

Measurement of the Higgs boson production via vector boson fusion and its decay into bottom quarks in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV

The CMS Collaboration*

Abstract

A measurement of the Higgs boson (H) production via vector boson fusion (VBF) and its decay into a bottom quark-antiquark pair ($b\bar{b}$) is presented using proton-proton collision data recorded by the CMS experiment at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV and corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 90.8 fb^{-1} . Treating the gluon-gluon fusion process as a background and constraining its rate to the value expected in the standard model (SM) within uncertainties, the signal strength of the VBF process, defined as the ratio of the observed signal rate to that predicted by the SM, is measured to be $\mu_{\text{H}b\bar{b}}^{\text{qqH}} = 1.01^{+0.55}_{-0.46}$. The VBF signal is observed with a significance of 2.4 standard deviations relative to the background prediction, while the expected significance is 2.7 standard deviations. Considering inclusive Higgs boson production and decay into bottom quarks, the signal strength is measured to be $\mu_{\text{H}b\bar{b}}^{\text{incl.}} = 0.99^{+0.48}_{-0.41}$, corresponding to an observed (expected) significance of 2.6 (2.9) standard deviations.

Submitted to the Journal of High Energy Physics

1 Introduction

Following the discovery of a scalar boson with a mass near 125 GeV by the ATLAS and CMS Collaborations [1–3] at the CERN LHC, extensive studies of the properties of this particle have been pursued. A multitude of measurements performed thus far in various production and decay modes support the hypothesis that the discovered particle is the Higgs boson (H) described by the standard model (SM) that arises as a consequence of the Brout–Englert–Higgs mechanism of the electroweak (EW) symmetry breaking [4–9].

The SM Higgs boson with mass of 125 GeV decays most frequently into a bottom quark-antiquark ($b\bar{b}$) pair with a branching fraction of about 58% [10, 11]. However, it is challenging to explore this decay mode experimentally. In the dominant gluon-gluon fusion (ggH) production mode, the $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ signal is overwhelmed by a background consisting of $b\bar{b}$ pairs produced through the strong interaction, referred to as quantum chromodynamics (QCD) multijet events. At the LHC, a moderate sensitivity to the $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ decay in the ggH process can be achieved by exploiting Lorentz-boosted production of the Higgs boson [12]. The most promising production mechanism to study the $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ decay is the Higgs boson production in association with a leptonically decaying W or Z boson (VH). Although the VH production cross section is more than an order of magnitude smaller than that of ggH, leptonic decays of W and Z bosons provide a handle to reduce backgrounds, thereby making the $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ decay accessible for detection. The VH production mode has contributed with the largest sensitivity to the observation of the $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ decay by the CMS and ATLAS Collaborations. The ATLAS Collaboration has measured the $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ signal yield relative to the SM prediction to be $\mu_{Hb\bar{b}}^{\text{incl.}} = 1.02 \pm 0.12$ (stat) ± 0.14 (syst), corresponding to a significance of 6.7 standard deviations (σ) [13] using 139 fb⁻¹ of pp collisions data collected at the centre-of-mass energy (\sqrt{s}) of 13 TeV. The measurement by CMS is $\mu_{Hb\bar{b}}^{\text{incl.}} = 1.04 \pm 0.14$ (stat) ± 0.14 (syst) and corresponds to a significance of 5.6 σ [14] by combining VH along with other production modes using the data collected at $\sqrt{s} = 7, 8$ and 13 TeV in 2011–2017.

This paper considers the vector boson fusion (VBF) production mechanism for the detection of the $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ signal. The VBF production of the Higgs boson has the second-largest cross section at the LHC and attracts particular attention because it involves large momentum transfer and provides a sensitive probe of momentum-dependent anomalous couplings [15].

The VBF production followed by the $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ decay, $qqH \rightarrow qq\bar{b}\bar{b}$, gives rise to a four-jet final state as depicted in Fig. 1. Two of the jets, from the $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ decay, typically lie in the central region of the detector. The other two jets, from the light quarks, are produced mainly in the forward and backward directions relative to the beam line and, consequently, have a large rapidity separation between them, as well as high dijet invariant mass. We refer to the latter as VBF jets. As the interaction proceeds via the exchange of colorless particles ($V = W$ or Z), the color connection between the outgoing light-flavor quarks is suppressed, leading to a relatively small amount of hadronic activity in the rapidity interval between the VBF jets and b-tagged jets originating from the Higgs boson decay. These distinct features allow for the suppression of the large QCD multijet background and the identification of the signal process.

The previous measurement of the $qqH \rightarrow qq\bar{b}\bar{b}$ process by the CMS Collaboration is based on a data set of proton-proton (pp) collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV, corresponding to an integrated luminosity of about 20 fb⁻¹ [16]. The signal strength was observed to be $\mu_{Hb\bar{b}}^{\text{qqH}} = 2.8_{-1.4}^{+1.6}$ with a significance of 2.2 σ , while the expected significance was 0.8 σ . The ATLAS Collaboration recently reported a measurement of the $qqH \rightarrow qq\bar{b}\bar{b}$ process using data collected in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 127 fb⁻¹ [17] and the signal




Figure 1: Representative Feynman diagram of the LO VBF production of a Higgs boson, followed by its decay to a pair of b quarks.

strength was measured to be $\mu_{\text{H}b\bar{b}}^{\text{qqH}} = 0.95^{+0.38}_{-0.36}$, corresponding to an observed (expected) significance of 2.6 (2.8) σ .

In this paper, we present a measurement of the $\text{qqH} \rightarrow \text{qqb}\bar{b}$ process using data collected by CMS at $\sqrt{s} = 13 \text{ TeV}$. The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 the main features of the CMS detector are outlined. Section 3 describes the reconstruction of physics objects relevant for this analysis. Data sets and simulated samples used in the study are presented in Section 4, and Section 5 describes employed triggers. Details of the offline analysis, including the event selection and categorization, the improvement of the jet transverse momentum (p_{T}) resolution by regression techniques, background estimation methods, and signal extraction procedure are discussed in Section 6. Section 7 details the main systematic uncertainties affecting the analysis. The final results are discussed in Section 8 and a brief summary is given in Section 9. The tabulated results are provided as HepData records [18].

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 along the beam direction. 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 consists of 75 848 lead tungstate crystals, which provide coverage in pseudorapidity $|\eta| < 1.48$ in the barrel (EB) region and $1.48 < |\eta| < 3.00$ in the two endcap (EE) regions. Preshower detectors consisting of two planes of silicon sensors interleaved with a total of 3 radiation lengths of lead are located in front of each endcap detector. Forward calorimeters extend the η 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 [19]. The first level (L1), composed of custom hardware processors, uses information from the calorimeters and the muon subdetectors to select events at a rate of around 100 kHz within a fixed time interval of less than 4 μs . The second level, known as the high-level trigger (HLT), 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 [20].

A more detailed description of the CMS detector, together with a definition of the coordinate system used and the relevant kinematic variables, can be found in Ref. [21].

3 Event reconstruction

The reconstruction of the physics objects at CMS is based on the particle-flow (PF) algorithm [22], which aims to reconstruct and identify each individual particle (PF candidate) in an event, with an optimized combination of information from the various elements of the CMS detector.

For each event, hadronic jets are clustered from these reconstructed particles using the infrared- and collinear-safe anti- k_T algorithm [23, 24] with a distance parameter of 0.4. The jet momentum is determined as the vectorial sum of all particle momenta in the jet, which is typically within 5 to 10% of the true momentum over the entire range of kinematically allowed p_T and the detector acceptance. Additional pp interactions within the same or nearby bunch crossings (pileup) increase the track multiplicity and calorimetric energy depositions which, potentially affects the jet momentum. To mitigate this effect, charged particles identified to be originating from pileup vertices are discarded and an offset correction is applied to account for the remaining contributions. Jet energy corrections are derived from simulation to match the measured response of the reconstructed jets to that of particle level-jets on average. In-situ measurements of the momentum balance in dijet, photon+jets, Z+jets and multijet events are used to account for any residual differences in the jet energy scale between data and simulation [25]. The jet energy resolution amounts typically to 15–20% at 30 GeV, 10% at 100 GeV, and 5% at 1 TeV [25]. Additional selection criteria are applied to remove jets potentially dominated by anomalous contributions from various subdetector components or reconstruction failures.

At the HLT, identification of the jets resulting from the hadronization of b-quarks is performed with the combined secondary vertex algorithm (CSV) [26, 27] and with its improved version using deep machine learning technique (DEEPCSV) [27]. These algorithms combine the information from track impact parameters and secondary vertices identified within a given jet, and provide a continuous discriminator output. A jet with a CSV or DEEPCSV discriminant value above a certain threshold is considered to be b-tagged. The efficiency for tagging b jets and the rate at which light-flavor, gluon, and charm jets are misidentified as b jets depend on the chosen threshold, as well as on the jet p_T and η . The thresholds are chosen to ensure an online selection of b jets with an efficiency of 60–70%, corresponding to a misidentification rate of 2–3%. Identification of b jets in the offline analysis is performed with the DEEPIET tagger [28, 29], which combines features of the individual jet constituents, properties of the reconstructed secondary vertices, and the global jet variables into a multiclass deep neural network (DNN) targeting three separate classes for the b jets: i) jet with one B hadron, ii) jet with two or more B hadrons, and iii) jet with semileptonic decays of B hadrons. The sum of three b tag class DNN outputs quantifies the consistency of a jet with the b jet hypothesis. A jet is considered to be b-tagged in the offline selection, if this DNN output, referred to as the b tag score, exceeds a certain threshold. These thresholds are chosen such that the b jet selection efficiency is 70–80% depending on data-taking periods, while the probability of light and gluon jets being misidentified as b jets is about 1% and the probability of charm jets being misidentified as b jets is about 10%.

4 Data set and simulated samples

This analysis uses data collected by the CMS experiment in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV corresponding to an integrated luminosity (\mathcal{L}) of 90.8 fb^{-1} . The total analyzed data volume comprises two sets recorded under different experimental conditions. The first set was collected in 2016 and corresponds to $\mathcal{L} = 36.3 \text{ fb}^{-1}$. The second set was collected in 2018, when the LHC delivered pp collisions at higher instantaneous luminosity compared to 2016, and corresponds to $\mathcal{L} = 54.5 \text{ fb}^{-1}$. No trigger path suitable for this analysis was available during the data-taking periods in 2017.

The analysis relies on simulated Monte Carlo (MC) samples for the estimation of the signal acceptance and efficiency and determination of the trigger efficiency. Additionally, the contributions from various subdominant background processes are determined from simulation.

The $qqH \rightarrow qq\bar{b}\bar{b}$ signal is generated using POWHEG 2.0 [30–32] at next-to-leading order (NLO) precision in the QCD coupling constant α_S [33]. A dipole parton shower model [34] is used for emulating of the initial-final state color flow that takes into account the color connection between the incoming and the outgoing partons. An alternative $qqH \rightarrow qq\bar{b}\bar{b}$ sample is also prepared using the POWHEG matrix element generator interfaced with HERWIG 7 v-7.1[35] for fragmentation and hadronization. This sample is used only to assess the systematic uncertainty related to the choice of the showering and hadronization model. The ggH production of the Higgs boson with at least two accompanying jets has a nonnegligible contribution to the kinematic phase space considered in this analysis. The ggH process is generated using the MINLO event generator at next-to-NLO (NNLO) [36, 37] precision in α_S [38], including finite top quark mass effects. An NLO process which may include loops needs to be hadronized with a parton shower model beyond LO. As a result, jet matching must take into account additional hard radiative jets. This is implemented, for this analysis, by employing the FxFx scheme [39]. Contributions from the weak gauge boson associated (VH) and top-quark-pair associated ($t\bar{t}H$) production of the Higgs boson are found to be negligible.

The dominant continuum background for this analysis is QCD multijet production. To assess properties of these events and validate the analysis strategy, QCD multijet events are generated with MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO [40] at leading order (LO) precision in α_S . The matrix element is matched to the parton showers generated by PYTHIA using the MLM prescription [41]. Generated samples of QCD multijet production are also used to derive corrections applied to simulated samples to account for difference in the trigger efficiency between data and simulation.

The dominant resonant background is the inclusive production of Z bosons (Z+jets). About 70% of the time Z bosons decay via a quark-antiquark pair of the same flavor, including 15% decay into a pair of bottom quarks. Hence, the main component of the resonant background in the event sample corresponds to the $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ decay mode, although there are contributions from charm quark, light-flavor quark, and gluon jets being misidentified as b jets. There are two different mechanisms of Z+jets boson production: via quark-antiquark annihilation ($q\bar{q} \rightarrow Z$) and fusion of W bosons ($WW \rightarrow Z$). Though the latter has a much lower rate, the event topology is the same as for the signal. W bosons can be produced in association with jets in similar ways. The inclusive W and Z samples are generated using MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO at LO precision in α_S . For the $q\bar{q} \rightarrow Z$ sample, correction factors have been applied to match the generator-level p_T distributions with analytic predictions available with the highest order accuracy in the perturbative expansion [42]. Two individual correction factors are used for each p_T bin; first to emulate the spectrum predicted by perturbative QCD with NNLO accuracy and then further reweighting was done to incorporate the higher-order EW effects.

Other important background contributions in the signal region arise from inclusive single top quark ($t/\bar{t}+X$) and top quark pair ($t\bar{t}+X$) production. These are modeled by POWHEG at the NLO QCD precision. For the $t\bar{t}$ process, all possible combinations of the decay modes of the two W bosons from the top quark and antiquark decays are considered leading to hadronic, leptonic, and semileptonic final states.

All the simulated samples except the HERWIG signal sample are interfaced with PYTHIA 8.212 [43] for parton showering and fragmentation with the standard p_T -ordered parton shower scheme. The underlying event is modeled with PYTHIA, using the CP5 tune [44] for both of the years. The parton distribution functions (PDFs) are taken from the sets of NNPDF3.0 [45] and NNPDF3.1 [46] for the 2016 and 2018 samples respectively. The response of the CMS detector is modeled using the GEANT4 [47] package. The event reconstruction is performed with the same algorithms as are used for the data. Additional pileup interactions in each bunch crossing are generated with PYTHIA and added to the simulated samples following a Poisson distribution with the mean value determined in the data. The simulated events are weighted such that the pileup distribution in the simulation matches the one observed in the data.

5 Triggers

Events are selected with dedicated L1 and HLT selections optimized separately for 2016 and 2018. At the L1 stage, events are required to have at least three jets with p_T above certain thresholds that were optimized according to the instantaneous luminosity. The p_T thresholds of 90, 76, and 64 GeV (100, 80, and 70 GeV) were imposed for 2016 (2018). The presence of a fourth jet is not required at the L1 stage.

An event is accepted by the HLT if it contains at least four jets reconstructed online with the PF algorithm. Jets are required to have p_T greater than 92, 76, 64, and 15 (105, 88, 76, and 15) GeV in 2016 (2018). Two complementary online requirements (HLT paths), as explained below, are also implemented to select events in each of the two sets. In the following we refer to these HLT paths as `HLT_Tight` and `HLT_Loose`.

The `HLT_Tight` path selects events with at least one b-tagged jet among six leading jets according to p_T . The b tagging is performed with the CSV (DEEPCSV) algorithm in 2016 (2018). The working point chosen for the online b tagging in the `HLT_Tight` path corresponds to b jet efficiency of roughly 60 to 70% and a misidentification rate for light-flavor quark and gluon jets of 3 to 4%. In addition to the b-tagging selection there is also a VBF-selection implemented at the HLT path, which considers only four p_T leading jets. Among these four jets the one with the highest CSV (DEEPCSV) discriminant is considered to be a jet from the Higgs boson decay, and out of the three remaining jets, a jet pair with the largest $\Delta\eta_{jj}$ is chosen as the pair of VBF-tagged jets. The last remaining jet is considered to be the other jet from the decay of the Higgs boson. The `HLT_Tight` path imposes very stringent conditions on the VBF-tagged jets: they must be separated in pseudorapidity by $\Delta\eta_{jj} > 4.1$ (3.5) and have invariant mass $m_{jj} > 500$ (460) GeV in 2016 (2018). For the other two jets, which are assigned to the $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ decay, the separation in azimuthal angle is required to be $\Delta\phi_{b\bar{b}} < 1.6$ (1.9) for 2016 (2018).

In contrast to the `HLT_Tight` path, the `HLT_Loose` path selects events with at least two b-tagged jets but imposes comparatively lenient requirements on the VBF-tagged jets: $m_{jj} > 240$ (200) GeV and $\Delta\eta_{jj} > 2.3$ (1.5) for 2016 (2018); while $\Delta\phi_{b\bar{b}} < 2.1$ (2.8) in 2016 (2018) is required for b jets. Requirements imposed by the `HLT_Tight` and `HLT_Loose` paths in the 2016 and 2018 data-taking periods are summarized in Table 1.

The absolute trigger efficiencies computed with respect to the inclusive simulated signal samples are 3.1 (2.3) and 3.5 (2.5)% in 2016 (2018), for the `HLT_Tight` and `HLT_Loose` paths respectively. The inefficiencies of the trigger paths are mainly driven by relatively high p_T thresholds imposed on the three leading jets.

6 Analysis procedures

Events recorded online by the HLT paths described in Section 5, are reconstructed with improved information related to the detector conditions and calibrations.

6.1 Event selection

An event is discarded if it contains any isolated muon or electron identified through a selection criteria, corresponding to a selection efficiency of 95% and a misidentification rate of 1–2%. This requirement suppresses contributions from $t\bar{t}$ and t/\bar{t} events with leptonic decays of the W bosons. The event is selected if it contains four jets with p_T greater than 95, 80, 65, and 30 GeV (110, 90, 80, and 30 GeV) in 2016 (2018). Reconstructed physics objects are matched to the corresponding trigger objects. At least two jets are required to be b tagged with the DEEPJET algorithm as described in Section 3. Out of the four p_T -leading jets, the two jets with the highest DEEPJET b tag scores are used to reconstruct the $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ decay candidate. After the Higgs boson candidate is selected, the two remaining jets are considered as VBF-tagged jet candidates. The jet with $p_T < 50$ GeV must also pass an identification criterion designed to reduce the number of selected jets originating from pileup interactions [48].

Depending on the data-taking periods and the trigger they pass, events are split into four nonoverlapping samples that are analyzed independently. Events from 2016 (2018) that pass the `HLT_Tight` path are assigned to the `Tight 2016` (`Tight 2018`) sample; events failing the `HLT_Tight` path but pass the `HLT_Loose` path comprise the `Loose 2016` (`Loose 2018`) sample. The selection criteria applied to the VBF- and b-tagged jets in each sample are:

- `Tight 2016`: $\Delta\phi_{b\bar{b}} < 1.6$, $\Delta\eta_{jj} > 4.2$, $m_{jj} > 500$ GeV;
- `Loose 2016`: $\Delta\phi_{b\bar{b}} < 2.1$, $\Delta\eta_{jj} > 2.5$, $m_{jj} > 250$ GeV;
- `Tight 2018`: $\Delta\phi_{b\bar{b}} < 1.6$, $\Delta\eta_{jj} > 3.8$, $m_{jj} > 500$ GeV; and
- `Loose 2018`: $\Delta\phi_{b\bar{b}} < 2.1$, $\Delta\eta_{jj} > 2.5$, $m_{jj} > 250$ GeV.

Details of the selection requirements imposed by the HLT paths and in the offline analysis are summarized in Table 1.

6.2 Regression of b jet energy

The energy of a b-tagged jet is likely to be underestimated often because of the unmeasured neutrino produced in the decay of a b hadron. This is partially remedied by the energy regression of a b jet [49] that improves the mass resolution of the Higgs boson candidate constructed from the two b-tagged jets. The regression is based on a DNN trained on simulated b jets from $t\bar{t}$ events. The algorithm’s input features include properties of the secondary vertices and tracks associated with the jet, jet constituents, soft muons and electrons from the semileptonic decays of b hadrons, as well as additional variables related to the jet energy. After the application of the b jet energy regression, the jet energy scale and resolution of b jets are corrected in simulated events to match the jet energy scale and resolution observed in data. Corrections are devised using events where a b-tagged jet recoils against a Z boson that decays into leptons. The Z boson p_T is reconstructed with high precision due to the excellent resolution of the lepton

Table 1: The HLT and offline selection requirements in the four analyzed samples.

Level	Requirements	2016 (36.3 fb ⁻¹)		2018 (54.5 fb ⁻¹)	
		Tight	Loose	Tight	Loose
HLT	p_T thresholds	92, 76, 64, 15 GeV		105, 88, 76, 15 GeV	
	Number of b tags	≥ 1	≥ 2	≥ 1	≥ 2
	$\Delta\phi_{b\bar{b}}$	< 1.6	< 2.1	< 1.9	< 2.8
	$\Delta\eta_{jj}$	> 4.1	> 2.3	> 3.5	> 1.5
	m_{jj}	> 500 GeV	> 240 GeV	> 460 GeV	> 200 GeV
Offline	p_T thresholds	95, 80, 65, 30 GeV		110, 90, 80, 30 GeV	
	Jet $ \eta < 4.7$	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Lepton veto	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Number of b tags ≥ 2	✓	✓	✓	✓
	b jet $ \eta < 2.4$	✓	✓	✓	✓
	$\Delta\phi_{b\bar{b}}$	< 1.6	< 2.1	< 1.6	< 2.1
	$\Delta\eta_{jj}$	> 4.2	> 2.5	> 3.8	> 2.5
	m_{jj}	> 500 GeV	> 250 GeV	> 500 GeV	> 250 GeV

momentum. As the p_T of the Z boson is balanced with the jet p_T , the ratio of the momentum of the reconstructed jet to the Z boson momentum is used to measure the jet energy scale and resolution in the data and simulated samples and derive corresponding corrections to the energy scale and resolution of b jets in the simulated events. As an illustration, Fig. 2 shows the effect of b jet energy regression on the invariant mass $m_{b\bar{b}}$ of the reconstructed b jet pair in simulated $qqH \rightarrow qq\bar{b}\bar{b}$ signal events for the Tight 2016 and Loose 2016 samples. Distributions of $m_{b\bar{b}}$ are obtained after applying dedicated corrections to the energy scale and resolution of b jets in simulated events. The b jet energy regression improves the $m_{b\bar{b}}$ resolution and the central value by approximately 10 to 15%.




Figure 2: The invariant mass $m_{b\bar{b}}$ of the b jet pair in simulated $qqH \rightarrow qq\bar{b}\bar{b}$ events before (orange dashed line) and after (blue dashed line) the application of the b jet energy regression in the Tight 2016 (left) and Loose 2016 (right) samples. A one-sided Crystal Ball function [50] is used to fit the distributions.

6.3 Event categorization

To discriminate the signal from the major background sources, a multivariate analysis (MVA) technique is applied; the key properties of the $qqH \rightarrow qq\bar{b}\bar{b}$ signal are combined in a boosted decision tree (BDT) algorithm implemented with the TMVA package [51]. The BDT response is then used to separate the signal from the background processes. Two different MVA strategies are applied in the `Tight` and `Loose` samples.

The `Tight 2016` and `Tight 2018` samples are characterized by lower background yields and higher signal-to-background ratios. In particular, the contributions from the resonant $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ background and ggH production are significantly suppressed by more stringent requirements imposed on the VBF-tagged jets. The largest background in these event classes originates from the QCD multijet production. Two separate binary classifiers are trained to discriminate the $qqH \rightarrow qq\bar{b}\bar{b}$ signal from the QCD multijet background for each individual year. The following variables are used as inputs to the BDT:

- Properties of the VBF-tagged jets: invariant mass (m_{jj}), difference in the pseudorapidity ($\Delta\eta_{jj}$), and difference in the azimuthal angle ($\Delta\phi_{jj}$);
- The minimal opening angle between the momentum vector of any of the two VBF-tagged jets and the momentum vector of the dijet system composed by the VBF-tagged jet pair (α_{jj});
- The quark-gluon discriminator [52, 53] score of the two VBF-tagged jets. This is a likelihood discriminator constructed using the information on the charged and the neutral constituents of a given jet and the jet shape variables to distinguish between the jets originating from quarks and from gluons;
- The DEEPJET b-tagging scores of the two selected b-tagged jets assigned to the $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ decay;
- The ratio of the magnitude of the transverse momentum vector of the selected four-jet system to the scalar p_T -sum of the four selected jets ($|\sum \vec{p}_T| / \sum p_T$);
- The longitudinal component of the momentum vector of the selected four-jet system ($\sum p_z$);
- The difference in the azimuthal angle between the Higgs boson candidate and the dijet system composed of the VBF-tagged jets ($|\phi_{b\bar{b}} - \phi_{jj}|$); and
- The multiplicity and p_T sum of extra jets with $p_T > 30 \text{ GeV}$ and $|\eta| < 2.4$, excluding the selected b-tagged and VBF-tagged jets.

The training is performed using half of the simulated VBF events and 2.5% of the data sample after event selection as a proxy for the dominant QCD multijet background, the rest of the simulated VBF sample as well as another 2.5% of the data is used for the validation of the training. Dedicated studies have been performed to assess the impact of using data events in the BDT training. In the first study several other disjoint data subsets corresponding to 5% of the total sample have been employed in the training and validation of the training. In the second study the subset of data used in the training has been removed from the data set used for the extraction of signal. The impact of these alternative analysis strategies on the measured signal rate and its uncertainty has been found to be below 2%. Figure 3 shows the distributions of the BDT output score (D) normalized to unity for the VBF, ggH , and $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ processes and the data as approximation for QCD background in the `Tight 2016` and `Tight 2018` samples.

In the `Loose` samples, where larger contributions from ggH and Z +jets events are expected




Figure 3: The unit normalized distributions of the VBF BDT outputs in data and simulated samples in the `Tight 2016` (left) and `Tight 2018` (right) analysis samples. Data events (points), dominated by the QCD multijet background, are compared to the VBF (red solid line), ggH (blue dashed line), and Z+jets (green hatched area) processes.

compared to the `Tight` sample, a multiclass BDT is trained to separate four processes simultaneously: (1) VBF Higgs boson production, (2) ggH Higgs boson production, (3) Z+jets, and (4) QCD multijet events. The training is performed using simulated samples of VBF, ggH, and Z+jets events and 5% of the data in the `Loose 2016` and `Loose 2018` samples. The BDTs trained in the `Loose` sample use the same set of input variables as the binary BDT classifiers trained in the `Tight` analysis samples. The multiclass BDT has four outputs, D_{VBF} , D_{ggH} , D_{Z} , and D_{QCD} , quantifying the compatibility of each event with the VBF, ggH, Z+jets, and QCD multijet production hypotheses, respectively. The distributions of D_{VBF} , D_{ggH} and D_{Z} normalized to unity are shown in Fig. 4 for data and simulated samples. A more efficient discrimination between the VBF signal and background processes is observed in the `Loose 2016` sample in comparison with the `Loose 2018` sample. This is clearly visible in the plots presenting the D_{VBF} and D_{Z} distributions. The reason for that lies in the definition of the `Loose` samples. These samples contain events failing the `HLT_Tight` trigger. In 2016 the lower cuts imposed by this trigger on variables m_{jj} and $\Delta\eta_{jj}$ are more stringent in comparison with 2018 (see Table 1). As a consequence, in the `Loose 2018` sample a larger part of phase space, where variables m_{jj} and $\Delta\eta_{jj}$ are particularly sensitive to the VBF signal, is removed in comparison with the `Loose 2016` sample, thus making the BDT in the `Loose 2018` sample less performant in discrimination between the VBF signal and background processes than in the `Loose 2016` sample.

Based on their BDT scores, events are classified into multiple exclusive categories, targeting the VBF, ggH, and Z+jets processes. Details of the event categorization and the naming convention of the event categories are given in Table 2. The BDT thresholds defining each category, are optimized by maximizing the quantity S/\sqrt{B} , where S is the number of expected events of the targeted process and B is the number of QCD multijet background events approximated as the observed data events in the $m_{b\bar{b}}$ interval populated by the targeted process. The $m_{b\bar{b}}$ interval of 80–100 GeV is used for the Z+jets process and 104–146 GeV for the VBF and ggH processes. In total, 18 categories are introduced, three in each of the two `Tight` analysis samples, and six in each of the two `Loose` analysis samples.

The aim of introducing distinct categories sensitive to the production of the Z boson is two-




Figure 4: The unit normalized distributions of the BDT outputs: D_{ggH} (upper), D_{VBF} (middle), and D_Z (lower) in data and simulated samples in the Loose 2016 (left) and Loose 2018 (right) analysis samples. Data events (points), dominated by the QCD multijet background, are compared to the VBF (red solid line), ggH (blue dashed line), and Z+jets (green hatched area) processes.

fold. Firstly, these categories are intended to establish the signal from the $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ production,

Table 2: Event categorization used in the analysis for a total of 18 categories. The names of the categories are given in the first column. The BDT score boundaries defining each category are given in the second column and the targeted process is indicated in the third column.

Category	BDT score boundaries	Targeted process
2016		
Tight 1	$0.25 < D < 0.50$	VBF
Tight 2	$0.50 < D < 0.75$	VBF
Tight 3	$0.75 < D$	VBF
Loose G1	$0.50 < D_{\text{ggH}} < 0.55$	ggH
Loose G2	$0.55 < D_{\text{ggH}}$	ggH
Loose V1	$D_{\text{ggH}} < 0.50, 0.80 < D_{\text{VBF}} < 0.85$	VBF
Loose V2	$D_{\text{ggH}} < 0.50, 0.85 < D_{\text{VBF}}$	VBF
Loose Z1	$D_{\text{ggH}} < 0.50, D_{\text{VBF}} < 0.80, 0.60 < D_Z < 0.75$	Z+jets
Loose Z2	$D_{\text{ggH}} < 0.50, D_{\text{VBF}} < 0.80, 0.75 < D_Z$	Z+jets
2018		
Tight 1	$0.25 < D < 0.50$	VBF
Tight 2	$0.50 < D < 0.75$	VBF
Tight 3	$0.75 < D$	VBF
Loose G1	$0.55 < D_{\text{ggH}} < 0.60$	ggH
Loose G2	$0.60 < D_{\text{ggH}}$	ggH
Loose V1	$D_{\text{ggH}} < 0.55, 0.50 < D_{\text{VBF}} < 0.55$	VBF
Loose V2	$D_{\text{ggH}} < 0.55, 0.55 < D_{\text{VBF}}$	VBF
Loose Z1	$D_{\text{ggH}} < 0.55, D_{\text{VBF}} < 0.50, 0.60 < D_Z < 0.70$	Z+jets
Loose Z2	$D_{\text{ggH}} < 0.55, D_{\text{VBF}} < 0.50, 0.70 < D_Z$	Z+jets

thereby validating the analysis techniques employed in this study. Secondly, the tail of each $m_{b\bar{b}}$ distribution in the Z+jets sample extends to the region partially populated by the signal events, thus affecting the precision of the measurement. It is therefore important to constrain the background from the Z+jets process with dedicated categories, thus improving the sensitivity to the signal. Further, introduction of separate categories targeting the ggH process improves the sensitivity of the analysis to inclusive Higgs boson production.

The numbers of selected events in data along with the expected background and signal yields in each analysis category are detailed in Tables 3 and 4. It is evident that the signal contribution is significantly smaller than the backgrounds in all analysis categories.

6.4 Signal extraction

The test statistic chosen to determine the signal yield is based on the profile likelihood ratio [54]. The signal is extracted from the simultaneous binned maximum likelihood fit of the $m_{b\bar{b}}$ distribution in all categories obtained from the data. In each category, the $m_{b\bar{b}}$ distribution is fitted with a superposition of three parametric analytic functions accounting for: (i) the continuum background, dominated by QCD multijet events, (ii) resonant Z+jets background and, (iii) signal. Contributions from other processes are found to have a negligible effect on the results. The addition of separate templates accounting for the W+jets, $t\bar{t}$, and t/\bar{t} backgrounds, changes the extracted signal yield and its uncertainty by less than 1%. The aggregate contribution from

Table 3: Event yields for various categories of the analyzed 2016 data corresponding to 36.3 fb^{-1} , compared to the expected number of events from the simulated samples of signal and background other than the QCD multijet process. The quoted uncertainties are statistical only.

Category	VBF	ggH	Z+jets	$t\bar{t}$ & t/\bar{t}	W+jets	Data
Loose G1	4.5 ± 0.2	27.5 ± 1.2	275 ± 16	116.7 ± 2.6	10.6 ± 3.0	41432
Loose G2	6.1 ± 0.3	51.6 ± 1.8	407 ± 19	127.3 ± 2.7	8.2 ± 2.4	58895
Loose V1	19.9 ± 0.4	2.7 ± 0.4	45 ± 2	10.6 ± 0.8	1.9 ± 1.3	4330
Loose V2	17.4 ± 0.4	1.7 ± 0.3	31 ± 5	4.7 ± 0.4	0.5 ± 0.3	1901
Loose Z1	9.6 ± 0.3	34.8 ± 1.4	1150 ± 20	226.3 ± 3.3	40.8 ± 6.1	78850
Loose Z2	3.1 ± 0.2	14.1 ± 0.7	650 ± 10	199.0 ± 3.0	35.0 ± 5.9	29992
Tight 1	92.7 ± 1.0	15.6 ± 1.0	161 ± 8	37.6 ± 1.4	7.7 ± 2.5	29864
Tight 2	136.2 ± 1.5	13.9 ± 0.9	151 ± 6	22.5 ± 1.2	4.2 ± 1.4	21831
Tight 3	117.3 ± 1.1	6.2 ± 0.7	75 ± 3	5.5 ± 0.5	3.1 ± 1.1	7231

Table 4: Event yields for various categories of the analyzed 2018 data corresponding to 54.5 fb^{-1} , compared to the expected number of events from the simulated samples of signal and background other than the QCD multijet process. The quoted uncertainties are statistical only.

Category	VBF	ggH	Z+jets	$t\bar{t}$ & t/\bar{t}	W+jets	Data
Loose G1	2.4 ± 0.2	13.5 ± 2.1	137 ± 9	32.4 ± 1.4	2.0 ± 0.5	17296
Loose G2	2.9 ± 0.2	24.3 ± 1.5	180 ± 10	33.1 ± 1.4	2.1 ± 0.5	24882
Loose V1	6.4 ± 0.3	1.0 ± 0.3	22 ± 3	4.4 ± 0.5	0.5 ± 0.3	1914
Loose V2	11.0 ± 0.4	1.7 ± 0.4	25 ± 3	4.7 ± 0.5	0.3 ± 0.2	2453
Loose Z1	7.0 ± 0.3	10.8 ± 0.9	506 ± 10	59.0 ± 1.7	19.5 ± 2.7	24559
Loose Z2	4.0 ± 0.2	7.1 ± 0.7	445 ± 7	99.0 ± 2.2	24.0 ± 2.8	14530
Tight 1	89.5 ± 1.1	18.0 ± 3.2	190 ± 8	49.3 ± 1.5	8.0 ± 2.5	29261
Tight 2	139.8 ± 1.4	17.9 ± 3.3	202 ± 7	31.6 ± 1.3	7.2 ± 2.4	23392
Tight 3	134.5 ± 1.4	8.7 ± 2.6	104 ± 5	7.6 ± 0.6	3.4 ± 1.6	8202

other decays of the Higgs boson ($H \rightarrow c\bar{c}$, $H \rightarrow \tau\tau$) and from the other production modes ($t\bar{t}H$ and VH) is evaluated to be almost two orders of magnitude lower than the contributions from the VBF and ggH processes, hence their contributions are neglected in the signal extraction procedure. The expected yields of the VBF, ggH , and Z +jets processes in a given category are estimated from simulation. The $m_{b\bar{b}}$ distributions for the VBF and ggH signal and Z +jets background are individually modeled with a superposition of a one-sided Crystal Ball (CB) function [50] for the resonant part and a second-order Bernstein polynomial accounting for the contribution from events where the jets are misassigned to the decay of the Z or the Higgs boson. The parameters of the CB function and the Bernstein polynomial are extracted from the fit to the $m_{b\bar{b}}$ spectrum in the respective simulated sample, and separately for each sample. For the signal, as well as the Z +jets processes, the variations of the shapes across different event categories are found to be well within the statistical uncertainties of the MC samples. For the VBF and ggH processes, which have similar shapes, a common analytic function is used to approximate the $m_{b\bar{b}}$ distribution. Figure 5 illustrates the modeling of the $m_{b\bar{b}}$ shape in samples of the simulated VBF, ggH , and Z +jets events assigned to the `Tight 2016` analysis sample.




Figure 5: The $m_{b\bar{b}}$ distributions from simulation with overlaid parametric fits (solid blue lines) for the `Tight 2016` analysis sample. Left: The fitted $m_{b\bar{b}}$ distribution in the signal combining the VBF (yellow histogram) and ggH (orange) contributions. The black points refer to the total Higgs boson contribution from VBF and ggH production modes. Right: The fitted $m_{b\bar{b}}$ distribution in simulated Z +jets background (black points) combining the $WW \rightarrow Z$ (dark green histogram) and $q\bar{q} \rightarrow Z$ (light green histogram) production modes. The black points refer to the total Z +jets contribution from $q\bar{q} \rightarrow Z$ and $WW \rightarrow Z$ modes. The dotted lines represent the second-order Bernstein polynomial components used to approximate the contributions from the wrong jet pairing.

The shape and normalization of the continuum background are estimated from the fit to data. The shape of the continuum background is modeled individually in each event category i by a product of exponential and polynomial functions of order n ,

$$F_i^{\text{QCD}} = \exp(-b_i m_{b\bar{b}}) \left(1 + \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} m_{b\bar{b}}^j \right). \quad (1)$$

The family of functions given by Eq. (1) includes the case corresponding to the zeroth order polynomial. In each category, the choice of the polynomial function is guided by the combined fit of two sideband regions, $80 < m_{b\bar{b}} < 104 \text{ GeV}$ and $146 < m_{b\bar{b}} < 200 \text{ GeV}$. Sequential

fits with increasing polynomial order are performed followed by a Fisher F -test [55] to select the function with the fewest number of parameters necessary to fit the data. The contribution from the Z+jets background is accounted for by performing fits with the superposition of two functions,

- tested analytic function from the family defined by Eq. 1 modeling continuum background dominated by the QCD multijet process;
- and a CB function describing the contribution from the Z+jets background.

First, the selection of functions for the modeling of the continuum background is performed in the categories targeting the Z+jets process: Loose Z1, Loose Z2 in 2016 and 2018 samples. Fits in each of the four aforementioned categories are performed by varying the normalization of the Z+jets process in an unconstrained manner. Once the functional form of the continuum background modeling in each category targeting the Z+jets process is selected based on the F -test result, a combined fit is performed in these four categories with a common normalization corresponding to the Z+jets component as a freely floating parameter. The selection of functions from the family given in Eq. 1 in the categories targeting VBF and ggH processes is done by performing fits with a Gaussian constraint imposed on the normalization of the Z+jets component, which is obtained from the combined fit in the four categories targeting the Z+jets process.

Ideally, the final result should not depend on the choice of the parametric fit function, but in reality, the choice of the function to model the background may bias the extraction of the signal. Therefore, a dedicated study is performed for each category to assess a possible bias in the signal extraction. For each of the selected functions, various alternative models of the continuum background are used to generate an ensemble of pseudo-data, including the injected signal and the contribution from Z+jets process. The resulting $m_{b\bar{b}}$ spectra obtained from the pseudo-data are fitted using the nominal model of the continuum background and the distribution of the extracted signal yield is compared to the injected yield. The study is performed using the following alternative models:

1. Functions from the same family, given by Eq. (1), but with polynomials one or two orders higher than the nominal function.
2. Inverse polynomials, $I(m_{b\bar{b}}) = 1/(1 + \sum_{j=1}^n a_j m_{b\bar{b}}^j)$, with $n = 2$ or 3 .

The injected signal yield is varied between 50–200% of the yield predicted by the SM to investigate a possible dependence of the bias on the signal strength. The background model chosen yields a maximum potential bias that does not exceed 10% of the statistical uncertainty on the fitted signal rate in each individual event category, and has negligible impact on the measurement. The systematic uncertainty related to the choice of the function used to model the continuum background has a subdominant effect on the final results. The functional forms employed in the modeling of the continuum background in each event category are reported in Table 5.

7 Systematic uncertainties

Several systematic uncertainties affect the overall normalizations and shapes of the $m_{b\bar{b}}$ distributions for signal and background. Systematic uncertainties are incorporated in the signal

Table 5: The functional forms used to fit the continuum component of the background in various analysis categories. The notation “exp” stands for the exponential function, “exp·pol1 (pol2)” denotes the product of an exponential function and a first-order (second-order) polynomial.

Category	Samples	
	Loose 2016	Loose 2018
G1	exp·pol2	exp·pol1
G2	exp·pol2	exp·pol1
V1	exp	exp
V2	exp	exp
Z1	exp·pol1	exp·pol1
Z2	exp·pol1	exp·pol1
	Tight 2016	Tight 2018
1	exp	exp
2	exp	exp
3	exp	exp

extraction procedure via nuisance parameters with Gaussian or log-normal probability density functions (pdfs), which are treated according to the frequentist paradigm. These pdfs are included as additional factors in the likelihood function, which is maximized in the fit. All uncertainties are divided into two categories. Theoretical uncertainties arise from the limited precision in the computation of the inclusive and differential cross sections of the modeled processes and are fully correlated between event categories and data-taking periods. Experimental uncertainties comprise i) uncertainties related to the imperfect simulation of the detector response and consequent inaccurate modeling of the reconstruction of physics objects and observables in the simulated samples, ii) the uncertainty in the integrated luminosity estimation, and iii) the uncertainty in the modeling of the pileup interactions. The dominant uncertainties affecting this measurement are briefly summarized in the following.

Theoretical uncertainties

- *Parton shower and hadronization model for VBF production:* This uncertainty is assessed by comparing the default parton shower model implemented in PYTHIA with the alternative one provided by the HERWIG event generator. Yields of the VBF signal in each event category are compared between the two models and the differences are used to define a double-sided uncertainty with the PYTHIA prediction taken as the central estimate.
- *Parton shower uncertainty in PYTHIA:* The uncertainty related to the modeling of the parton shower in PYTHIA is estimated by varying the scales of the initial- and final-state QCD radiation. The impact on the predicted event yields varies between 2 and 10% across event categories with larger effects observed for categories targeting VBF production.
- *Uncertainties from Z+jets NLO K-factors:* The MC samples of $q\bar{q} \rightarrow Z$ events are simulated with MADGRAPH5.aMC@NLO at the LO accuracy with MLM matching. To improve the modeling of this process, additional p_T -dependent K -factors are applied following the prescription in Ref. [42] to match the differential distribution of the Z boson p_T as predicted by the NNLO QCD and NLO EW calculations. The uncertainties in these K -factors are incorporated via six nuisance parameters that vary the

acceptance of Z+jets events in different event categories.

- *Scale variations*: Uncertainties arising from missing higher-order QCD corrections in the theoretical computations affect the overall production rates as well as the kinematics of the simulated processes. The impact of these uncertainties on the cross sections of the VBF and the ggH productions are estimated by varying the renormalization and factorization scales, yielding uncertainties of $\pm 2.1\%$ and $^{+4.6\%}_{-6.7\%}$, respectively [11]. The impact on the acceptance of VBF and ggH events across the event categories is evaluated by applying event weights that reflect the effect of the scale variations on the kinematics of the simulated events. The variations in event yields across categories are typically between 1 and 4%, with larger effects observed in categories targeting the VBF process.
- *Uncertainties in PDFs and α_S* : The PDF and α_S uncertainties in the cross sections of the VBF and ggH processes are $\pm 0.4\%$ and $\pm 3.2\%$, respectively [11].
- *Uncertainty in the branching fraction*: The theoretical uncertainty in the branching fraction of the Higgs boson decay to bottom quarks is 0.65% at $m_H = 125$ GeV [11].

Experimental uncertainties

- *Jet energy scale and resolution corrections*: The uncertainties in the jet energy scale and resolution originate from different sources with limited correlations [25, 53]. The uncertainties depend on the jet kinematics and are typically larger in the forward regions. Variations of the jet four-momenta caused by these uncertainties have an impact on the acceptance in various event categories of between 5 and 10%.
- *b tagging*: The uncertainties in b tagging efficiency are evaluated with the control samples of the semileptonic $t\bar{t}$ decays, Z+jets events, and the inclusive QCD multijet events [27]. The uncertainties associated with the selection of the working point of the DEEPJET score for the tagger vary between 4–8% depending on jet flavor, p_T , and η . The DEEPJET discriminants of the two b-tagged jets are also used as an input to the BDT classifiers. An assessment of control samples of QCD multijet and leptonic $t\bar{t}$ events revealed only small differences in the DEEPJET discriminant distribution between data and simulated events above the threshold defining the working point. These differences are found to have subdominant effects on the response of BDT classifiers, leading to a migration of events between categories at a percent level.
- *Trigger efficiency*: The efficiency of the trigger selection is measured with the tag-and-probe method [56] using events selected with control triggers. The trigger scale factors, representing the ratio of the trigger efficiency in data to that in the simulated events, are measured as a function of jet p_T and η for each leg of the four-jet requirement. For the online b tagging, the scale factors are derived also as a function of the DEEPJET discriminants of the offline tagged jets. The uncertainties in the trigger scale factors are predominantly statistical. The impact of these uncertainties on the acceptance of signal and background events in various analysis categories is estimated to range from 5 to 10%.
- *Corrections to b jet energy regression*: The scale and smearing corrections to the regressed b jet energy are derived as described in Section 6.2. The uncertainties in the corrections are propagated to the parameters of the CB functions modeling the core of the $m_{b\bar{b}}$ spectrum in the simulated samples of $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ and $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ decays. Furthermore, these uncertainties change the shape of several observables used as inputs to the BDT classifiers, and consequently affect the estimate of the acceptance in various event categories.

- *Integrated luminosity*: The uncertainty in the luminosity measurement has both correlated and uncorrelated components, which vary across different data-taking periods [57, 58]. The uncertainties of the individual years are 1.2 and 2.5% for 2016 and 2018, respectively. The uncertainty of the combined 2016+2018 integrated luminosity is 1.7% (calculated using the full correlation scheme and per-year luminosities of 36.3 fb^{-1} and 54.5 fb^{-1}).
- *Pileup modeling*: The number of primary interactions per bunch crossing varies with the instantaneous luminosity during the data-taking operation. In order to match the distribution of pileup in data with that in the simulated samples, weights are applied that are determined by studying minimum-bias data sets. A normalization uncertainty is derived by altering the pileup weights obtained by changing the total inelastic cross section by $\pm 4.6\%$ [59] of its nominal value.
- *Pileup jet identification*: This uncertainty is estimated by comparing the pileup jet identification score [48] of the jet in events with a Z boson decaying into a pair of electrons or muons and one balanced jet in data and simulation. The assigned uncertainty depends on p_T and η , and is designed to cover all differences between data and simulation in the distribution.

The impact of the most significant uncertainties are presented in Table 6.

Table 6: The impact of the dominant systematic uncertainties on the observed signal strength for inclusive Higgs boson production followed by decay to bottom quarks.

Source of systematic uncertainty	Impact on signal strength [%]
VBF parton shower	13.0
Jet energy scale	7.7
Trigger efficiency	6.7
Parton shower (final-state radiation)	5.6
b jet regression smearing	3.3
b tagging efficiency	3.0
Pileup modeling	2.3
b jet regression scale	2.0
Jet energy resolution	1.5

8 Results

This analysis is primarily sensitive to the VBF Higgs boson production followed by $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ decay. The outcome of the measurement depends on how the contribution from the ggH process is accounted for, and three scenarios are presented that differ in the way this process is treated in the signal extraction procedure. In each scenario, the best fit value of the parameters of interest and their confidence level (CL) intervals are extracted following the procedure described in Section 3.2 of Ref. [60].

8.1 Measurement of inclusive Higgs boson production

In the measurement of the inclusive Higgs boson production rate, the ggH process is considered as part of the signal. The fit is performed with an unconstrained signal strength modifier $\mu_{Hb\bar{b}}^{\text{incl.}}$ that simultaneously scales the yields of VBF and ggH events in all categories. The parameter $\mu_{Hb\bar{b}}^{\text{incl.}}$ is the product of the inclusive production cross section of the Higgs boson and

the $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ branching fraction relative to the SM expectation. In the measurement we allow the overall normalization of the Z+jets process $\mu_{Zb\bar{b}}$ to vary in an unconstrained manner.

The analytic function used to fit the $m_{b\bar{b}}$ spectrum in the i th category is given by

$$F_i(m_{b\bar{b}}|\vec{\theta}) = N_i^{\text{QCD}} F_i^{\text{QCD}}(m_{b\bar{b}}|\vec{\alpha}_i) + \mu_{Zb\bar{b}} N_i^{\text{Zb}\bar{b}}(\vec{\theta}) F_i^{\text{Zb}\bar{b}}(m_{b\bar{b}}|\vec{\theta}_S) + \mu_{\text{Hb}\bar{b}}^{\text{incl.}} (N_i^{\text{qqH}}(\vec{\theta}) + N_i^{\text{ggH}}(\vec{\theta})) F_i^{\text{Hb}\bar{b}}(m_{b\bar{b}}|\vec{\theta}_S). \quad (2)$$

The function includes the following category-dependent components:

- N_i^{QCD} : the normalization of the QCD multijet background extracted from the fit.
- $F_i^{\text{QCD}}(m_{b\bar{b}}|\vec{\alpha}_i)$: analytic parametric function normalized to unity modeling the shape of the QCD multijet background. The parameters $\vec{\alpha}_i$ of the function are obtained from the fit. The types of functions used to model the QCD multijet background are discussed in Section 6.4.
- $N_i^{\text{qqH,ggH,Zb}\bar{b}}(\vec{\theta})$: predicted yields of the VBF, ggH, and Z+jets processes; these yields depend on the nuisance parameters $\vec{\theta}$ that incorporate systematic uncertainties in the fit.
- $F_i^{\text{Hb}\bar{b},\text{Zb}\bar{b}}(m_{b\bar{b}}|\vec{\theta}_S)$: analytic functions normalized to unity modeling the shape of the $m_{b\bar{b}}$ distribution in the samples of $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ and $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ decays. The parameters of the analytic functions, described in Section 6.4, are influenced by the nuisance parameters $\vec{\theta}_S$ associated with the uncertainties in the scale and resolution of the b jet energy regression.

The measurement of the inclusive Higgs boson production yields the best fit values as

$$\mu_{\text{Hb}\bar{b}}^{\text{incl.}} = 0.99_{-0.24}^{+0.33} (\text{syst}) \pm 0.33 (\text{stat}), \quad \text{and} \\ \mu_{Zb\bar{b}} = 0.96 \pm 0.22 (\text{syst}) \pm 0.22 (\text{stat}).$$

The $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ signal, including contributions from the VBF and ggH processes, is observed with a statistical significance of 2.6σ , compared to the expected significance of 2.9σ . The sensitivity of the measurement is driven by the `Tight` categories, while the `Loose` categories constrain the Z+jets background. Figures 6 and 7 show the results of the fit in the `Tight 2016` and `Tight 2018` categories, and Fig. 8 is for the `Loose 2016 Z2` and `Loose 2018 Z2` categories. In these Figures, "ndf" is the number of degrees of freedom; the "p-value" of the fit is described in Ref. [61].

Figure 9 shows the $m_{b\bar{b}}$ spectrum combining all 18 analysis categories. Each category enters the combination with a weight $S/(S+B)$, where S is the total $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ signal yield (VBF and ggH contributions) and B is the total background yield including QCD multijet and Z+jets processes obtained in a given category from the combined fit. The yields are computed by integrating the $m_{b\bar{b}}$ distribution over the entire fitted range of 80–200 GeV. The distribution in data is compared with the fitted background-only model and the signal-plus-background model.




Figure 6: The $m_{b\bar{b}}$ distributions in three event categories: TIGHT 2016 1 (left), TIGHT 2016 2 (center), and TIGHT 2016 3 (right). The points indicate data, the blue solid curve corresponds to the fitted nonresonant component of the background, dominated by QCD multijet events; the shaded (cyan) band represents the $\pm 1\sigma$ uncertainty band. The total signal-plus-background model includes contributions from $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$, $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$, and the nonresonant component; it is represented by the magenta curve. The lower panel compares the distribution of the data after subtracting the nonresonant component with the resonant contributions of the $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ background (red curve) and $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ signal (green curve).




Figure 7: The $m_{b\bar{b}}$ distributions in three event categories: TIGHT 2018 1 (left), TIGHT 2018 2 (center), and TIGHT 2018 3 (right). A complete description is given in Fig. 6.

8.2 Measurement of VBF production when ggH production is constrained to SM expectations

The measurement of the exclusive VBF production rate is performed with the contribution from the ggH process constrained within theoretical and experimental uncertainties to the SM expectation. In this case, the analytic function employed to fit the $m_{b\bar{b}}$ spectrum in category i is modified to be

$$F_i(m_{b\bar{b}}|\vec{\theta}) = N_i^{\text{QCD}} F_i^{\text{QCD}}(m_{b\bar{b}}|\vec{\alpha}_i) + \mu_{Zb\bar{b}} N_i^{Zb\bar{b}}(\vec{\theta}) F_i^{Zb\bar{b}}(m_{b\bar{b}}|\vec{\theta}_S) + (\mu_{Hb\bar{b}}^{\text{qqH}} N_i^{\text{qqH}}(\vec{\theta}) + N_i^{\text{ggH}}(\vec{\theta})) F_i^{\text{Hb}\bar{b}}(m_{b\bar{b}}|\vec{\theta}_S). \quad (3)$$

The fit is performed with two unconstrained parameters: the signal strength modifier for the




Figure 8: The $m_{b\bar{b}}$ distributions in two event categories: Loose 2016 Z2 (left) and Loose 2018 Z2 (right). A complete description is given in Fig. 6.




Figure 9: The $m_{b\bar{b}}$ distribution after weighted combination of all categories in the analysis weighted with $S/(S+B)$. A complete description is given in Fig. 6.

VBF process ($\mu_{Hb\bar{b}}^{\text{qqH}}$) and $\mu_{Zb\bar{b}}$. The measurement yields

$$\mu_{Hb\bar{b}}^{\text{qqH}} = 1.01_{-0.27}^{+0.40} (\text{syst}) \pm 0.36 (\text{stat}), \quad \text{and}$$

$$\mu_{Zb\bar{b}} = 0.96 \pm 0.22 (\text{syst}) \pm 0.22 (\text{stat}).$$

The VBF signal is observed with a significance of 2.4σ . The expected significance is 2.7σ . The best fit values of the signal strength modifiers for the different processes are also shown in

Fig. 10.




Figure 10: The best fit values of the signal strength modifier for the different processes. The horizontal bars in blue and red colors represent the $\pm 1\sigma$ total uncertainty and its systematic component. The vertical dashed line shows the standard model prediction.

8.3 Independent measurement of VBF and ggH production

Independent measurement of the VBF and ggH production rates is performed by fitting the $m_{b\bar{b}}$ spectra with three unconstrained parameters, $\mu_{Zb\bar{b}}$, $\mu_{Hb\bar{b}}^{qqH}$, and $\mu_{Hb\bar{b}}^{ggH}$, with the last one being the signal strength for the ggH process. In this measurement, the $m_{b\bar{b}}$ spectrum in the i th category is fitted with the function

$$F_i(m_{b\bar{b}}|\vec{\theta}) = N_i^{\text{QCD}} F_i^{\text{QCD}}(m_{b\bar{b}}|\vec{\alpha}_i) + \mu_{Zb\bar{b}} N_i^{Zb\bar{b}}(\vec{\theta}) F_i^{Zb\bar{b}}(m_{b\bar{b}}|\vec{\theta}_S) \\ + (\mu_{Hb\bar{b}}^{qqH} N_i^{qqH}(\vec{\theta}) + \mu_{Hb\bar{b}}^{ggH} N_i^{ggH}(\vec{\theta})) F_i^{Hb\bar{b}}(m_{b\bar{b}}|\vec{\theta}_S).$$

The fit yields

$$\mu_{Hb\bar{b}}^{qqH} = 1.53^{+0.62}_{-0.70} (\text{syst}) \pm 0.54 (\text{stat}), \\ \mu_{Hb\bar{b}}^{ggH} = -2.7^{+5.0}_{-2.6} (\text{syst}) \pm 3.5 (\text{stat}), \quad \text{and} \\ \mu_{Zb\bar{b}} = 0.94 \pm 0.29 (\text{syst}) \pm 0.25 (\text{stat}).$$

The best fit values of the signal strength modifiers for the different processes are shown in Fig. 11 (left). The negative best fit value for the signal strength modifier of the ggH process, i.e., $\mu_{Hb\bar{b}}^{ggH}$, is caused by deficit of the data compared to the expected yields from the background processes only for $m_{b\bar{b}}$ between 100 and 150 GeV, observed in some of the event categories targeting the ggH or Z+jets processes. A two-dimensional likelihood scan of $\mu_{Hb\bar{b}}^{qqH}$ and $\mu_{Hb\bar{b}}^{ggH}$ presented in Fig. 11 (right), shows that the measured value of $\mu_{Hb\bar{b}}^{ggH}$ is consistent with the SM prediction within 1σ . Because of the degeneracy of the $m_{b\bar{b}}$ shapes in the VBF and ggH processes and the nonnegligible contribution from the ggH process in the categories targeting VBF production, $\mu_{Hb\bar{b}}^{qqH}$ and $\mu_{Hb\bar{b}}^{ggH}$ exhibit strong anticorrelation. As a consequence, a downward shift in the measured value of $\mu_{Hb\bar{b}}^{ggH}$ causes an upward shift in the measured value of $\mu_{Hb\bar{b}}^{qqH}$.




Figure 11: The best fit values of the signal strength modifier for the different processes, the horizontal bars in blue and red colors represent the $\pm 1\sigma$ total uncertainty and its systematic component and the vertical dashed line shows the SM prediction (left). The two-dimensional likelihood scan of $\mu_{Hb\bar{b}}^{qqH}$ and $\mu_{Hb\bar{b}}^{ggH}$, the red (blue) solid and dashed lines correspond to the observed (expected) 68 and 95% CL contours in the $(\mu_{Hb\bar{b}}^{qqH}, \mu_{Hb\bar{b}}^{ggH})$ plane (right). The SM predicted and observed best fit values are indicated by the blue and red crosses.

9 Summary

A measurement of the Higgs boson (H) production via vector boson fusion (VBF) process and its decay to a bottom quark-antiquark pair ($b\bar{b}$) was performed on proton-proton collision data sets collected by the CMS experiment at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV corresponding to a total integrated luminosity of 90.8 fb^{-1} . The analysis employs boosted decision trees (BDTs) to discriminate the signal against major background processes – QCD-induced multijet production and Z+jets events. The BDTs exploit kinematic properties of the VBF jets, information of the b-tagged jets assigned to the $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ decay, and global event shape variables. Based on the BDT response, multiple event categories are introduced, targeting the VBF, gluon-gluon fusion (ggH), and Z+jets processes to achieve a maximum sensitivity for the signal. While the VBF categories have the highest signal-to-background ratio, the Z+jets categories constrain the largest resonant background. The ggH categories enhance the sensitivity to the inclusive production of the Higgs boson in association with two jets.

The VBF Higgs boson production rate has been measured in its decay to bottom quark-antiquark pairs with the ggH contribution constrained within the theoretical and experimental uncertainties to the standard model prediction. The signal strength of the VBF Higgs production, followed by the $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ decay, defined as the rate of the signal process relative to the value predicted in the standard model, is measured to be, $\mu_{Hb\bar{b}}^{qqH} = 1.01_{-0.46}^{+0.55}$. The signal was observed with a significance of 2.4 standard deviations, compared to the expected significance of 2.7 standard deviations. In addition, inclusive Higgs boson production in association with two jets, followed by $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ decay, was measured by treating the ggH contribution as part of the signal. The inclusive signal strength was measured to be $\mu_{Hb\bar{b}}^{\text{incl.}} = 0.99_{-0.41}^{+0.48}$, corresponding to an observed (expected) significance of 2.6 (2.9) standard deviations. The measurements are consistent within uncertainties with the prediction from the standard model.

Acknowledgments

We congratulate our colleagues in the CERN accelerator departments for the excellent performance of the LHC and thank the technical and administrative staffs at CERN and at other CMS institutes for their contributions to the success of the CMS effort. In addition, we gratefully acknowledge the computing centres and personnel of the Worldwide LHC Computing Grid and other centres 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: SC (Armenia), BMBWF and FWF (Austria); FNRS and FWO (Belgium); CNPq, CAPES, FAPERJ, FAPERGS, and FAPESP (Brazil); MES and BNSF (Bulgaria); CERN; CAS, MoST, and NSFC (China); MINCIENCIAS (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); GSRI (Greece); NKFIH (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); MES and NSC (Poland); FCT (Portugal); MESTD (Serbia); MCIN/AEI and PCTI (Spain); MOSTR (Sri Lanka); Swiss Funding Agencies (Switzerland); MST (Taipei); MHESI and NSTDA (Thailand); TUBITAK and TENMAK (Turkey); NASU (Ukraine); STFC (United Kingdom); DOE and NSF (USA).

Individuals have received support from the Marie-Curie programme and the European Research Council and Horizon 2020 Grant, contract Nos. 675440, 724704, 752730, 758316, 765710, 824093, 884104, and COST Action CA16108 (European Union); the Leventis Foundation; the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation; the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation; the Science Committee, project no. 22rl-037 (Armenia); 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 Shota Rustaveli National Science Foundation, grant FR-22-985 (Georgia); the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG), under Germany's Excellence Strategy – EXC 2121 "Quantum Universe" – 390833306, and under project number 400140256 - GRK2497; the Hellenic Foundation for Research and Innovation (HFRI), Project Number 2288 (Greece); the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, the New National Excellence Program - ÚNKP, the NKFIH research grants K 124845, K 124850, K 128713, K 128786, K 129058, K 131991, K 133046, K 138136, K 143460, K 143477, 2020-2.2.1-ED-2021-00181, and TKP2021-NKTA-64 (Hungary); the Council of Science and Industrial Research, India; the Latvian Council of Science; the Ministry of Education and Science, project no. 2022/WK/14, and the National Science Center, contracts Opus 2021/41/B/ST2/01369 and 2021/43/B/ST2/01552 (Poland); the Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, grant CEECIND/01334/2018 (Portugal); the National Priorities Research Program by Qatar National Research Fund; MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033, ERDF "a way of making Europe", and the Programa Estatal de Fomento de la Investigación Científica y Técnica de Excelencia María de Maeztu, grant MDM-2017-0765 and Programa Severo Ochoa del Principado de Asturias (Spain); the Chulalongkorn Academic into Its 2nd Century Project Advancement Project, and the National Science, Research and Innovation Fund via the Program Management Unit for Human Resources & Institutional Development, Research and Innovation, grant B05F650021 (Thailand); the Kavli Foundation; the Nvidia Corporation; the SuperMicro Corporation; the

Welch Foundation, contract C-1845; and the Weston Havens Foundation (USA).

References

- [1] ATLAS Collaboration, “Observation of a new particle in the search for the standard model Higgs boson with the ATLAS detector at the LHC”, *Phys. Lett. B* **716** (2012) 1, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2012.08.020, arXiv:1207.7214.
- [2] CMS Collaboration, “Observation of a new boson at a mass of 125 GeV with the CMS experiment at the LHC”, *Phys. Lett. B* **716** (2012) 30, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2012.08.021, arXiv:1207.7235.
- [3] CMS Collaboration, “Observation of a new boson with mass near 125 GeV in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ and 8 TeV”, *JHEP* **06** (2013) 081, doi:10.1007/JHEP06(2013)081, arXiv:1303.4571.
- [4] F. Englert and R. Brout, “Broken symmetry and the mass of gauge vector mesons”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **13** (1964) 321, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.13.321.
- [5] P. W. Higgs, “Broken symmetries, massless particles and gauge fields”, *Phys. Lett.* **12** (1964) 132, doi:10.1016/0031-9163(64)91136-9.
- [6] P. W. Higgs, “Broken symmetries and the masses of gauge bosons”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **13** (1964) 508, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.13.508.
- [7] G. S. Guralnik, C. R. Hagen, and T. W. B. Kibble, “Global conservation laws and massless particles”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **13** (1964) 585, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.13.585.
- [8] P. W. Higgs, “Spontaneous symmetry breakdown without massless bosons”, *Phys. Rev.* **145** (1966) 1156, doi:10.1103/PhysRev.145.1156.
- [9] T. W. B. Kibble, “Symmetry breaking in non-abelian gauge theories”, *Phys. Rev.* **155** (1967) 1554, doi:10.1103/PhysRev.155.1554.
- [10] A. Djouadi, J. Kalinowski, and M. Spira, “HDECAY: A Program for Higgs boson decays in the standard model and its supersymmetric extension”, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **108** (1998) 56, doi:10.1016/S0010-4655(97)00123-9, arXiv:hep-ph/9704448.
- [11] LHC Higgs Cross Section Working Group, “Handbook of LHC Higgs Cross Sections: 4. Deciphering the nature of the Higgs sector”, *CERN Yellow Rep. Monogr.* **2** (2017) doi:10.23731/CYRM-2017-002, arXiv:1610.07922.
- [12] CMS Collaboration, “Inclusive search for highly boosted Higgs bosons decaying to bottom quark-antiquark pairs in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV”, *JHEP* **12** (2020) 085, doi:10.1007/JHEP12(2020)085, arXiv:2006.13251.
- [13] ATLAS Collaboration, “Measurements of WH and ZH production in the $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ decay channel in pp collisions at 13 TeV with the ATLAS detector”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81** (2021) 178, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-020-08677-2, arXiv:2007.02873.
- [14] CMS Collaboration, “Observation of Higgs boson decay to bottom quarks”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121** (2018) 121801, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.121.121801, arXiv:1808.08242.

- [15] F. Maltoni, K. Mawatari, and M. Zaro, “Higgs characterisation via vector-boson fusion and associated production: NLO and parton-shower effects”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74** (2014) 2710, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-013-2710-5, arXiv:1311.1829.
- [16] CMS Collaboration, “Search for the standard model Higgs boson produced through vector boson fusion and decaying to $b\bar{b}$ ”, *Phys. Rev. D* **92** (2015) 032008, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.032008, arXiv:1506.01010.
- [17] ATLAS Collaboration, “Measurements of Higgs bosons decaying to bottom quarks from vector boson fusion production with the ATLAS experiment at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81** (2021) 537, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-021-09192-8, arXiv:2011.08280.
- [18] HEPData record for this analysis, 2023. doi:10.17182/hepdata.142036.
- [19] CMS Collaboration, “The CMS trigger system”, *JINST* **12** (2017) P01020, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/12/01/P01020, arXiv:1609.02366.
- [20] CMS Collaboration, “The CMS high level trigger”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **46** (2006) 605, doi:10.1140/epjc/s2006-02495-8, arXiv:hep-ex/0512077.
- [21] CMS Collaboration, “The CMS experiment at the CERN LHC”, *JINST* **3** (2008) S08004, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08004.
- [22] CMS Collaboration, “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.
- [23] 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.
- [24] 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.
- [25] 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.
- [26] CMS Collaboration, “Identification of b-quark jets with the CMS experiment”, *JINST* **8** (2013) P04013, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/8/04/P04013, arXiv:1211.4462.
- [27] CMS Collaboration, “Identification of heavy-flavour jets with the CMS detector in pp collisions at 13 TeV”, *JINST* **13** (2018) P05011, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/13/05/P05011, arXiv:1712.07158.
- [28] E. Bols et al., “Jet flavour classification using DEEPJET”, *JINST* **15** (2020) P12012, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/15/12/P12012, arXiv:2008.10519.
- [29] CMS Collaboration, “Performance of the DeepJet b tagging algorithm using 41.9 fb^{-1} of data from proton-proton collisions at 13 TeV with Phase 1 CMS detector”, CMS Detector Performance Note CMS-DP-2018-058, 2018.
- [30] 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.

-
- [31] 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.
- [32] 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.
- [33] P. Nason and C. Oleari, “NLO Higgs boson production via vector-boson fusion matched with shower in POWHEG”, *JHEP* **02** (2010) 037, doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2010)037, arXiv:0911.5299.
- [34] B. Cabouat and T. Sjöstrand, “Some dipole shower studies”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **78** (2018) 226, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-018-5645-z, arXiv:1710.00391.
- [35] J. Bellm et al., “HERWIG 7.0/HERWIG++3.0 release note”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76** (2016) 196, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-4018-8, arXiv:1512.01178.
- [36] G. Luisoni, P. Nason, C. Oleari, and F. Tramontano, “ $HW^\pm/HZ+0$ and 1 jet at NLO with the POWHEG box interfaced to GoSam and their merging within MiNLO”, *JHEP* **10** (2013) 083, doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2013)083, arXiv:1306.2542.
- [37] K. Hamilton, P. Nason, C. Oleari, and G. Zanderighi, “Merging H/W/Z+0 and 1 jet at NLO with no merging scale: A path to parton shower + NNLO matching”, *JHEP* **05** (2013) 082, doi:10.1007/JHEP05(2013)082, arXiv:1212.4504.
- [38] E. Bagnaschi, G. Degrossi, P. Slavich, and A. Vicini, “Higgs production via gluon fusion in the POWHEG approach in the SM and in the MSSM”, *JHEP* **02** (2012) 088, doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2012)088, arXiv:1111.2854.
- [39] R. Frederix and S. Frixione, “Merging meets matching in mc@nlo”, *JHEP* **12** (2012) 061, doi:10.1007/JHEP12(2012)061, arXiv:1209.6215.
- [40] J. Alwall et al., “The automated computation of tree-level and next-to-leading order differential cross sections, and their matching to parton shower simulations”, *JHEP* **07** (2014) 079, doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2014)079, arXiv:1405.0301.
- [41] M. L. Mangano, M. Moretti, F. Piccinini, and M. Treccani, “Matching matrix elements and shower evolution for top-quark production in hadronic collisions”, *JHEP* **01** (2007) 013, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2007/01/013, arXiv:hep-ph/0611129.
- [42] 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.
- [43] T. Sjöstrand et al., “An introduction to PYTHIA8.2”, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **191** (2015) 159, doi:10.1016/j.cpc.2015.01.024, arXiv:1410.3012.
- [44] CMS Collaboration, “Extraction and validation of a new set of CMS PYTHIA8 tunes from underlying-event measurements”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80** (2020) 4, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-019-7499-4, arXiv:1903.12179.
- [45] NNPDF Collaboration, “Parton distributions for the LHC Run II”, *JHEP* **04** (2015) 040, doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2015)040, arXiv:1410.8849.




















- [46] NNPDF Collaboration, “Parton distributions from high-precision collider data”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77** (2017) 663, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-5199-5, arXiv:1706.00428.
- [47] GEANT4 Collaboration, “GEANT4—a simulation toolkit”, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **506** (2003) 250, doi:10.1016/S0168-9002(03)01368-8.
- [48] CMS Collaboration, “Pileup mitigation at CMS in 13 TeV data”, *JINST* **15** (2020) P09018, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/15/09/P09018, arXiv:2003.00503.
- [49] CMS Collaboration, “A deep neural network for simultaneous estimation of b jet energy and resolution”, *Comput. Softw. Big Sci.* **4** (2020) 10, doi:10.1007/s41781-020-00041-z, arXiv:1912.06046.
- [50] M. J. Oreglia, “A study of the reactions $\psi' \rightarrow \gamma\gamma\psi$ ”. PhD thesis, Stanford University, 1980. SLAC Report SLAC-R-236.
- [51] P. Speckmayer, A. Hocker, J. Stelzer, and H. Voss, “The toolkit for multivariate data analysis, TMVA 4”, *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **219** (2010) 032057, doi:10.1088/1742-6596/219/3/032057.
- [52] CMS Collaboration, “Performance of quark/gluon discrimination in 8 TeV pp data”, CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-JME-13-002, 2013.
- [53] CMS Collaboration, “Jet algorithms performance in 13 TeV data”, CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-JME-16-003, CERN, 2017.
- [54] ATLAS and CMS Collaborations, and LHC Higgs Combination Group, “Procedure for the LHC Higgs boson search combination in Summer 2011”, Technical Report CMS-NOTE-2011-005, ATL-PHYS-PUB-2011-11, 2011.
- [55] R. A. Fisher, “On the interpretation of χ^2 from contingency tables, and the calculation of P”, *J. R. Stat. Soc.* **85** (1922) 87, doi:10.2307/2340521.
- [56] 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.
- [57] CMS Collaboration, “Precision luminosity measurement in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV in 2015 and 2016 at CMS”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81** (2021) 800, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-021-09538-2, arXiv:2104.01927.
- [58] CMS Collaboration, “CMS luminosity measurement for the 2018 data-taking period at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV”, CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-LUM-18-002, 2019.
- [59] CMS Collaboration, “Measurement of the inelastic proton-proton cross section at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ tev”, *JHEP* **07** (2018) 161, doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2018)161, arXiv:1802.02613.
- [60] CMS Collaboration, “Precise determination of the mass of the Higgs boson and tests of compatibility of its couplings with the standard model predictions using proton collisions at 7 and 8 TeV”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **75** (2015) 212, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-015-3351-7, arXiv:1412.8662.
- [61] E. Gross and O. Vitells, “Trial factors for the look elsewhere effect in high energy physics”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **70** (2010) 525, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-010-1470-8, arXiv:1005.1891.

A The CMS Collaboration

Yerevan Physics Institute, Yerevan, Armenia

A. Hayrapetyan, A. Tumasyan¹ 

Institut für Hochenergiephysik, Vienna, Austria

W. Adam , J.W. Andrejkovic, T. Bergauer , S. Chatterjee , K. Damanakis , M. Dragicevic , A. Escalante Del Valle , P.S. Hussain , M. Jeitler² , N. Krammer , L. Lechner , D. Liko , I. Mikulec , J. Schieck² , R. Schöfbeck , D. Schwarz , M. Sonawane , S. Templ , W. Waltenberger , C.-E. Wulz² 















Universiteit Antwerpen, Antwerpen, Belgium

M.R. Darwish³ , T. Janssen , T. Kello⁴, P. Van Mechelen 








Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussel, Belgium

E.S. Bols , J. D'Hondt , S. Dansana , A. De Moor , M. Delcourt , H. El Faham , S. Lowette , I. Makarenko , A. Morton , D. Müller , A.R. Sahasransu , S. Tavernier , M. Tytgat⁵ , S. Van Putte , D. Vannerom 

Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium

B. Clerbaux , G. De Lentdecker , L. Favart , D. Hohov , J. Jaramillo , A. Khalilzadeh, K. Lee , M. Mahdavihorrami , A. Malara , S. Paredes , L. Pétré , N. Postiau, L. Thomas , M. Vanden Bemden , C. Vander Velde , P. Vanlaer 






Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

M. De Coen , D. Dobur , J. Knolle , L. Lambrecht , G. Mestdach, C. Rendón, A. Samalan, K. Skovpen , N. Van Den Bossche , B. Vermassen, L. Wezenbeek 




















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

A. Benecke , G. Bruno , F. Bury , C. Caputo , C. Delaere , I.S. Donertas , A. Giammanco , K. Jaffel , Sa. Jain , V. Lemaître, J. Lidrych , P. Mastrapasqua , K. Mondal , T.T. Tran , S. Wertz 

Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Físicas, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

G.A. Alves , E. Coelho , C. Hensel , A. Moraes , P. Rebello Teles 

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

W.L. Aldá Júnior , M. Alves Gallo Pereira , M. Barroso Ferreira Filho , H. Brandao Malbouisson , W. Carvalho , J. Chinellato⁶, E.M. Da Costa , G.G. Da Silveira⁷ , D. De Jesus Damiao , S. Fonseca De Souza , J. Martins⁸ , C. Mora Herrera , K. Mota Amarilo , L. Mundim , H. Nogima , A. Santoro , S.M. Silva Do Amaral , A. Sznajder , M. Thiel , A. Vilela Pereira 

Universidade Estadual Paulista, Universidade Federal do ABC, São Paulo, Brazil

C.A. Bernardes⁷ , L. Calligaris , T.R. Fernandez Perez Tomei , E.M. Gregores , P.G. Mercadante , S.F. Novaes , B. Orzari , Sandra S. Padula 

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

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





University of Sofia, Sofia, Bulgaria

A. Dimitrov , T. Ivanov , L. Litov , B. Pavlov , P. Petkov , A. Petrov , E. Shumka 

Instituto De Alta Investigación, Universidad de Tarapacá, Casilla 7 D, Arica, Chile

S. Keshri , S. Thakur 

Beihang University, Beijing, China

T. Cheng , Q. Guo, T. Javaid , M. Mittal , L. Yuan 

Department of Physics, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China

G. Bauer⁹, Z. Hu , K. Yi^{9,10} 

Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing, China

G.M. Chen¹¹ , H.S. Chen¹¹ , M. Chen¹¹ , F. Iemmi , C.H. Jiang, A. Kapoor , H. Liao , Z.-A. Liu¹² , F. Monti , R. Sharma , J.N. Song¹², J. Tao , J. Wang , H. Zhang 


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

A. Agapitos , Y. Ban , A. Levin , C. Li , Q. Li , X. Lyu, Y. Mao, S.J. Qian , X. Sun , D. Wang , H. Yang

Sun Yat-Sen University, Guangzhou, China

M. Lu , Z. You 

University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, China

N. Lu 

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

X. Gao⁴ , D. Leggat, H. Okawa , Y. Zhang 





Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, Zhejiang, China

Z. Lin , C. Lu , M. Xiao 





Universidad de Los Andes, Bogota, Colombia

C. Avila , D.A. Barbosa Trujillo, A. Cabrera , C. Florez , J. Fraga , J.A. Reyes Vega

Universidad de Antioquia, Medellin, Colombia

J. Mejia Guisao , F. Ramirez , M. Rodriguez , J.D. Ruiz Alvarez 

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

D. Giljanovic , N. Godinovic , D. Lelas , A. Sculac 









University of Split, Faculty of Science, Split, Croatia

M. Kovac , T. Sculac 




Institute Rudjer Boskovic, Zagreb, Croatia

P. Bargassa , V. Brigljevic , B.K. Chitroda , D. Ferencek , S. Mishra , A. Starodumov¹³ , T. Susa 

University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus

A. Attikis , K. Christoforou , S. Konstantinou , J. Mousa , C. Nicolaou, F. Ptochos , P.A. Razis , H. Rykaczewski, H. Saka , A. Stepennov 

Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

M. Finger , M. Finger Jr. , A. Kveton 

Escuela Politecnica Nacional, Quito, Ecuador

E. Ayala 



Universidad San Francisco de Quito, Quito, Ecuador

E. Carrera Jarrin 









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

H. Abdalla¹⁴ , Y. Assran^{15,16}

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

M. Abdullah Al-Mashad , M.A. Mahmoud 

















National Institute of Chemical Physics and Biophysics, Tallinn, Estonia

K. Ehataht , M. Kadastik, T. Lange , S. Nandan , C. Nielsen , J. Pata , M. Raidal , L. Tani , C. Veelken 

Department of Physics, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

H. Kirschenmann , K. Osterberg , M. Voutilainen 
















Helsinki Institute of Physics, Helsinki, Finland

S. Bharthuar , E. Brücken , F. Garcia , J. Havukainen , K.T.S. Kallonen , M.S. Kim , R. Kinnunen, T. Lampén , K. Lassila-Perini , S. Lehti , T. Lindén , M. Lotti, L. Martikainen , M. Myllymäki , M.m. Rantanen , H. Siikonen , E. Tuominen , J. Tuominiemi 





























Lappeenranta-Lahti University of Technology, Lappeenranta, Finland

P. Luukka , H. Petrow , 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 , P. Gras , G. Hamel de Monchenault , V. Lohezic , J. Malcles , J. Rander, A. Rosowsky , M.Ö. Sahin , A. Savoy-Navarro¹⁷ , P. Simkina , M. Titov 


















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

C. Baldenegro Barrera , F. Beaudette , A. Buchot Perraguin , P. Busson , A. Cappati , C. Charlot , F. Damas , O. Davignon , B. Diab , G. Falmagne , B.A. Fontana Santos Alves , S. Ghosh , R. Granier de Cassagnac , A. Hakimi , B. Harikrishnan , G. Liu , J. Motta , M. Nguyen , C. Ochando , L. Portales , R. Salerno , U. Sarkar , J.B. Sauvan , Y. Sirois , A. Tarabini , E. Vernazza , A. Zabi , A. Zghiche 




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

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

Institut de Physique des 2 Infinis de Lyon (IP2I), Villeurbanne, France

S. Beauceron , B. Blancon , G. Boudoul , N. Chanon , J. Choi , D. Contardo , P. Depasse , C. Dozen¹⁹ , H. El Mamouni, J. Fay , S. Gascon , M. Gouzevitch , C. Greenberg, G. Grenier , B. Ille , I.B. Laktineh, M. Lethuillier , L. Mirabito, S. Perries, M. Vander Donckt , P. Verdier , J. Xiao 

Georgian Technical University, Tbilisi, Georgia




















A. Khvedelidze¹³ , I. Lomidze , Z. Tsamalaidze¹³ 

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

V. Botta , L. Feld , K. Klein , M. Lipinski , D. Meuser , A. Pauls , N. Röwert , M. Teroerde 

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



































































S. Diekmann , A. Dodonova , N. Eich , D. Eliseev , M. Erdmann , P. Fackeldey 

B. Fischer , T. Hebbeker , K. Hoepfner , F. Ivone , M.y. Lee , L. Mastrolorenzo, M. Merschmeyer , A. Meyer , S. Mondal , S. Mukherjee , D. Noll , A. Novak , F. Nowotny, A. Pozdnyakov , Y. Rath, W. Redjeb , F. Rehm, H. Reithler , A. Schmidt , S.C. Schuler, A. Sharma , A. Stein , F. Torres Da Silva De Araujo²⁰ , L. Vigilante, S. Wiedenbeck , S. Zaleski











































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

C. Dziwok , G. Flügge , W. Haj Ahmad²¹ , T. Kress , A. Nowack , O. Pooth , A. Stahl , T. Ziemons , A. Zotz 






























Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Hamburg, Germany

H. Aarup Petersen , M. Aldaya Martin , J. Alimena , S. Amoroso, Y. An , S. Baxter , M. Bayatmakou , H. Becerril Gonzalez , O. Behnke , S. Bhattacharya , F. Blekman²² , K. Borras²³ , D. Brunner , A. Campbell , A. Cardini , C. Cheng, F. Colombina , S. Consuegra Rodríguez , G. Correia Silva , M. De Silva , G. Eckerlin, D. Eckstein , L.I. Estevez Banos , O. Filatov , E. Gallo²² , A. Geiser , A. Giraldi , G. Greau, V. Guglielmi , M. Guthoff , A. Jafari²⁴ , N.Z. Jomhari , B. Kaech , M. Kasemann , H. Kaveh , C. Kleinwort , R. Kogler , M. Komm , D. Krücker , W. Lange, D. Leyva Pernia , K. Lipka²⁵ , W. Lohmann²⁶ , R. Mankel , I.-A. Melzer-Pellmann , M. Mendizabal Morentin , J. Metwally, A.B. Meyer , G. Milella , M. Mormile , A. Mussgiller , A. Nürnberg , Y. Otariid, D. Pérez Adán , E. Ranken , A. Raspereza , B. Ribeiro Lopes , J. Rübenach, A. Saggio , M. Scham^{27,23} , V. Scheurer, S. Schnake²³ , P. Schütze , C. Schwanenberger²² , M. Shchedrolosiev , R.E. Sosa Ricardo , L.P. Sreelatha Pramod , D. Stafford, F. Vazzoler , A. Ventura Barroso , R. Walsh , Q. Wang , Y. Wen , K. Wichmann, L. Wiens²³ , C. Wissing , S. Wuchterl , Y. Yang , A. Zimmermann Castro Santos 

University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany

A. Albrecht , S. Albrecht , M. Antonello , S. Bein , L. Benato , M. Bonanomi , P. Connor , K. De Leo , M. Eich, K. El Morabit , Y. Fischer , A. Fröhlich, C. Garbers , E. Garutti , A. Grohsjean , M. Hajheidari, J. Haller , A. Hinzmann , H.R. Jabusch , G. Kasieczka , P. Keicher, R. Klanner , W. Korcari , T. Kramer , V. Kutzner , F. Labe , J. Lange , A. Lobanov , C. Matthies , A. Mehta , L. Moureaux , M. Mrowietz, A. Nigamova , Y. Nissan, A. Paasch , K.J. Pena Rodriguez , T. Quadfasel , B. Raciti , M. Rieger , D. Savoiu , J. Schindler , P. Schleper , M. Schröder , J. Schwandt , M. Sommerhalder , H. Stadie , G. Steinbrück , A. Tews, M. Wolf 

Karlsruher Institut fuer Technologie, Karlsruhe, Germany

S. Brommer , M. Burkart, E. Butz , T. Chwalek , A. Dierlamm , A. Droll, N. Faltermann , M. Giffels , A. Gottmann , F. Hartmann²⁸ , M. Horzela , U. Husemann , M. Klute , R. Koppenhöfer , M. Link, A. Lintuluoto , S. Maier , S. Mitra , Th. Müller , M. Neukum, M. Oh , G. Quast , K. Rabbertz , I. Shvetsov , H.J. Simonis , N. Trevisani , R. Ulrich , J. van der Linden , R.F. Von Cube , M. Wassmer , S. Wieland , R. Wolf , S. Wunsch, X. Zuo 




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

G. Anagnostou, P. Assiouras , G. Daskalakis , A. Kyriakis, A. Stakia 


National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece

D. Karasavvas, P. Kontaxakis , G. Melachroinos, A. Panagiotou, I. Papavergou , I. Paraskevas , N. Saoulidou , K. Theofilatos , E. Tziaferi , K. Vellidis , I. Zisopoulos 

National Technical University of Athens, Athens, Greece

G. Bakas , T. Chatzistavrou, G. Karapostoli , K. Kousouris , I. Papakrivopoulos , E. Siamarkou, G. Tsipolitis, A. Zacharopoulou






University of Ioánnina, Ioánnina, Greece

K. Adamidis, I. Bestintzanos, I. Evangelou , C. Foudas, P. Gianneios , C. Kamtsikis, P. Katsoulis, P. Kokkas , P.G. Kosmoglou Kioseoglou , N. Manthos , I. Papadopoulos , J. Strologas 

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

M. Csanád , K. Farkas , M.M.A. Gadallah²⁹ , Á. Kadlecik , P. Major , K. Mandal , G. Pásztor , A.J. Rádl³⁰ , O. Surányi , G.I. Veres 



Wigner Research Centre for Physics, Budapest, Hungary

M. Bartók³¹ , C. Hajdu , D. Horvath^{32,33} , F. Sikler , V. Veszpremi 




Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary

G. Bencze, S. Czellar, J. Karancsi³¹ , J. Molnar, Z. Szillasi

















Institute of Physics, University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary

P. Raics, B. Ujvari³⁴ , G. Zilizi 

Karoly Robert Campus, MATE Institute of Technology, Gyongyos, Hungary

T. Csorgo³⁰ , F. Nemes³⁰ , T. Novak 







Panjab University, Chandigarh, India

J. Babbar , S. Bansal , S.B. Beri, V. Bhatnagar , G. Chaudhary , S. Chauhan , N. Dhingra³⁵ , R. Gupta, A. Kaur , A. Kaur , H. Kaur , M. Kaur , S. Kumar , P. Kumari , M. Meena , K. Sandeep , T. Sheokand, J.B. Singh³⁶ , A. Singla 

















University of Delhi, Delhi, India

A. Ahmed , A. Bhardwaj , A. Chhetri , B.C. Choudhary , A. Kumar , M. Naimuddin , K. Ranjan , S. Saumya 



Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, HBNI, Kolkata, India

S. Baradia , S. Barman³⁷ , S. Bhattacharya , D. Bhowmik, S. Dutta , S. Dutta, B. Gomber³⁸ , P. Palit , G. Saha , B. Sahu³⁸ , S. Sarkar

Indian Institute of Technology Madras, Madras, India

P.K. Behera , S.C. Behera , S. Chatterjee , P. Jana , P. Kalbhor , J.R. Komaragiri³⁹ , D. Kumar³⁹ , M. Mohammad Mobassir Ameen , A. Muhammad , L. Panwar³⁹ , R. Pradhan , P.R. Pujahari , N.R. Saha , A. Sharma , A.K. Sikdar , S. Verma 













Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-A, Mumbai, India

T. Aziz, I. Das , S. Dugad, M. Kumar , G.B. Mohanty , P. Suryadevara

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-B, Mumbai, India

A. Bala , S. Banerjee , M. Guchait , S. Karmakar , S. Kumar , G. Majumder , K. Mazumdar , S. Mukherjee , A. Thachayath 




National Institute of Science Education and Research, An OCC of Homi Bhabha National Institute, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India

S. Bahinipati⁴⁰ , A.K. Das, C. Kar , D. Maity⁴¹ , P. Mal , T. Mishra , V.K. Muraleedharan Nair Bindhu⁴¹ , K. Naskar⁴¹ , A. Nayak⁴¹ , P. Sadangi, P. Saha , S.K. Swain , S. Varghese⁴¹ , D. Vats⁴¹ 

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

A. Alpana , S. Dube , B. Kansal , A. Laha , S. Pandey , A. Rastogi , S. Sharma 

Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, Iran

H. Bakhshiansohi^{42,43} , E. Khazaie⁴³ , M. Zeinali⁴⁴ 































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

S. Chenarani⁴⁵ , S.M. Etesami , M. Khakzad , M. Mohammadi Najafabadi 




























University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland

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,46} , A. Colaleo^a , D. Creanza^{a,c} , B. D' Anzi^{a,b} , N. De Filippis^{a,c} , M. De Palma^{a,b} , A. Di Florio^{a,b} , W. Elmetenawee^{a,b} , L. Fiore^a , G. Iaselli^{a,c} , G. Maggi^{a,c} , M. Maggi^a , I. Margjeka^{a,b} , V. Mastrapasqua^{a,b} , S. My^{a,b} , S. Nuzzo^{a,b} , A. Pellecchia^{a,b} , A. Pompili^{a,b} , G. Pugliese^{a,c} , R. Radogna^a , D. Ramos^a , A. Ranieri^a , L. Silvestris^a , F.M. Simone^{a,b} , Ü. Sözbilir^a , A. Stamerra^a , R. Venditti^a , P. Verwilligen^a , A. Zaza^{a,b} 

















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 , R. Campanini^{a,b} , P. Capiluppi^{a,b} , A. Castro^{a,b} , F.R. Cavallo^a , M. Cuffiani^{a,b} , G.M. Dallavalle^a , T. Diotallevi^{a,b} , F. Fabbri^a , A. Fanfani^{a,b} , D. Fasanella^{a,b} , P. Giacomelli^a , L. Giommi^{a,b} , C. Grandi^a , L. Guiducci^{a,b} , S. Lo Meo^{a,47} , L. Lunerti^{a,b} , S. Marcellini^a , G. Masetti^a , F.L. Navarria^{a,b} , F. Primavera^{a,b} , A.M. Rossi^{a,b} , T. Rovelli^{a,b} , G.P. Siroli^{a,b} 

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

S. Costa^{a,b,48} , A. Di Mattia^a , R. Potenza^{a,b} , A. Tricomi^{a,b,48} , C. Tuve^{a,b} 

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

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

























INFN Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, Frascati, Italy

L. Benussi , S. Bianco , S. Meola⁴⁹ , D. Piccolo 











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

P. Chatagnon^a , F. Ferro^a , E. Robutti^a , S. Tosi^{a,b} 



























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

A. Benaglia^a , G. Boldrini^a , F. Brivio^{a,b} , F. Cetorelli^{a,b} , 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.T. Lucchini^{a,b} , M. Malberti^a , S. Malvezzi^a , A. Massironi^a , D. Menasce^a , L. Moroni^a , M. Paganoni^{a,b} , D. Pedrini^a , B.S. Pinolini^a , S. Ragazzi^{a,b} , N. Redaelli^a , T. Tabarelli de Fatis^{a,b} , D. Zuolo^{a,b} 












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

S. Buontempo^a , A. Cagnotta^{a,b} , F. Carnevali^{a,b} , N. Cavallo^{a,c} , A. De Iorio^{a,b} , F. Fabozzi^{a,c} , A.O.M. Iorio^{a,b} , L. Lista^{a,b,50} , P. Paolucci^{a,28} , B. Rossi^a , C. Sciacca^{a,b} 
















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

R. Ardino^a , P. Azzi^a , N. Bacchetta^{a,51} , D. Bisello^{a,b} , P. Bortignon^a , A. Bragagnolo^{a,b} , R. Carlin^{a,b} , P. Checchia^a , T. Dorigo^a , F. Gasparini^{a,b} , U. Gasparini^{a,b} , G. Grosso^a, L. Layer^{a,52}, E. Lusiani^a , M. Margoni^{a,b} , M. Migliorini^{a,b} , M. Passaseo^a , J. Pazzini^{a,b} , P. Ronchese^{a,b} , R. Rossin^{a,b} , M. Sgaravatto^a , F. Simonetto^{a,b} , G. Strong^a , M. Tosi^{a,b} , A. Triossi^{a,b} , S. Ventura^a , H. Yarar^{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

S. Abu Zeid^{a,53} , C. Aimè^{a,b} , A. Braghieri^a , S. Calzaferri^{a,b} , D. Fiorina^{a,b} , P. Montagna^{a,b} , V. Re^a , C. Riccardi^{a,b} , P. Salvini^a , I. Vai^{a,b} , P. Vitulo^{a,b} 





















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

S. Ajmal^{a,b} , P. Asenov^{a,54} , G.M. Bilei^a , D. Ciangottini^{a,b} , L. Fanò^{a,b} , M. Magherini^{a,b} , G. Mantovani^{a,b}, V. Mariani^{a,b} , M. Menichelli^a , F. Moscatelli^{a,54} , A. Piccinelli^{a,b} , M. Presilla^{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

P. Azzurri^a , G. Bagliesi^a , R. Bhattacharya^a , L. Bianchini^{a,b} , T. Boccali^a , E. Bossini^{a,b} , D. Bruschini^{a,c} , R. Castaldi^a , M.A. Ciocci^{a,b} , V. D'Amante^{a,d} , R. Dell'Orso^a , S. Donato^a , A. Giassi^a , F. Ligabue^{a,c} , D. Matos Figueiredo^a , A. Messineo^{a,b} , M. Musich^{a,b} , F. Palla^a , S. Parolia^a , G. Ramirez-Sanchez^{a,c} , A. Rizzi^{a,b} , G. Rolandi^{a,c} , S. Roy Chowdhury^a , T. Sarkar^a , A. Scribano^a , 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, Roma, Italy

P. Barria^a , M. Campana^{a,b} , F. Cavallari^a , L. Cunqueiro Mendez^{a,b} , D. Del Re^{a,b} , E. Di Marco^a , M. Diemoz^a , F. Errico^{a,b} , E. Longo^{a,b} , P. Meridiani^a , J. Mijuskovic^{a,b} , 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 , 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 , N. Cartiglia^a , M. Costa^{a,b} , R. Covarelli^{a,b} , N. Demaria^a , L. Finco^a , M. Grippo^{a,b} , B. Kiani^{a,b} , F. Legger^a , F. Luongo^{a,b} , C. Mariotti^a , S. Maselli^a , A. Mecca^{a,b} , E. Migliore^{a,b} , M. Monteno^a , R. Mulargia^a , M.M. Obertino^{a,b} , G. Ortona^a , L. Pacher^{a,b} , N. Pastrone^a , M. Pelliccioni^a , M. Ruspà^{a,c} , K. Shchelina^a , F. Siviero^{a,b} , V. Sola^{a,b} , A. Solano^{a,b} , D. Soldi^{a,b} , A. Staiano^a , C. Tarricone^{a,b} , M. Tornago^{a,b} , D. Trocino^a , G. Umoret^{a,b} , A. Vagnerini^{a,b} , E. Vlasov^{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 , G. Della Ricca^{a,b} , G. Sorrentino^{a,b} 

Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea

S. Dogra , C. Huh , B. Kim , D.H. Kim , J. Kim , J. Lee , S.W. Lee , C.S. Moon , Y.D. Oh , S.I. Pak , M.S. Ryu , S. Sekmen , Y.C. Yang 





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

G. Bak , P. Gwak , H. Kim , D.H. Moon 

Hanyang University, Seoul, Korea

E. Asilar , D. Kim , T.J. Kim , J. Park 

Korea University, Seoul, Korea

S. Choi , S. Han, B. Hong , K. Lee, K.S. Lee , J. Park, S.K. Park, J. Yoo 

Kyung Hee University, Department of Physics, Seoul, Korea

J. Goh 

Sejong University, Seoul, Korea

H. S. Kim , Y. Kim, S. Lee

Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea

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

University of Seoul, Seoul, Korea

W. Jang , D.Y. Kang, Y. Kang , S. Kim , B. Ko, J.S.H. Lee , Y. Lee , J.A. Merlin, I.C. Park , Y. Roh, I.J. Watson , S. Yang 


Yonsei University, Department of Physics, Seoul, Korea

S. Ha , H.D. Yoo 

Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon, Korea

M. Choi , M.R. Kim , H. Lee, Y. Lee , I. Yu 


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

T. Beyrouthy, Y. Maghrbi 

Riga Technical University, Riga, Latvia

K. Dreimanis , A. Gaile , G. Pikurs, A. Potrebko , M. Seidel , V. Veckalns⁵⁵ 

University of Latvia (LU), Riga, Latvia

N.R. Strautnieks 






Vilnius University, Vilnius, Lithuania

M. Ambrozas , A. Juodagalvis , A. Rinkevicius , G. Tamulaitis 








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

N. Bin Norjoharuddeen , I. Yusuff⁵⁶ , Z. Zolkapli

Universidad de Sonora (UNISON), Hermosillo, Mexico









































































J.F. Benitez , A. Castaneda Hernandez , H.A. Encinas Acosta, L.G. Gallegos Maríñez, M. León Coello , J.A. Murillo Quijada , A. Sehrawat , L. Valencia Palomo 

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

G. Ayala , H. Castilla-Valdez , E. De La Cruz-Burelo , I. Heredia-De La Cruz⁵⁷ , R. Lopez-Fernandez , C.A. Mondragon Herrera, D.A. Perez Navarro , A. Sánchez Hernández 




Universidad Iberoamericana, Mexico City, Mexico

C. Oropeza Barrera , M. Ramírez García 

Benemerita Universidad Autonoma de Puebla, Puebla, MexicoI. Bautista , I. Pedraza , H.A. Salazar Ibarguen , C. Uribe Estrada **University of Montenegro, Podgorica, Montenegro**I. Bubanja, N. Raicevic **University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand**P.H. Butler **National Centre for Physics, Quaid-I-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan**A. Ahmad , M.I. Asghar, A. Awais , M.I.M. Awan, H.R. Hoorani , W.A. Khan **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 , M. Górski , M. Kazana , M. Szeleper , P. Zalewski **Institute of Experimental Physics, Faculty of Physics, University of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland**K. Bunkowski , K. Doroba , A. Kalinowski , M. Konecki , J. Krolikowski **Laboratório de Instrumentação e Física Experimental de Partículas, Lisboa, Portugal**M. Araujo , D. Bastos , C. Beirão Da Cruz E Silva , A. Boletti , M. Bozzo , P. Faccioli , M. Gallinaro , J. Hollar , N. Leonardo , T. Niknejad , M. Pisano , J. Seixas , J. Varela **Faculty of Physics, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia**P. Adzic , P. Milenovic **VINCA Institute of Nuclear Sciences, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia**M. Dordevic , J. Milosevic , V. Rekovic**Centro de Investigaciones Energéticas Medioambientales y Tecnológicas (CIEMAT), Madrid, Spain**M. Aguilar-Benitez, J. Alcaraz Maestre , M. Barrio Luna, Cristina F. Bedoya , M. Cepeda , M. Cerrada , N. Colino , B. De La Cruz , A. Delgado Peris , D. Fernández Del Val , J.P. Fernández Ramos , J. Flix , M.C. Fouz , O. Gonzalez Lopez , S. Goy Lopez , J.M. Hernandez , M.I. Josa , J. León Holgado , D. Moran , Á. Navarro Tobar , C. Perez Dengra , A. Pérez-Calero Yzquierdo , J. Puerta Pelayo , I. Redondo , D.D. Redondo Ferrero , L. Romero, S. Sánchez Navas , L. Urda Gómez , J. Vazquez Escobar , C. Willmott**Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain**J.F. de Trocóniz **Universidad de Oviedo, Instituto Universitario de Ciencias y Tecnologías Espaciales de Asturias (ICTEA), Oviedo, Spain**B. Alvarez Gonzalez , J. Cuevas , J. Fernandez Menendez , S. Folgueras , I. Gonzalez Caballero , J.R. González Fernández , E. Palencia Cortezon , C. Ramón Álvarez , V. Rodríguez Bouza , A. Soto Rodríguez , A. Trapote , C. Vico Villalba , P. Vischia **Instituto de Física de Cantabria (IFCA), CSIC-Universidad de Cantabria, Santander, Spain**S. Bhowmik , S. Blanco Fernández , J.A. Brochero Cifuentes , I.J. Cabrillo , A. Calderon , J. Duarte Campderros , M. Fernandez , C. Fernandez Madrazo , G. Gomez , C. Lasiosa García , C. Martinez Rivero , P. Martinez Ruiz del Arbol 

F. Matorras , P. Matorras Cuevas , E. Navarrete Ramos, J. Piedra Gomez , C. Prieels, L. Scodellaro , I. Vila , J.M. Vizan Garcia 





























































University of Colombo, Colombo, Sri Lanka

M.K. Jayananda , B. Kailasapathy⁵⁸ , D.U.J. Sonnadara , D.D.C. 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

D. Abbaneo , E. Auffray , G. Auzinger , J. Baechler, D. Barney , A. Bermúdez Martínez , M. Bianco , B. Bilin , A.A. Bin Anuar , A. Bocci , E. Brondolin , C. Caillol , T. Camporesi , G. Cerminara , N. Chernyavskaya , M. Cipriani , D. d'Enterria , A. Dabrowski , A. David , A. De Roeck , M.M. Defranchis , M. Deile , M. Dobson , F. Fallavollita⁵⁹, L. Forthomme , G. Franzoni , W. Funk , S. Giani, D. Gigi, K. Gill , F. Glege , L. Gouskos , M. Haranko , J. Hegeman , T. James , J. Kieseler , N. Kratochwil , S. Laurila , P. Lecoq , E. Leutgeb , C. Lourenço , B. Maier , L. Malgeri , M. Mannelli , A.C. Marini , F. Meijers , S. Mersi , E. Meschi , V. Milosevic , F. Moortgat , M. Mulders , S. Orfanelli, F. Pantaleo , M. Peruzzi , A. Petrilli , G. Petrucciani , A. Pfeiffer , M. Pierini , D. Piparo , H. Qu , D. Rabady , G. Reales Gutiérrez, M. Rovere , H. Sakulin , S. Scarfi , M. Selvaggi , A. Sharma , P. Silva , P. Sphicas⁶⁰ , A.G. Stahl Leitner , A. Steen , S. Summers , D. Treille , P. Tropea , A. Tsirou, D. Walter , J. Wanczyk⁶¹ , K.A. Wozniak , P. Zehetner , P. Zejdl , W.D. Zeuner
























Paul Scherrer Institut, Villigen, Switzerland

T. Bevilacqua⁶² , L. Caminada⁶² , A. Ebrahimi , W. Erdmann , R. Horisberger , Q. Ingram , H.C. Kaestli , D. Kotlinski , C. Lange , M. Missiroli⁶² , L. Noehte⁶² , T. Rohe 




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

T.K. Aarrestad , K. Androsov⁶¹ , M. Backhaus , A. Calandri , K. Datta , A. De Cosa , G. Dissertori , M. Dittmar, M. Donegà , F. Eble , M. Galli , K. Gedia , F. Glessgen , C. Grab , D. Hits , W. Lustermann , A.-M. Lyon , R.A. Manzoni , L. Marchese , C. Martin Perez , A. Mascellani⁶¹ , F. Nessi-Tedaldi , F. Pauss , V. Perovic , S. Pigazzini , M.G. Ratti , M. Reichmann , C. Reissel , T. Reitenspiess , B. Ristic , F. Riti , D. Ruini, D.A. Sanz Becerra , R. Seidita , J. Steggemann⁶¹ , D. Valsecchi , R. Wallny 










Universität Zürich, Zurich, Switzerland

C. Amsler⁶³ , P. Bäertschi , C. Botta , D. Brzhechko, M.F. Canelli , K. Cormier , A. De Wit , R. Del Burgo, J.K. Heikkilä , M. Huwiler , W. Jin , A. Jofrehei , B. Kilminster , S. Leontsinis , S.P. Liechi , A. Macchiolo , P. Meiring , V.M. Mikuni , U. Molinatti , I. Neutelings , A. Reimers , P. Robmann, S. Sanchez Cruz , K. Schweiger , M. Senger , Y. Takahashi 

National Central University, Chung-Li, Taiwan

C. Adloff⁶⁴, C.M. Kuo, W. Lin, P.K. Rout , P.C. Tiwari³⁹ , S.S. Yu 




















National Taiwan University (NTU), Taipei, Taiwan

L. Ceard, Y. Chao , K.F. Chen , P.s. Chen, W.-S. Hou , Y.w. Kao, R. Khurana, G. Kole , Y.y. Li , R.-S. Lu , E. Paganis , A. Psallidas, J. Thomas-Wilsker , H.y. Wu, E. Yazgan 

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

C. Asawatangtrakuldee , N. Srimanobhas , V. Wachirapusanand 

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

D. Agyel , F. Boran , Z.S. Demiroglu , F. Dolek , I. Dumanoglu⁶⁵ , E. Eskut ,
Y. Guler⁶⁶ , E. Gurpinar Guler⁶⁶ , C. Isik , O. Kara, A. Kayis Topaksu , U. Kiminsu ,
G. Onengut , K. Ozdemir⁶⁷ , A. Polatoz , B. Tali⁶⁸ , U.G. Tok , S. Turkcapar ,
E. Uslan , I.S. Zorbakir 

Middle East Technical University, Physics Department, Ankara, Turkey

K. Ocalan⁶⁹ , M. Yalvac⁷⁰ 

Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey

B. Akgun , I.O. Atakisi , E. Gülmez , M. Kaya⁷¹ , O. Kaya⁷² , S. Tekten⁷³ 

Istanbul Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey

A. Cakir , K. Cankocak⁶⁵ , Y. Komurcu , S. Sen⁷⁴ 


Istanbul University, Istanbul, Turkey

O. Aydilek , S. Cerci⁶⁸ , V. Epshteyn , B. Hacisahinoglu , I. Hos⁷⁵ , B. Isildak⁷⁶ ,
B. Kaynak , S. Ozkorucuklu , H. Sert , C. Simsek , D. Sunar Cerci⁶⁸ , C. Zorbilmez 















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

A. Boyaryntsev , B. Grynyov 



















National Science Centre, Kharkiv Institute of Physics and Technology, Kharkiv, Ukraine

L. Levchuk 
































University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom

D. Anthony , J.J. Brooke , A. Bundock , E. Clement , D. Cussans , H. Flacher ,
M. Glowacki, J. Goldstein , H.F. Heath , L. Kreczko , B. Krikler , S. Paramesvaran ,
S. Seif El Nasr-Storey, V.J. Smith , N. Stylianou⁷⁷ , K. Walkingshaw Pass, R. White 




Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom

A.H. Ball, K.W. Bell , A. Belyaev⁷⁸ , C. Brew , R.M. Brown , D.J.A. Cockerill ,
C. Cooke , K.V. Ellis, K. Harder , S. Harper , M.-L. Holmberg⁷⁹ , Sh. Jain , J. Linacre ,
K. Manolopoulos, D.M. Newbold , E. Olaiya, D. Petyt , T. Reis , G. Salvi , T. Schuh,
C.H. Shepherd-Themistocleous , I.R. Tomalin , T. Williams 














Imperial College, London, United Kingdom

R. Bainbridge , P. Bloch , C.E. Brown , O. Buchmuller, V. Cacchio, C.A. Carrillo Montoya ,
V. Cepaitis , G.S. Chahal⁸⁰ , D. Colling , J.S. Dancu, P. Dauncey , G. Davies ,
J. Davies, M. Della Negra , S. Fayer, G. Fedi , G. Hall , M.H. Hassanshahi ,
A. Howard, G. Iles , J. Langford , L. Lyons , A.-M. Magnan , S. Malik, A. Martelli ,
M. Mieskolainen , J. Nash⁸¹ , M. Pesaresi, B.C. Radburn-Smith , A. Richards, A. Rose ,
C. Seez , R. Shukla , A. Tapper , K. Uchida , G.P. Uttley , L.H. Vage, T. Virdee²⁸ ,
M. Vojinovic , N. Wardle , D. Winterbottom 






Brunel University, Uxbridge, United Kingdom

K. Coldham, J.E. Cole , A. Khan, P. Kyberd , I.D. Reid 

Baylor University, Waco, Texas, USA

S. Abdullin , A. Brinkerhoff , B. Caraway , J. Dittmann , K. Hatakeyama , J. Hiltbrand ,
A.R. Kanuganti , B. McMaster , M. Saunders , S. Sawant , C. Sutantawibul ,
M. Toms , J. Wilson 
















Catholic University of America, Washington, DC, USA

R. Bartek , A. Dominguez , C. Huerta Escamilla, A.E. Simsek , R. Uniyal , A.M. Vargas Hernandez 

















The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Alabama, USA

R. Chudasama , S.I. Cooper , S.V. Gleyzer , C.U. Perez , P. Rumerio⁸² , E. Usai , C. West 




















Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts, USA

A. Akpinar , A. Albert , D. Arcaro , C. Cosby , Z. Demiragli , C. Erice , E. Fontanesi , D. Gastler , J. Rohlf , K. Salyer , D. Sperka , D. Spitzbart , I. Suarez , A. Tsatsos , S. Yuan 








Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island, USA

G. Benelli , X. Coubez²³, D. Cutts , M. Hadley , U. Heintz , J.M. Hogan⁸³ , T. Kwon , G. Landsberg , K.T. Lau , D. Li , J. Luo , M. Narain , N. Pervan , S. Sagir⁸⁴ , F. Simpson , W.Y. Wong, X. Yan , D. Yu , W. Zhang





University of California, Davis, Davis, California, USA

S. Abbott , J. Bonilla , C. Brainerd , R. Breedon , M. Calderon De La Barca Sanchez , M. Chertok , M. Citron , J. Conway , P.T. Cox , R. Erbacher , G. Haza , F. Jensen , O. Kukral , G. Mocellin , M. Mulhearn , D. Pellett , B. Regnery , W. Wei, Y. Yao , F. Zhang 
























University of California, Los Angeles, California, USA

M. Bachtis , R. Cousins , A. Datta , J. Hauser , M. Ignatenko , M.A. Iqbal , T. Lam , E. Manca , W.A. Nash , D. Saltzberg , B. Stone , V. Valuev 

University of California, Riverside, Riverside, California, USA

R. Clare , M. Gordon, G. Hanson , W. Si , S. Wimpenny[†] 











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

J.G. Branson , S. Cittolin , S. Cooperstein , D. Diaz , J. Duarte , R. Gerosa , L. Gianini , J. Guiang , R. Kansal , V. Krutelyov , R. Lee , J. Letts , M. Masciovecchio , F. Mokhtar , M. Pieri , M. Quinnan , B.V. Sathia Narayanan , V. Sharma , M. Tadel , E. Vourliotis , F. Würthwein , Y. Xiang , A. Yagil 















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

L. Brennan, C. Campagnari , G. Collura , A. Dorsett , J. Incandela , M. Kilpatrick , J. Kim , A.J. Li , P. Masterson , H. Mei , M. Oshiro , J. Richman , U. Sarica , R. Schmitz , F. Setti , J. Sheplock , D. Stuart , S. Wang 














California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California, USA

A. Bornheim , O. Cerri, A. Latorre, J.M. Lawhorn , J. Mao , H.B. Newman , T. Q. Nguyen , M. Spiropulu , J.R. Vlimant , C. Wang , S. Xie , R.Y. Zhu 



Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA

J. Alison , S. An , M.B. Andrews , P. Bryant , V. Dutta , T. Ferguson , A. Harilal , C. Liu , T. Mudholkar , S. Murthy , M. Paulini , A. Roberts , A. Sanchez , W. Terrill 










University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, Colorado, USA

J.P. Cumalat , W.T. Ford , A. Hassani , G. Karathanasis , E. MacDonald, N. Manganello , F. Marini , A. Perloff , C. Savard , N. Schonbeck , K. Stenson , K.A. Ulmer , S.R. Wagner , N. Zipper 













Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, USA

J. Alexander , S. Bright-Thonney , X. Chen , D.J. Cranshaw , J. Fan , X. Fan , D. Gadkari , S. Hogan , J. Monroy , J.R. Patterson , J. Reichert , M. Reid , A. Ryd , J. Thom , P. Wittich , R. Zou













Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, Illinois, USA

M. Albrow , M. Alyari , O. Amram , G. Apollinari , A. Apresyan , L.A.T. Bauerdick , D. Berry , J. Berryhill , P.C. Bhat , K. Burkett , J.N. Butler , A. Canepa , G.B. Cerati , H.W.K. Cheung , F. Chlebana , G. Cummings , J. Dickinson , I. Dutta , V.D. Elvira , Y. Feng , J. Freeman , A. Gandrakota , Z. Gecse , L. Gray , D. Green , S. Grünendahl , D. Guerrero , O. Gutsche , R.M. Harris , R. Heller , T.C. Herwig , J. Hirschauer , L. Horyn , B. Jayatilaka , S. Jindariani , M. Johnson , U. Joshi , T. Klijnsma , B. Klima , K.H.M. Kwok , S. Lammel , D. Lincoln , R. Lipton , T. Liu , C. Madrid , K. Maeshima , C. Mantilla , D. Mason , P. McBride , P. Merkel , S. Mrenna , S. Nahn , J. Ngadiuba , D. Noonan , V. Papadimitriou , N. Pastika , K. Pedro , C. Pena⁸⁵ , F. Ravera , A. Reinsvold Hall⁸⁶ , L. Ristori , E. Sexton-Kennedy , N. Smith , A. Soha , L. Spiegel , S. Stoynev , L. Taylor , S. Tkaczyk , N.V. Tran , L. Uplegger , E.W. Vaandering , I. Zoi









University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, USA

C. Aruta , P. Avery , D. Bourilkov , L. Cadamuro , P. Chang , V. Cherepanov , R.D. Field , E. Koenig , M. Kolosova , J. Konigsberg , A. Korytov , K.H. Lo , K. Matchev , N. Menendez , G. Mitselmakher , A. Muthirakalayil Madhu , N. Rawal , D. Rosenzweig , S. Rosenzweig , K. Shi , J. Wang













Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida, USA

T. Adams , A. Al Kadhimi , A. Askew , N. Bower , R. Habibullah , V. Hagopian , R. Hashmi , R.S. Kim , S. Kim , T. Kolberg , G. Martinez , H. Prosper , P.R. Prova , O. Viazlo , M. Wulansatiti , R. Yohay , J. Zhang











Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, Florida, USA

B. Alsufyani , M.M. Baarmand , S. Butalla , T. Elkafrawy⁵³ , M. Hohlmann , R. Kumar Verma , M. Rahmani , F. Yumiceva 











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

M.R. Adams , C. Bennett , R. Cavanaugh , S. Dittmer , O. Evdokimov , C.E. Gerber , D.J. Hofman , J.h. Lee , D. S. Lemos , A.H. Merrit , C. Mills , S. Nanda , G. Oh , D. Pilipovic , T. Roy , S. Rudrabhatla , M.B. Tonjes , N. Varelas , X. Wang , Z. Ye , J. Yoo











The University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, USA






M. Alhousseini , D. Blend , K. Dilsiz⁸⁷ , L. Emediato , G. Karaman , O.K. Köseyan , J.-P. Merlo , A. Mestvirishvili⁸⁸ , J. Nachtman , O. Neogi , H. Ogul⁸⁹ , Y. Onel , A. Penzo , C. Snyder , E. Tiras⁹⁰

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, USA








B. Blumenfeld , L. Corcodilos , J. Davis , A.V. Gritsan , L. Kang , S. Kyriacou , P. Maksimovic , M. Roguljic , J. Roskes , S. Sekhar , M. Swartz , T.Á. Vámi

The University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, USA

A. Abreu , L.F. Alcerro Alcerro , J. Anguiano , P. Baringer , A. Bean , Z. Flowers , J. King , G. Krintiras , M. Lazarovits , C. Le Mahieu , C. Lindsey , J. Marquez , N. Minafra , M. Murray , M. Nickel , M. Pitt , S. Popescu⁹¹ , C. Rogan , C. Royon

R. Salvatico , S. Sanders , C. Smith , Q. Wang , G. Wilson 








Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas, USA

B. Allmond , A. Ivanov , K. Kaadze , A. Kalogeropoulos , D. Kim, Y. Maravin , K. Nam, J. Natoli , D. Roy 









Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California, USA

F. Rebassoo , D. Wright 








University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland, USA

E. Adams , A. Baden , O. Baron, A. Belloni , A. Bethani , Y.m. Chen , S.C. Eno , N.J. Hadley , S. Jabeen , R.G. Kellogg , T. Koeth , Y. Lai , S. Lascio , A.C. Mignerey , S. Nabili , C. Palmer , C. Papageorgakis , L. Wang , K. Wong

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA

J. Bendavid , W. Busza , I.A. Cali , Y. Chen , M. D'Alfonso , J. Eysermans , C. Freer , G. Gomez-Ceballos , M. Goncharov, P. Harris, D. Hoang, D. Kovalskyi , J. Krupa , L. Lavezzo , Y.-J. Lee , K. Long , C. Mironov , C. Paus , D. Rankin , C. Roland , G. Roland , S. Rothman , Z. Shi , G.S.F. Stephans , J. Wang, Z. Wang , B. Wyslouch , T. J. Yang

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA

R.M. Chatterjee, B. Crossman , B.M. Joshi , C. Kapsiak , M. Krohn , D. Mahon , J. Mans , M. Revering , R. Rusack , R. Saradhy , N. Schroeder , N. Strobbe , M.A. Wadud

University of Mississippi, Oxford, Mississippi, USA

L.M. Cremaldi 









University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, Nebraska, USA

K. Bloom , M. Bryson, D.R. Claes , C. Fangmeier , F. Golf , C. Joo , I. Kravchenko , I. Reed , J.E. Siado , G.R. Snow[†], W. Tabb , A. Wightman , F. Yan , A.G. Zecchinelli









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

G. Agarwal , H. Bandyopadhyay , L. Hay , I. Iashvili , A. Kharchilava , C. McLean , M. Morris , D. Nguyen , J. Pekkanen , S. Rappoccio , H. Rejeb Sfar, A. Williams









Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts, USA

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

Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, USA

S. Bhattacharya , J. Bueghly, Z. Chen , A. Gilbert , K.A. Hahn , Y. Liu , D.G. Monk , M.H. Schmitt , A. Taliencio , M. Velasco

University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana, USA



















R. Band , R. Bucci, S. Castells , M. Cremonesi, A. Das , R. Goldouzian , M. Hildreth , K.W. Ho , K. Hurtado Anampa , C. Jessop , K. Lannon , J. Lawrence , N. Loukas , L. Lutton , J. Mariano, N. Marinelli, I. Mcalister, T. McCauley , C. Mcgrady , K. Mohrman , C. Moore , Y. Musienko¹³ , H. Nelson , R. Ruchti , A. Townsend , M. Wayne , H. Yockey, M. Zarucki , L. Zygala

The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, USA

B. Bylsma, M. Carrigan , L.S. Durkin , C. Hill , M. Joyce , A. Lesauvage 

M. Nunez Ornelas , K. Wei, B.L. Winer , B. R. Yates 






















Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey, USA

F.M. Addesa , H. Bouchamaoui , P. Das , G. Dezoort , P. Elmer , A. Frankenthal , B. Greenberg , N. Haubrich , S. Higginbotham , G. Kopp , S. Kwan , D. Lange , A. Loeliger , D. Marlow , I. Ojalvo , J. Olsen , D. Stickland , C. Tully 




University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez, Puerto Rico, USA

S. Malik 
















Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana, USA

A.S. Bakshi , V.E. Barnes , S. Chandra , R. Chawla , S. Das , A. Gu , L. Gutay, M. Jones , A.W. Jung , D. Kondratyev , A.M. Koshy, M. Liu , G. Negro , N. Neumeister , G. Paspalaki , S. Piperov , A. Purohit , J.F. Schulte , M. Stojanovic¹⁷ , J. Thieman , A. K. Viridi , F. Wang , W. Xie 












Purdue University Northwest, Hammond, Indiana, USA

J. Dolen , N. Parashar , A. Pathak 

Rice University, Houston, Texas, USA

D. Acosta , A. Baty , T. Carnahan , S. Dildick , K.M. Ecklund , P.J. Fernández Manteca , S. Freed, P. Gardner, F.J.M. Geurts , A. Kumar , W. Li , O. Miguel Colin , B.P. Padley , R. Redjimi, J. Rotter , S. Yang , E. Yigitbasi , Y. Zhang 


















University of Rochester, Rochester, New York, USA

A. Bodek , P. de Barbaro , R. Demina , J.L. Dulemba , C. Fallon, A. Garcia-Bellido , O. Hindrichs , A. Khukhunaishvili , P. Parygin , E. Popova , R. Taus , G.P. Van Onsem 


The Rockefeller University, New York, New York, USA

K. Goulianos 














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

B. Chiarito, J.P. Chou , Y. Gershtein , E. Halkiadakis , A. Hart , M. Heindl , D. Jaroslowski , O. Karacheban²⁶ , I. Laflotte , A. Lath , R. Montalvo, K. Nash, M. Osherson , H. Routray , S. Salur , S. Schnetzer, S. Somalwar , R. Stone , S.A. Thayil , S. Thomas, J. Vora , H. Wang 












University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee, USA

H. Acharya, A.G. Delannoy , S. Fiorendi , T. Holmes , N. Karunarathna , L. Lee , E. Nibigira , S. Spanier 











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

M. Ahmad , O. Bouhali⁹² , M. Dalchenko , R. Eusebi , J. Gilmore , T. Huang , T. Kamon⁹³ , H. Kim , S. Luo , S. Malhotra, R. Mueller , D. Overton , D. Rathjens , A. Safonov 









Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas, USA

N. Akchurin , J. Damgov , V. Hegde , A. Hussain , Y. Kazhykarim, K. Lamichhane , S.W. Lee , A. Mankel , T. Mengke, S. Muthumuni , T. Peltola , I. Volobouev , A. Whitbeck 

Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee, USA

E. Appelt , S. Greene, A. Gurrola , W. Johns , R. Kunnawalkam Elayavalli , A. Melo , F. Romeo , P. Sheldon , S. Tuo , J. Velkovska , J. Viinikainen 






















University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia, USA

B. Cardwell , B. Cox , J. Hakala , R. Hirosky , A. Ledovskoy , A. Li , C. Neu , C.E. Perez Lara 

Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan, USA

P.E. Karchin 

University of Wisconsin - Madison, Madison, Wisconsin, USA

A. Aravind, S. Banerjee , K. Black , T. Bose , S. Dasu , I. De Bruyn , P. Everaerts , C. Galloni, H. He , M. Herndon , A. Herve , C.K. Koraka , A. Lanaro, R. Loveless , J. Madhusudanan Sreekala , A. Mallampalli , A. Mohammadi , S. Mondal, G. Parida , D. Pinna, A. Savin, V. Shang , V. Sharma , W.H. Smith , D. Teague, H.F. Tsoi , W. Vetens , A. Warden 

Authors affiliated with an institute or an international laboratory covered by a cooperation agreement with CERN

S. Afanasiev , V. Andreev , Yu. Andreev , T. Aushev , M. Azarkin , A. Babaev , A. Belyaev , V. Blinov⁹⁴, E. Boos , V. Borshch , D. Budkouski , V. Bunichev , V. Chekhovsky, R. Chistov⁹⁴ , M. Danilov⁹⁴ , A. Dermenev , T. Dimova⁹⁴ , D. Druzhkin⁹⁵ , M. Dubinin⁸⁵ , L. Dudko , A. Ershov , G. Gavrilov , V. Gavrilov , S. Gninenko , V. Golovtsov , N. Golubev , I. Golutvin , I. Gorbunov , A. Gribushin , Y. Ivanov , V. Kachanov , L. Kardapoltsev⁹⁴ , V. Karjavine , A. Karneyeu , V. Kim⁹⁴ , M. Kirakosyan, D. Kirpichnikov , M. Kirsanov , V. Klyukhin , O. Kodolova⁹⁶ , D. Konstantinov , V. Korenkov , A. Kozyrev⁹⁴ , N. Krasnikov , A. Lanev , P. Levchenko⁹⁷ , N. Lychkovskaya , V. Makarenko , A. Malakhov , V. Matveev⁹⁴ , V. Murzin , A. Nikitenko^{98,96} , S. Obraztsov , V. Oreshkin , A. Oskin, V. Palichik , V. Perelygin , M. Perfilov, S. Polikarpov⁹⁴ , V. Popov, O. Radchenko⁹⁴ , M. Savina , V. Savrin , D. Selivanova , V. Shalaev , S. Shmatov , S. Shulha , Y. Skovpen⁹⁴ , S. Slabospitskii , V. Smirnov , D. Sosnov , V. Sulimov , E. Tcherniaev , A. Terkulov , O. Teryaev , I. Tlisova , A. Toropin , L. Uvarov , A. Uzunian , A. Vorobyev[†], N. Voytishin , B.S. Yuldashev⁹⁹, A. Zarubin , I. Zhizhin , A. Zhokin 

†: Deceased

¹Also at Yerevan State University, Yerevan, Armenia

²Also at TU Wien, Vienna, Austria

³Also at Institute of Basic and Applied Sciences, Faculty of Engineering, Arab Academy for Science, Technology and Maritime Transport, Alexandria, Egypt

⁴Also at Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium

⁵Also at Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

⁶Also at Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, Brazil

⁷Also at Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, Brazil

⁸Also at UFMS, Nova Andradina, Brazil

⁹Also at Nanjing Normal University, Nanjing, China

¹⁰Now at The University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, USA

¹¹Also at University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China

¹²Also at University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China

¹³Also at an institute or an international laboratory covered by a cooperation agreement with CERN

¹⁴Also at Cairo University, Cairo, Egypt

¹⁵Also at Suez University, Suez, Egypt

¹⁶Now at British University in Egypt, Cairo, Egypt

-
- ¹⁷Also at Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana, USA
- ¹⁸Also at Université de Haute Alsace, Mulhouse, France
- ¹⁹Also at Department of Physics, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China
- ²⁰Also at The University of the State of Amazonas, Manaus, Brazil
- ²¹Also at Erzincan Binali Yildirim University, Erzincan, Turkey
- ²²Also at University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany
- ²³Also at RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut A, Aachen, Germany
- ²⁴Also at Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, Iran
- ²⁵Also at Bergische University Wuppertal (BUW), Wuppertal, Germany
- ²⁶Also at Brandenburg University of Technology, Cottbus, Germany
- ²⁷Also at Forschungszentrum Jülich, Juelich, Germany
- ²⁸Also at CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland
- ²⁹Also at Physics Department, Faculty of Science, Assiut University, Assiut, Egypt
- ³⁰Also at Wigner Research Centre for Physics, Budapest, Hungary
- ³¹Also at Institute of Physics, University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary
- ³²Also at Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary
- ³³Now at Universitatea Babeş-Bolyai - Facultatea de Fizica, Cluj-Napoca, Romania
- ³⁴Also at Faculty of Informatics, University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary
- ³⁵Also at Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana, India
- ³⁶Also at UPES - University of Petroleum and Energy Studies, Dehradun, India
- ³⁷Also at University of Visva-Bharati, Santiniketan, India
- ³⁸Also at University of Hyderabad, Hyderabad, India
- ³⁹Also at Indian Institute of Science (IISc), Bangalore, India
- ⁴⁰Also at IIT Bhubaneswar, Bhubaneswar, India
- ⁴¹Also at Institute of Physics, Bhubaneswar, India
- ⁴²Also at Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Hamburg, Germany
- ⁴³Now at Department of Physics, Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, Iran
- ⁴⁴Also at Sharif University of Technology, Tehran, Iran
- ⁴⁵Also at Department of Physics, University of Science and Technology of Mazandaran, Behshahr, Iran
- ⁴⁶Also at Helwan University, Cairo, Egypt
- ⁴⁷Also at Italian National Agency for New Technologies, Energy and Sustainable Economic Development, Bologna, Italy
- ⁴⁸Also at Centro Siciliano di Fisica Nucleare e di Struttura Della Materia, Catania, Italy
- ⁴⁹Also at Università degli Studi Guglielmo Marconi, Roma, Italy
- ⁵⁰Also at Scuola Superiore Meridionale, Università di Napoli 'Federico II', Napoli, Italy
- ⁵¹Also at Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, Illinois, USA
- ⁵²Also at Università di Napoli 'Federico II', Napoli, Italy
- ⁵³Also at Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt
- ⁵⁴Also at Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche - Istituto Officina dei Materiali, Perugia, Italy
- ⁵⁵Also at Riga Technical University, Riga, Latvia
- ⁵⁶Also at Department of Applied Physics, Faculty of Science and Technology, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi, Malaysia
- ⁵⁷Also at Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología, Mexico City, Mexico
- ⁵⁸Also at Trincomalee Campus, Eastern University, Sri Lanka, Nilaveli, Sri Lanka
- ⁵⁹Also at INFN Sezione di Pavia, Università di Pavia, Pavia, Italy
- ⁶⁰Also at National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece
- ⁶¹Also at Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland
- ⁶²Also at Universität Zürich, Zurich, Switzerland

- ⁶³Also at Stefan Meyer Institute for Subatomic Physics, Vienna, Austria
- ⁶⁴Also at Laboratoire d'Annecy-le-Vieux de Physique des Particules, IN2P3-CNRS, Annecy-le-Vieux, France
- ⁶⁵Also at Near East University, Research Center of Experimental Health Science, Mersin, Turkey
- ⁶⁶Also at Konya Technical University, Konya, Turkey
- ⁶⁷Also at Izmir Bakircay University, Izmir, Turkey
- ⁶⁸Also at Adiyaman University, Adiyaman, Turkey
- ⁶⁹Also at Necmettin Erbakan University, Konya, Turkey
- ⁷⁰Also at Bozok Universitetesi Rektörlüğü, Yozgat, Turkey
- ⁷¹Also at Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey
- ⁷²Also at Milli Savunma University, Istanbul, Turkey
- ⁷³Also at Kafkas University, Kars, Turkey
- ⁷⁴Also at Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey
- ⁷⁵Also at Istanbul University - Cerrahpasa, Faculty of Engineering, Istanbul, Turkey
- ⁷⁶Also at Yildiz Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey
- ⁷⁷Also at Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussel, Belgium
- ⁷⁸Also at School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southampton, Southampton, United Kingdom
- ⁷⁹Also at University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom
- ⁸⁰Also at IPPP Durham University, Durham, United Kingdom
- ⁸¹Also at Monash University, Faculty of Science, Clayton, Australia
- ⁸²Also at Università di Torino, Torino, Italy
- ⁸³Also at Bethel University, St. Paul, Minnesota, USA
- ⁸⁴Also at Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University, Karaman, Turkey
- ⁸⁵Also at California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California, USA
- ⁸⁶Also at United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, USA
- ⁸⁷Also at Bingol University, Bingol, Turkey
- ⁸⁸Also at Georgian Technical University, Tbilisi, Georgia
- ⁸⁹Also at Sinop University, Sinop, Turkey
- ⁹⁰Also at Erciyes University, Kayseri, Turkey
- ⁹¹Also at Horia Hulubei National Institute of Physics and Nuclear Engineering (IFIN-HH), Bucharest, Romania
- ⁹²Also at Texas A&M University at Qatar, Doha, Qatar
- ⁹³Also at Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea
- ⁹⁴Also at another institute or international laboratory covered by a cooperation agreement with CERN
- ⁹⁵Also at Universiteit Antwerpen, Antwerpen, Belgium
- ⁹⁶Also at Yerevan Physics Institute, Yerevan, Armenia
- ⁹⁷Also at Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts, USA
- ⁹⁸Also at Imperial College, London, United Kingdom
- ⁹⁹Also at Institute of Nuclear Physics of the Uzbekistan Academy of Sciences, Tashkent, Uzbekistan