cherepanov, F. Errico, R.D. Field, D. Guerrero, B.M. Joshi, M. Kim, J. Konigsberg, A. Korytov, K.H. Lo, K. Matchev, N. Menendez, G. Mitselmakher, D. Rosenzweig, K. Shi, J. Wang, S. Wang, X. Zuo

Florida State University, Tallahassee, USA

T. Adams, A. Askew, D. Diaz, R. Habibullah, S. Hagopian, V. Hagopian, K.F. Johnson, R. Khurana, T. Kolberg, G. Martinez, H. Prosper, C. Schiber, R. Yohay, J. Zhang

Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, USA

M.M. Baarmand, S. Butalla, T. Elkafrawy⁸³, M. Hohlmann, D. Noonan, M. Rahmani, M. Saunders, F. Yumiceva

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

M.R. Adams, L. Apanasevich, H. Becerril Gonzalez, R. Cavanaugh, X. Chen, S. Dittmer,

O. Evdokimov, C.E. Gerber, D.A. Hangal, D.J. Hofman, C. Mills, G. Oh, T. Roy, M.B. Tonjes, N. Varelas, J. Viinikainen, X. Wang, Z. Wu

The University of Iowa, Iowa City, USA

M. Alhusseini, K. Dilsiz⁸⁴, S. Durgut, R.P. Gandrajula, M. Haytmyradov, V. Khristenko, O.K. Köseyan, J.-P. Merlo, A. Mestvirishvili⁸⁵, A. Moeller, J. Nachtman, H. Ogul⁸⁶, Y. Onel, F. Ozok⁸⁷, A. Penzo, C. Snyder, E. Tiras, J. Wetzell, K. Yi⁸⁸

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA

O. Amram, B. Blumenfeld, L. Corcodilos, M. Eminizer, A.V. Gritsan, S. Kyriacou, P. Maksimovic, C. Mantilla, J. Roskes, M. Swartz, T.Á. Vámi

The University of Kansas, Lawrence, USA

C. Baldenegro Barrera, P. Baringer, A. Bean, A. Bylinkin, T. Isidori, S. Khalil, J. King, G. Krintiras, A. Kropivnitskaya, C. Lindsey, N. Minafra, M. Murray, C. Rogan, C. Royon, S. Sanders, E. Schmitz, J.D. Tapia Takaki, Q. Wang, J. Williams, G. Wilson

Kansas State University, Manhattan, USA

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

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, USA

F. Rebassoo, D. Wright

University of Maryland, College Park, USA

E. Adams, A. Baden, O. Baron, A. Belloni, S.C. Eno, Y. Feng, N.J. Hadley, S. Jabeen, G.Y. Jeng, R.G. Kellogg, T. Koeth, A.C. Mignerey, S. Nabili, M. Seidel, A. Skuja, S.C. Tonwar, L. Wang, K. Wong

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, USA

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

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, USA

R.M. Chatterjee, A. Evans, S. Guts[†], P. Hansen, J. Hiltbrand, Sh. Jain, M. Krohn, Y. Kubota, Z. Lesko, J. Mans, M. Revering, R. Rusack, R. Saradhy, N. Schroeder, N. Strobbe, M.A. Wadud

University of Mississippi, Oxford, USA

J.G. Acosta, S. Oliveros

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, USA

K. Bloom, S. Chauhan, D.R. Claes, C. Fangmeier, L. Finco, F. Golf, J.R. González Fernández, I. Kravchenko, J.E. Siado, G.R. Snow[†], B. Stieger, W. Tabb, F. Yan

State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, USA

G. Agarwal, H. Bandyopadhyay, C. Harrington, L. Hay, I. Iashvili, A. Kharchilava, C. McLean, D. Nguyen, J. Pekkanen, S. Rappoccio, B. Roozbahani

Northeastern University, Boston, USA

G. Alverson, E. Barberis, C. Freer, Y. Haddad, A. Hortiangtham, J. Li, G. Madigan, B. Marzocchi, D.M. Morse, V. Nguyen, T. Orimoto, A. Parker, L. Skinnari, A. Tishelman-Charny, T. Wamorkar, B. Wang, A. Wisecarver, D. Wood

Northwestern University, Evanston, USA

S. Bhattacharya, J. Bueghly, Z. Chen, A. Gilbert, T. Gunter, K.A. Hahn, N. Odell, M.H. Schmitt, K. Sung, M. Velasco

University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, USA

R. Bucci, N. Dev, R. Goldouzian, M. Hildreth, K. Hurtado Anampa, C. Jessop, D.J. Karmgard, K. Lannon, W. Li, N. Loukas, N. Marinelli, I. Mcalister, F. Meng, K. Mohrman, Y. Musienko⁴⁶, R. Ruchti, P. Siddireddy, S. Taroni, M. Wayne, A. Wightman, M. Wolf, L. Zygala

The Ohio State University, Columbus, USA

J. Alimena, B. Bylsma, B. Cardwell, L.S. Durkin, B. Francis, C. Hill, A. Lefeld, B.L. Winer, B.R. Yates

Princeton University, Princeton, USA

P. Das, G. Dezoort, P. Elmer, B. Greenberg, N. Haubrich, S. Higginbotham, A. Kalogeropoulos, G. Kopp, S. Kwan, D. Lange, M.T. Lucchini, J. Luo, D. Marlow, K. Mei, I. Ojalvo, J. Olsen, C. Palmer, P. Piroué, D. Stickland, C. Tully

University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez, USA

S. Malik, S. Norberg

Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA

V.E. Barnes, R. Chawla, S. Das, L. Gutay, M. Jones, A.W. Jung, B. Mahakud, G. Negro, N. Neumeister, C.C. Peng, S. Piperov, H. Qiu, J.F. Schulte, M. Stojanovic¹⁷, N. Trevisani, F. Wang, R. Xiao, W. Xie

Purdue University Northwest, Hammond, USA

T. Cheng, J. Dolen, N. Parashar

Rice University, Houston, USA

A. Baty, S. Dildick, K.M. Ecklund, S. Freed, F.J.M. Geurts, M. Kilpatrick, A. Kumar, W. Li, B.P. Padley, R. Redjimi, J. Roberts[†], J. Rorie, W. Shi, A.G. Stahl Leiton

University of Rochester, Rochester, USA

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

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

B. Chiarito, J.P. Chou, A. Gandrakota, Y. Gershtein, E. Halkiadakis, A. Hart, M. Heindl, E. Hughes, S. Kaplan, O. Karacheban²⁴, I. Laflotte, A. Lath, R. Montalvo, K. Nash, M. Osherson, S. Salur, S. Schnetzer, S. Somalwar, R. Stone, S.A. Thayil, S. Thomas, H. Wang

University of Tennessee, Knoxville, USA

H. Acharya, A.G. Delannoy, S. Spanier

Texas A&M University, College Station, USA

O. Bouhali⁸⁹, M. Dalchenko, A. Delgado, R. Eusebi, J. Gilmore, T. Huang, T. Kamon⁹⁰, H. Kim, S. Luo, S. Malhotra, R. Mueller, D. Overton, L. Perniè, D. Rathjens, A. Safonov, J. Sturdy

Texas Tech University, Lubbock, USA

N. Akchurin, J. Damgov, V. Hegde, S. Kunori, K. Lamichhane, S.W. Lee, T. Mengke, S. Muthumuni, T. Peltola, S. Undleeb, I. Volobouev, Z. Wang, A. Whitbeck

Vanderbilt University, Nashville, USA

E. Appelt, S. Greene, A. Gurrola, R. Janjam, W. Johns, C. Maguire, A. Melo, H. Ni, K. Padeken, F. Romeo, P. Sheldon, S. Tuo, J. Velkovska, M. Verweij

University of Virginia, Charlottesville, USA

M.W. Arenton, B. Cox, G. Cummings, J. Hakala, R. Hirosky, M. Joyce, A. Ledovskoy, A. Li, C. Neu, B. Tannenwald, Y. Wang, E. Wolfe, F. Xia

Wayne State University, Detroit, USA

P.E. Karchin, N. Poudyal, P. Thapa

University of Wisconsin - Madison, Madison, WI, USA

K. Black, T. Bose, J. Buchanan, C. Caillol, S. Dasu, I. De Bruyn, P. Everaerts, C. Galloni, H. He, M. Herndon, A. Hervé, U. Hussain, A. Lanaro, A. Loeliger, R. Loveless, J. Madhusudanan Sreekala, A. Mallampalli, D. Pinna, T. Ruggles, A. Savin, V. Shang, V. Sharma, W.H. Smith, D. Teague, S. Trembath-reichert, W. Vetens

†: Deceased

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

2: Also at Institute of Basic and Applied Sciences, Faculty of Engineering, Arab Academy for Science, Technology and Maritime Transport, Alexandria, Egypt, Alexandria, Egypt

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

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

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

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

7: Also at UFMS, Nova Andradina, Brazil

8: Also at Universidade Federal de Pelotas, Pelotas, Brazil

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

10: Also at Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics named by A.I. Alikhanov of NRC 'Kurchatov Institute', Moscow, Russia

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

12: Also at Helwan University, Cairo, Egypt

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

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

15: Now at Cairo University, Cairo, Egypt

16: Now at Fayoum University, El-Fayoum, Egypt

17: Also at Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA

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

19: Also at Erzincan Binali Yildirim University, Erzincan, Turkey

20: Also at CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland

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

22: Also at University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany

23: Also at Department of Physics, Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, Iran, Isfahan, Iran

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

25: Also at Skobeltsyn Institute of Nuclear Physics, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia

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

27: Also at Physics Department, Faculty of Science, Assiut University, Assiut, Egypt

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

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

30: Also at IIT Bhubaneswar, Bhubaneswar, India, Bhubaneswar, India

31: Also at Institute of Physics, Bhubaneswar, India

-
- 32: Also at G.H.G. Khalsa College, Punjab, India
33: Also at Shoolini University, Solan, India
34: Also at University of Hyderabad, Hyderabad, India
35: Also at University of Visva-Bharati, Santiniketan, India
36: Also at Indian Institute of Technology (IIT), Mumbai, India
37: Also at Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Hamburg, Germany
38: Also at Department of Physics, University of Science and Technology of Mazandaran, Behshahr, Iran
39: Now at INFN Sezione di Bari ^a, Università di Bari ^b, Politecnico di Bari ^c, Bari, Italy
40: Also at Italian National Agency for New Technologies, Energy and Sustainable Economic Development, Bologna, Italy
41: Also at Centro Siciliano di Fisica Nucleare e di Struttura Della Materia, Catania, Italy
42: Also at INFN Sezione di Napoli ^a, Università di Napoli 'Federico II' ^b, Napoli, Italy, Università della Basilicata ^c, Potenza, Italy, Università G. Marconi ^d, Roma, Italy, Napoli, Italy
43: Also at Riga Technical University, Riga, Latvia, Riga, Latvia
44: Also at Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología, Mexico City, Mexico
45: Also at Warsaw University of Technology, Institute of Electronic Systems, Warsaw, Poland
46: Also at Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia
47: Now at National Research Nuclear University 'Moscow Engineering Physics Institute' (MEPhI), Moscow, Russia
48: Also at St. Petersburg State Polytechnical University, St. Petersburg, Russia
49: Also at University of Florida, Gainesville, USA
50: Also at Imperial College, London, United Kingdom
51: Also at Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Moscow, Russia, Moscow, Russia
52: Also at California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA
53: Also at Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, Novosibirsk, Russia
54: Also at Faculty of Physics, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia
55: Also at Trincomalee Campus, Eastern University, Sri Lanka, Nilaveli, Sri Lanka
56: Also at INFN Sezione di Pavia ^a, Università di Pavia ^b, Pavia, Italy, Pavia, Italy
57: Also at National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece
58: Also at Universität Zürich, Zurich, Switzerland
59: Also at Stefan Meyer Institute for Subatomic Physics, Vienna, Austria, Vienna, Austria
60: Also at Laboratoire d'Annecy-le-Vieux de Physique des Particules, IN2P3-CNRS, Annecy-le-Vieux, France
61: Also at Şirnak University, Sirnak, Turkey
62: Also at Department of Physics, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China, Beijing, China
63: Also at Near East University, Research Center of Experimental Health Science, Nicosia, Turkey
64: Also at Beykent University, Istanbul, Turkey, Istanbul, Turkey
65: Also at Istanbul Aydin University, Application and Research Center for Advanced Studies (App. & Res. Cent. for Advanced Studies), Istanbul, Turkey
66: Also at Mersin University, Mersin, Turkey
67: Also at Piri Reis University, Istanbul, Turkey
68: Also at Adiyaman University, Adiyaman, Turkey
69: Also at Ozyegin University, Istanbul, Turkey
70: Also at Izmir Institute of Technology, Izmir, Turkey
71: Also at Necmettin Erbakan University, Konya, Turkey
72: Also at Bozok Universititesi Rektörlüğü, Yozgat, Turkey, Yozgat, Turkey
73: Also at Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey

- 74: Also at Milli Savunma University, Istanbul, Turkey
75: Also at Kafkas University, Kars, Turkey
76: Also at Istanbul Bilgi University, Istanbul, Turkey
77: Also at Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey
78: Also at School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southampton, Southampton, United Kingdom
79: Also at IPPP Durham University, Durham, United Kingdom
80: Also at Monash University, Faculty of Science, Clayton, Australia
81: Also at Bethel University, St. Paul, Minneapolis, USA, St. Paul, USA
82: Also at Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University, Karaman, Turkey
83: Also at Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt
84: Also at Bingol University, Bingol, Turkey
85: Also at Georgian Technical University, Tbilisi, Georgia
86: Also at Sinop University, Sinop, Turkey
87: Also at Mimar Sinan University, Istanbul, Istanbul, Turkey
88: Also at Nanjing Normal University Department of Physics, Nanjing, China
89: Also at Texas A&M University at Qatar, Doha, Qatar
90: Also at Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea, Daegu, Korea