

Measurement of the top-quark mass in $t\bar{t}$ events with dilepton final states in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV

The CMS Collaboration*
CERN, Geneva, Switzerland

Received: 11 September 2012 / Revised: 11 October 2012 / Published online: 31 October 2012
© CERN for the benefit of the CMS collaboration 2012. This article is published with open access at Springerlink.com

Abstract The top-quark mass is measured in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV using a data sample corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 5.0 fb^{-1} collected by the CMS experiment at the LHC. The measurement is performed in the dilepton decay channel $t\bar{t} \rightarrow (\ell^+ \nu_{\ell} b) (\ell^- \bar{\nu}_{\ell} \bar{b})$, where $\ell = e, \mu$. Candidate top-quark decays are selected by requiring two leptons, at least two jets, and imbalance in transverse momentum. The mass is reconstructed with an analytical matrix weighting technique using distributions derived from simulated samples. Using a maximum-likelihood fit, the top-quark mass is determined to be 172.5 ± 0.4 (stat.) ± 1.5 (syst.) GeV.

1 Introduction

The top-quark mass is an important parameter of the standard model (SM) of particle physics, as it affects predictions of SM observables via radiative corrections. Precise measurements of the top-quark mass are critical inputs to global electroweak fits [1, 2], which provide constraints on the properties of the Higgs boson.

The top quark constitutes an exception in the quark sector as it decays, primarily to a W boson and a b quark, before it can hadronize. Thus, in contrast to all other quarks, the mass of the top quark can be measured directly and is currently known with the smallest relative uncertainty. All measurements of the top-quark mass to date are based on the decay products of $t\bar{t}$ pairs, using final states with zero, one, or two charged leptons. The mass of the top quark has been measured very precisely in $p\bar{p}$ collisions by the Tevatron experiments, and the current world average is $m_t = 173.18 \pm 0.56$ (stat.) ± 0.75 (syst.) GeV [3]. In the dilepton channel, in which each W boson decays

into a charged lepton and a neutrino, the top-quark mass has been measured to be $m_t = 170.28 \pm 1.95$ (stat.) ± 3.13 (syst.) GeV by the CDF Collaboration [4] and $m_t = 174.00 \pm 2.36$ (stat.) ± 1.44 (syst.) GeV by the D0 Collaboration [5]. The combination of these two measurements yields a top-quark mass of $m_t = 171.1 \pm 2.1$ GeV [3]. Measurements of m_t in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV were performed at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) in the dilepton channel by the Compact Muon Solenoid (CMS) Collaboration [6] and in the lepton + jet channel, in which one W boson decays into quarks and the other into a charged lepton and a neutrino, by the ATLAS [7] and CMS [8] Collaborations.

Of all $t\bar{t}$ decay channels, the dilepton channel has the smallest branching fraction and is expected to be the least contaminated by background processes. The dominant background process is Drell–Yan (DY) production. Single top quark production through the tW channel as well as diboson production also mimic the dilepton signature but have much lower cross sections. The production of multijet events has a large cross section at the LHC, but the contamination of the dilepton sample is small as two isolated leptons with high transverse momentum (p_T) are very rarely produced. The presence of at least two neutrinos in dilepton $t\bar{t}$ decays gives rise to an experimental p_T imbalance, which allows a further discrimination between background and $t\bar{t}$ events. However, the kinematical system is underconstrained as only the p_T imbalance can be measured.

Here we report an update of the measurement of m_t performed in dileptonic final states, containing electrons or muons, with an analytical matrix weighting technique. An alternative measurement is performed using a full kinematic analysis. The data samples used in this analysis were recorded by the CMS experiment at a centre-of-mass energy of 7 TeV and correspond to a total integrated luminosity of $5.0 \pm 0.1 \text{ fb}^{-1}$.

* e-mail: cms-publication-committee-chair@cern.ch

2 The CMS detector

The central feature of the CMS detector is a superconducting solenoid, 13 m in length and 6 m in diameter, which provides an axial magnetic field of 3.8 T. The bore of the solenoid is outfitted with various particle detection systems. Charged particle trajectories are measured by the silicon pixel and strip subdetectors, covering $0 < \phi < 2\pi$ in azimuth and $|\eta| < 2.5$, where the pseudorapidity η is defined as $\eta = -\ln[\tan(\theta/2)]$, with θ being the polar angle of the trajectory of the particle with respect to the anticlockwise-beam direction. A lead tungstate crystal electromagnetic calorimeter (ECAL) and a brass/scintillator sampling hadronic calorimeter (HCAL) surround the tracking volume; in this analysis the calorimetry provides high-resolution energy and direction measurements of electrons and hadronic jets. Muons are measured in drift tubes, cathode strip chambers, and resistive plate chambers embedded in the flux-return yoke of the solenoid. The detector is nearly hermetic, allowing for p_T imbalance measurements in the plane transverse to the beam directions. A two-level trigger system selects the most interesting pp collision events for use in physics analysis. A detailed description of the CMS detector can be found in Ref. [9].

3 Simulation of signal and background events

The simulation of $t\bar{t}$ events is performed using the MADGRAPH [10] event generator (v. 5.1.1.0), where the generated top-quark pairs are accompanied by up to three additional high- p_T jets. The parton configurations generated by MADGRAPH are processed with PYTHIA 6.424 [11] to provide showering of the generated particles. The parton showers are matched using the k_T -MLM prescription [12]. The underlying event is described with the Z2 tune [13] and the CTEQ6.6L [14] set of parton distribution functions (PDFs) are used. The TAUOLA package (v. 27.121.5) [15] is used to simulate decays of the τ leptons. Events in which the τ leptons decay to electrons or muons are taken as part of the signal.

For the reference sample, a top-quark mass of $m_t = 172.5$ GeV is used. Additional samples with masses of 161.5 GeV and between 163.5 and 187.5 GeV in steps of 3 GeV are used. Furthermore, in order to estimate systematic effects in the modelling of dilepton events, simulated signal samples using alternative settings of the parameters are also considered. The following parameters are varied: the QCD factorisation and renormalisation scale (defined as the squared sum of the four-momenta of the primary partons in the event which is transferred dynamically in the hard interaction) and the threshold used for the matching of the partons from matrix elements to the parton showers. The

uncertainty on the choice of the Q^2 or matching scales are considered by varying the corresponding nominal value by a factor of two, up and down.

Electroweak production of single top quarks is simulated using POWHEG (v. 301) [16]; MADGRAPH is used to simulate W/Z events with up to four jets. Production of WW, WZ, and ZZ is simulated with PYTHIA.

Signal and background processes used in the analysis of $t\bar{t}$ events are normalised to next-to-leading order (NLO) or next-to-next-to-leading order (NNLO) cross section calculations, where calculations are available. The production cross section of $\sigma_{t\bar{t}} = 164^{+13}_{-10}$ pb computed with HATHOR [17, 18] at approximate NNLO is used. The single top quark associated production (tW) cross section is taken to be $\sigma_{tW} = 15.7 \pm 1.2$ pb at NNLO [19]. The inclusive NNLO cross section of the production of W bosons (multiplied by the leptonic branching fraction of the W boson) is estimated to be $\sigma_{W \rightarrow \ell\nu} = 31.3 \pm 1.6$ nb using FEWZ [20] with a Q^2 scale of $(m_W)^2 + \sum(p_T^{\text{parton}})^2$, where $m_W = 80.4$ GeV and p_T^{parton} are the transverse momenta of the partons in the event. The DY production cross section at NNLO is calculated using FEWZ to be $\sigma_{Z/\gamma^* \rightarrow \ell\ell}(m_{\ell\ell} > 20 \text{ GeV}) = 5.00 \pm 0.27$ nb, where $m_{\ell\ell}$ is the invariant mass of the two leptons. In the computation, the scales are set using the Z-boson mass $m_Z = 91.2$ GeV [21]. The normalisation of WW, WZ, and ZZ production is defined using the inclusive cross sections of 43.0 ± 1.5 pb, 18.8 ± 0.7 pb, and 7.4 ± 0.2 pb respectively (all calculated at NLO with MCFM [22]).

All generated events are passed through the full simulation of the CMS detector based on GEANT4 [23]. We simulate additional soft Monte Carlo events corresponding to a number of collisions distributed as seen in data.

4 Event selection

The $t\bar{t}$ candidate events are required to contain at least two jets, two energetic isolated leptons (electrons or muons), and missing transverse energy (E_T^{miss}) which is defined as the magnitude of the p_T imbalance vector. Events are selected by dilepton triggers in which two muons, two electrons, or one electron and one muon are required to be present. The instantaneous luminosity increased significantly during the data taking period thus the lepton p_T thresholds were increased during the data taking period to keep the trigger rates within the capabilities of the data acquisition system. For the dimuon trigger, the p_T requirements evolved from 7 GeV for each muon to asymmetric requirements of 17 GeV for the highest- p_T (leading) muon and 8 GeV for the second-highest p_T muon. For the dielectron trigger, the requirement was asymmetric with a threshold applied to the energy of an ECAL cluster projected onto

the plane transverse to the nominal beam line (E_T). The cluster of the leading electron is required to have $E_T > 17$ GeV and the second-leading electron $E_T > 8$ GeV. For the electron-muon trigger, the thresholds were either $E_T > 17$ GeV for the electron and $p_T > 8$ GeV for the muon, or $E_T > 8$ GeV for the electron and $p_T > 17$ GeV for the muon.

All objects are reconstructed using a particle-flow algorithm [24]. The particle-flow algorithm combines the information from all subdetectors to identify and reconstruct all particles produced in the collision, namely charged hadrons, photons, neutral hadrons, muons, and electrons. Jets are reconstructed by the anti- k_T jet clustering algorithm [25] with a distance parameter $R = 0.5$. Jet energy corrections are applied to all the jets in data and simulation [26]. The E_T^{miss} vector is calculated using all reconstructed particles.

Events are selected with two isolated, oppositely charged leptons with $p_T > 20$ GeV and $|\eta| < 2.4$, and at least two jets with $p_T > 30$ GeV and $|\eta| < 2.4$. The lepton isolation I_{rel} is defined as the sum of the transverse momenta of stable charged hadrons, neutral hadrons and photons in a cone of $\Delta R = \sqrt{(\Delta\eta)^2 + (\Delta\phi)^2} = 0.3$ around the lepton track, divided by its transverse momentum. A lepton candidate is not considered as isolated and is rejected if the value of I_{rel} is >0.20 for a muon and >0.17 for an electron. The two leptons of highest p_T are chosen for the reconstruction of the top quark candidates. The choice of the jets is different in each analysis and is described later. The reconstructed E_T^{miss} of events with same-flavour lepton pairs is required to be above 40 GeV to reject DY events. No such selection is applied to $e\mu$ events. The selected leptons and jets are required to originate from the primary pp interaction vertex, identified as the reconstructed vertex with the largest $\sum p_T^2$ of its associated tracks. Events with same-flavour lepton pairs in the dilepton mass window $76 < m_{\ell\ell} < 106$ GeV are removed to suppress the dominant DY production background. Dilepton pairs from heavy-flavour resonances as well as low-mass DY production are also removed by requiring a minimum invariant mass of 20 GeV. A highly efficient b-tagging algorithm based on a likelihood method that combines information about impact parameter significance, secondary vertex reconstruction, and jet kinematic properties, into a b-tagging discriminator, is used to classify the jets [27]. We require at least one b-tagged jet in the event.

The observed number of events is consistent with the expected signal and background yields, as shown in Table 1. Simulated events are reweighted to account for differences in trigger, lepton, and b-tagging selection efficiency between data and simulation. The b-tagging efficiency is estimated from a sample of top-quark candidates [28] while the probability of tagging light-quark jets (mistag rate) is estimated

Table 1 Numbers of observed and expected events in each dilepton channel after all selection requirements have been applied. Event yields correspond to an integrated luminosity of 5.0 fb^{-1} . The uncertainties quoted correspond to the limited statistics in simulation. The total uncertainty associated to the estimates from data of the $t\bar{t}$ background and DY production are included as well

Processes	ee	$e\mu$	$\mu\mu$
1b-tagged jet			
$t\bar{t}$ signal	598 ± 18	2359 ± 71	770 ± 23
$t\bar{t}$ background	10.6 ± 0.3	101.8 ± 3.1	15.7 ± 0.5
Single top	40.7 ± 1.2	172.2 ± 5.2	53.3 ± 1.6
Drell–Yan	107 ± 24	241 ± 27	143 ± 31
Dibosons	11.4 ± 0.3	39.7 ± 1.2	13.0 ± 0.4
Total prediction	767 ± 30	2914 ± 76	995 ± 39
Data	817	2788	1032
≥ 2b-tagged jets			
$t\bar{t}$ signal	1057 ± 32	4312 ± 129	1393 ± 42
$t\bar{t}$ background	4.6 ± 0.3	37.6 ± 1.1	5.5 ± 0.5
Single top	36.8 ± 1.1	140.6 ± 4.2	48.2 ± 1.4
Drell–Yan	38 ± 11	38.9 ± 4.3	32 ± 12
Dibosons	2.9 ± 0.1	9.1 ± 0.3	2.5 ± 0.1
Total prediction	1139 ± 34	4539 ± 130	1481 ± 43
Data	1151	4365	1474

from multijet events [27]. The lepton selection efficiency data-to-simulation scale factors are estimated using dileptons inside the Z-boson mass window. The trigger efficiencies are estimated using a data sample collected with a trigger based on E_T^{miss} that is weakly correlated with the dilepton triggers and after selecting dilepton events which fulfil the complete event selection criteria.

The contribution of the DY background is measured using data. For the ee and $\mu\mu$ channels, the $R_{\text{out/in}}$ method is used [6]. In this method, the number of DY events counted inside the Z-boson mass window in the data is rescaled by the ratio of DY events predicted by the simulation outside and inside the mass window. As contamination from non-DY backgrounds is expected to be present in the Z-boson mass window, a subtraction based on data is applied using the $e\mu$ channel scaled according to the event yields in the ee and $\mu\mu$ channels. For the $e\mu$ channel, the DY background yield is estimated after performing a binned maximum-likelihood fit to the dilepton invariant mass distribution. The fitting functions are taken from simulation for both the signal and background contributions. The contamination from multijet and W + jets backgrounds is estimated with a matrix method [29], and non-dileptonic $t\bar{t}$ decays are reweighted in the simulation to take these backgrounds into account. This component will be called $t\bar{t}$ background in the following.

5 Analytical matrix weighting technique

Since the dilepton channel contains in the final state at least two neutrinos which can not be detected, the reconstruction of m_t from dilepton events involves an underconstrained system. For each $t\bar{t}$ event, the kinematic properties are fully specified by 24 parameters, which are the four-momenta of the six particles in the final state: two charged leptons, two neutrinos and two jets. Out of the 24 free parameters, 14 are inferred from measurements (the three-momenta of the jets and leptons, and the two components of the E_T^{miss}) and 9 are constrained. Two constraints arise from demanding that the reconstructed W-boson masses be equal to the world-average measured value [21] and one constraint is imposed by assuming the top quark and antiquark masses to be the same [30]. Furthermore, the masses of the 6 final-state particles are taken as the world-average measured values [21]. This leaves one free parameter that must be constrained by using some hypotheses.

Several methods have been developed for measuring the top-quark mass in the dilepton decay channel. We use an improved version of the Matrix Weighting Technique (MWT) [31] that was used in the first measurements in this channel [31, 32]. The algorithm is referred to as the analytical MWT (AMWT) method. A key improvement with respect to the original MWT is the selection of the jets used to reconstruct the top quark candidates. Instead of taking the two leading jets (i.e. the jets with the highest p_T), the fraction of correctly assigned jets can be increased significantly by using the information provided by b-tagging. Therefore, the leading b-tagged jets are used in the reconstruction, even if they are not the leading jets. If there is a single b-tagged jet in the event, it is supplemented by the leading untagged jet. The same b-tagging algorithm is used as in the event selection. A further improvement is the use of an analytical method [33, 34] to determine the momenta of the two neutrinos instead of a numerical method.

In the AMWT, the mass of the top quark is used to fully constrain the $t\bar{t}$ system. For a given top-quark mass hypothesis, the constraints and the measured observables restrict the transverse momenta of the neutrinos to lie on ellipses in the p_x - p_y plane. If we assume that the measured missing transverse energy is solely due to the neutrinos, the two ellipses constraining the transverse momenta of the neutrinos can be obtained, and the intersections of the ellipses provide the solutions that fulfill the constraints. With two possible lepton-jet combinations, there are up to eight solutions for the neutrino momenta for a given top-quark mass hypothesis. Nevertheless, in this method, an irreducible singularity that precludes the determination of the longitudinal momentum of the neutrinos remains in a limited kinematical region. The fraction of events affected by this singularity is below 0.1 %, and a numerical method is used to determine the solutions in these rare cases [35].

The kinematic equations are solved many times per event using a series of top-quark mass hypotheses between 100 and 400 GeV in 1 GeV steps. Typically, solutions are found for the neutrino momenta that are consistent with all constraints for large intervals of mass hypotheses. In order to determine a preferred mass hypothesis, a weight w is assigned to each solution [36]:

$$w = \left\{ \sum f(x_1) f(x_2) \right\} p(E_{\ell^+}^* | m_t) p(E_{\ell^-}^* | m_t), \quad (1)$$

where x_i are the Bjorken x values of the initial-state partons, $f(x)$ are the parton distribution functions, and the summation is over the possible leading-order initial-state partons ($u\bar{u}$, $\bar{u}u$, $d\bar{d}$, $\bar{d}d$, and $g\bar{g}$). Each term of the form $p(E^* | m_t)$ is the probability density of observing a massless charged lepton of energy E^* in the rest frame of the top quark, for a given m_t [36]:

$$p(E^* | m_t) = \frac{4m_t E^* (m_t^2 - m_b^2 - 2m_t E^*)}{(m_t^2 - m_b^2)^2 + M_W^2 (m_t^2 - m_b^2) - 2M_W^4}. \quad (2)$$

Detector resolution effects are accounted for by reconstructing the event 1000 times, each time varying the p_T , η , and ϕ of each jet according to the measured detector resolution, and correcting the E_T^{miss} accordingly. For each mass hypothesis, the weights w from all solutions are summed. For each event, the top-quark mass hypothesis with the maximum weight is taken as the reconstructed top-quark mass m_{AMWT} . Events that have no solutions or that have a maximum weight below a threshold are discarded. This removes 14.6 % of the events, and 9934 events remain in the data, 1550 ee events, 6222 $e\mu$ events, and 2110 $\mu\mu$ events.

A likelihood \mathcal{L} is computed for values of m_t between 161.5 and 184.5 GeV, from data in the range $100 < m_{\text{AMWT}} < 300$ GeV. For each value of m_t , the likelihood is computed by comparing the reconstructed mass distribution in data with the expectation from simulation. For the background, the reconstructed mass distribution of each individual process is added according to its expected relative contribution. Two different templates are used according to the b-tag multiplicity of the event, either one b-tagged jet, or two or more b-tagged jets. For the DY background, the relative contribution is derived from data in the Z-boson mass window. For the other processes, the contributions predicted by the simulation are used. The value that maximises the likelihood is calculated after fitting a quadratic function to the $-\ln \mathcal{L}$ values obtained for all mass points and it is taken as the measurement of m_t . Using all the mass points in this fit yields pull widths that are closer to unity.

We determine the bias of this estimate using ensembles of pseudo-experiments based on the expected numbers of signal and background events, as shown in Fig. 1. Given the fit




Fig. 1 Mean mass bias (*top*) and pull width (*bottom*) for different top-quark masses in pseudo-experiments for the AMWT method. The *red solid line* represents the linear fit used to determine the correction to apply in order to minimise the residual bias and the *blue dashed line* show the expectation for an unbiased fit. The average pull width for the different top-quark masses is 0.99

to the data, a correction of -0.34 ± 0.20 GeV is applied to the final result to compensate for the residual bias introduced by the fit (Fig. 1, top). This correction is obtained from the fit of a linear function to the average top-quark masses measured for different mass hypotheses. The width of the pull distribution is within 10 % of unity for all the mass points, indicating that the statistical uncertainties are correctly estimated (Fig. 1, bottom).




Fig. 2 Distribution of the reconstructed mass in data and simulation for a top-quark mass hypothesis of 172.5 GeV with the AMWT method. All events used in the analysis are included in the distribution. The *inset* shows $-2 \ln(\mathcal{L}/\mathcal{L}_{\max})$ versus m_t with the quadratic fit superimposed

After correction for the bias, the top-quark mass is measured to be $m_t = 172.50 \pm 0.43$ (stat.) GeV. The predicted distribution of the reconstructed masses m_{AMWT} for a simulated top quark with mass $m_t = 172.5$ GeV, superimposed on the distribution observed in data, is shown in Fig. 2. The inset shows the distribution of the $-2 \ln(\mathcal{L}/\mathcal{L}_{\max})$ points with the quadratic fit used to measure m_t . The χ^2 probability of the fit is 0.36.

6 Systematic uncertainties

The contributions from the different sources of uncertainty are summarised in Table 2. The uncertainty of the overall jet energy scale (JES) is the dominant source of uncertainty on m_t . The JES is known with an uncertainty of 1–3 %, depending on the p_T and η of the jet [26]. Even in a high-pileup regime such as the one observed throughout the 2011 data taking period, the JES uncertainty is mostly dominated by the uncertainties on the absolute scale, initial- and final-state radiation, and corrections arising from the fragmentation and single-particle response in the calorimeter. It has been evaluated for 16 independent sources of systematic uncertainty. To estimate the effect of each source on the measurement of m_t , the (p_T, η) -dependent uncertainty is used to shift concurrently the energy of each jet by $\pm 1\sigma$ with respect to its nominal value, and correcting the E_T^{miss} accordingly. For each source, pseudo-experiments are generated from simulated event samples for which the JES is varied by the relevant uncertainty, and the reconstructed top-quark mass distributions are fitted with the templates derived with the nominal JES. The average variation of the top-quark mass is used to estimate the systematic uncertainty. The quadratic sum of

Table 2 List of systematic uncertainties with their contributions to the top-quark mass measurement

Source	Δm_t (GeV)
Jet energy scale	+0.90 −0.97
b-jet energy scale	+0.76 −0.66
Jet energy resolution	± 0.14
Lepton energy scale	± 0.14
Unclustered E_T^{miss}	± 0.12
b-tagging efficiency	± 0.05
Mistag rate	± 0.08
Fit calibration	± 0.40
Background normalization	± 0.05
Matching scale	± 0.19
Renormalisation and factorisation scale	± 0.55
Pileup	± 0.11
PDFs	± 0.09
Underlying event	± 0.26
Colour reconnection	± 0.13
Monte Carlo generator	± 0.04
Total	± 1.48

the variation for each source is taken as the systematic uncertainty. The uncertainty on pileup corrections to the jet energy calibration (five sources) correspond to a combined uncertainty of 0.53 GeV on m_t . Another important contribution is the overall data-to-simulation scale calibrated in photon + jet events, yielding a 0.51 GeV uncertainty. Other contributions are related to limited knowledge of the single-pion response ($^{+0.2}_{-0.3}$ GeV) and fragmentation models (0.3 GeV) used in the extrapolation as a function of jet p_T . We also include a time-dependent effect (0.2 GeV) related to variations in calorimeter response in the endcaps. Residual α -dependent corrections based on dijet balance studies (six sources) yield a negligible uncertainty on m_t (0.03 GeV). All these sources added in quadrature give a combined JES uncertainty of $^{+0.90}_{-0.97}$ GeV. The final component of JES uncertainty corresponds to the uncertainty on the modeling of jet flavour dependence of the jet energy scale ($^{+0.76}_{-0.66}$ GeV) which is quoted separately in Table 2.

The uncertainty due to jet energy resolution is evaluated from pseudo-experiments where the jet energy resolution width in the simulation is modified by $\pm 1\sigma$ with respect to its nominal width. The uncertainty on the lepton energy scale is observed to have an almost negligible effect on the measurement of m_t . The uncertainty in the E_T^{miss} scale is propagated to the measurement of m_t after subtracting the clustered (i.e. jet energy) and leptonic components, which are varied separately as previously described. This procedure takes into account possible correlations between the different sources of uncertainty. The scale of the residual unclustered energy contribution to the E_T^{miss} is varied by

$\pm 10\%$ and the corresponding variation of the top-quark mass measurement is evaluated from pseudo-experiments.

The uncertainty due to b-tagging efficiency was evaluated by varying the b-tagging efficiency and mistag rates of the algorithm by their respective uncertainties [27, 28]. The tagging rate was varied according to the flavour of the selected jet as determined from the simulation. This affects the multiplicity of b-tagged jets and the choice of the jets used in the reconstruction of m_t .

The effect of statistical fluctuations in the templates is estimated by splitting the $t\bar{t}$ sample in four independent subsamples and producing independent templates for each. Pseudo-experiments are performed using each new signal template, and the RMS variation of the average top-quark mass from each template is taken as an estimate of this uncertainty. The uncertainty on the calibration of the fit is added to the systematic uncertainty. The contribution from the uncertainty in the ratio between the signal and the background used in the fit is evaluated by varying by the corresponding uncertainty the expected number of events. The variation of the top-quark mass fit is assigned as a systematic uncertainty.

The effect due to the scale used to match clustered jets to partons (i.e. jet-parton matching) is estimated with dedicated samples generated by varying the nominal matching p_T thresholds from the default of 20 GeV down to 10 GeV and up to 40 GeV. Effects due to the definition of the renormalisation and factorisation scales used in the simulation of the signal are studied with dedicated Monte Carlo samples with both scales varied by factors of 2 or $\frac{1}{2}$.

The uncertainty due to pileup is evaluated from pseudo-experiments where the total inelastic cross section used to simulate the pileup is varied within its uncertainty, which is estimated to be 8%. The uncertainties related to the parton distribution function (PDF) used to model the hard scattering of the proton-proton collisions is evaluated from pseudo-experiments for which the distribution of m_t was obtained after varying parameters of the PDF by $\pm 1\sigma$ with respect to their nominal values and using the PDF4LHC prescription [14, 37, 38]. The differences found with respect to the nominal prediction are added in quadrature to obtain the total PDF uncertainty. The uncertainties due to the underlying event [13] and the colour reconnection [39] are evaluated with dedicated samples. The uncertainties due to the underlying event are estimated by comparing two alternative PYTHIA tunes with increased and decreased underlying event activity relative to a central tune. The results for the top-quark mass measured in pseudo-experiments using the Perugia 2011 tune are thus compared to the Perugia 2011 ‘mpiHi’ and Perugia 2011 Tevatron tunes [40]. The difference found between the two samples is taken as an estimate of the uncertainty in the modelling of the underlying event in our simulation. The Perugia 2011 ‘noCR’ tune is a variant in which colour reconnection effects are not taken into

account. The difference in the average top-quark mass, measured with and without colour reconnection effects, is taken as the estimate for the colour reconnection systematic uncertainty. Finally, the uncertainty due to the modelling of the signal templates by the Monte Carlo generator are studied by comparing the results of the pseudo-experiments using the reference sample to that from a sample generated with the POWHEG generator.

7 Measurement with the full kinematic analysis

An alternative measurement is performed using the KINb method [6] and a tighter event selection. The jet p_T is required to be at least 35 GeV and the reconstructed E_T^{miss} of $e\mu$ events is required to be at least 30 GeV. These tighter requirements are expected to improve the resolution of the method. In KINb, as in the AMWT method, the kinematic equations describing the $t\bar{t}$ system are solved many times per event for each lepton-jet combination. The longitudinal momentum of the $t\bar{t}$ system ($p_z^{t\bar{t}}$) is used as the extra constraint required to solve the equations. The jet p_T , the E_T^{miss} direction, and the $p_z^{t\bar{t}}$ are varied independently according to their resolutions in order to scan the kinematic phase space consistent with the $t\bar{t}$ system. The jet p_T resolution is obtained from the data [26]; the $p_z^{t\bar{t}}$ description, that is minimally dependent on m_t , is taken from simulation. The solution with the lowest invariant mass of the $t\bar{t}$ system is accepted if the mass difference between the top quark and antiquark masses is less than 3 GeV. The combination of leptons and jets yielding the largest number of solutions is chosen, and the mass value m_{KINb} is estimated by means of a Gaussian fit to the distribution of solutions in a 50 GeV window built around the most probable value. A key point in the method is the choice of the jets used to reconstruct the top-quark candidate, favouring jets that have higher value of the b-tagging discriminator. Simulations demonstrate that the proportion of events in which the jets used for the reconstruction are correctly matched to partons from top quark decays is increased significantly with respect to a choice based on the two jets with highest p_T . Only events with solutions contribute to the m_t measurement; in simulation, solutions are found for 80 % of signal events and 70 % of background events.

We use a two-component unbinned maximum-likelihood fit to the m_{KINb} distribution to mitigate the effect of background and signal events with misreconstructed top-quark masses and obtain an estimate of m_t . The free parameters of the likelihood are m_t and the numbers of signal and background events. The main background contribution is from the DY events, which is estimated from data using a template fit to the angle between the momenta of the two leptons. Depending on m_t , the signal and background templates may

resemble each other; therefore the number of background events is constrained by a Gaussian term in the likelihood function. The parameters of signal and background templates are taken from simulation and fixed in the fit. The signal shape is obtained with a simultaneous fit of simulated $t\bar{t}$ samples to a Gaussian plus Landau function template with parameters that are linear functions of m_t . Separate templates are used for the four samples corresponding to the same or different flavour dileptons with one or two and more b-tagged jets. In each category the backgrounds are added in the expected proportions. The expected distribution from DY events is determined from data near the Z peak ($76 < M_{\ell\ell} < 106$ GeV) for same-flavour dileptons. From simulation, the template obtained near the Z peak is expected to describe well DY events in the signal region. In the case of different-flavour dileptons we estimate the contribution from DY events using a data sample of $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$, by replacing the muons with fully simulated decays of τ leptons [41] and applying the event selection and top-quark mass reconstruction. For single top quark, diboson, and other residual backgrounds the templates are taken from simulation.

The fit is performed separately for same- and different-lepton flavour events with either one or at least two b-tagged jets using an unbinned likelihood method, where the inputs are the mass value returned by the KINb method in the data, and the probability density function for signal and background. The data in the range $100 < m_{\text{KINb}} < 300$ GeV is used in the fit. Figure 3 (inset) shows the variation of $-2\ln(\mathcal{L}/\mathcal{L}_{\text{max}})$ as a function of m_t , for the different categories individually and for all categories combined. For each event category the corresponding likelihood is maximised, yielding an estimate of the top-quark mass value as well as the expected numbers of signal and background events. The result of the fit for the category of events with the smallest background contamination ($e\mu$ events with at least two b-tagged jets) is shown in Fig. 3.

The expected contamination from background events and the result obtained from the fit in each category agree well. A combined unbinned likelihood is constructed in order to extract the final measurement of m_t from data. To minimise any residual bias resulting from the parameterisations of the signal and background m_{KINb} distributions, pseudo-experiments are performed using simulated dilepton events generated with different m_t values. The resulting m_t distributions are used to calibrate the parametrisation of the signal template. We find an average bias on m_t of 0.4 ± 0.2 GeV, which we use to correct our final value. We assign the envelope of the residual bias (0.2 GeV) as the systematic uncertainty associated with the fit.

Other sources of systematic uncertainty are similar and fully correlated with those in the AMWT analysis. We observe however that the KINb method is affected by larger




Fig. 3 Result of the fit to $e\mu$ events with at least two b-tagged jets using the KINb method. The inset shows the variation of the likelihood used to extract the top-quark mass, in the different event categories and for all channels combined

uncertainties compared to the AMWT method, reflecting the fact that the mass resolution is slightly poorer. The degradation of the resolution is related to the fact that a choice is made for the lepton-jet assignment in the event and that there is no reweighting of the solutions found based on any expectation for the kinematic properties, such as polarization effects which are intrinsically modelled by Eq. (2). We find no improvement in combining the AMWT and KINb given the difference in statistical uncertainty achieved and the dominance of the correlated systematic uncertainties. The KINb analysis is thus used as a cross-check, and we measure $m_t = 171.8 \pm 0.6$ (stat.) ± 2.2 (syst.) GeV, in agreement with the AMWT measurement.

8 Summary

In summary, a measurement of the top-quark mass from $t\bar{t}$ decays to dilepton final states is presented, using a data sample corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 5.0 fb^{-1} recorded by the CMS experiment at $\sqrt{s} = 7 \text{ TeV}$. The measurement yields $m_t = 172.5 \pm 0.4$ (stat.) ± 1.5 (syst.) GeV. An alternative measurement gives a consistent result. With respect to the previous measurement in the dilepton channel performed by CMS on the 36 pb^{-1} data collected in 2010 [6], the systematic uncertainty could be reduced substantially by improved understanding of the effect of pileup, underlying event and the uncertainty on the JES. To date, this measurement is the most precise determination of the top-quark mass in the dilepton channel.

Acknowledgements We congratulate our colleagues in the CERN accelerator departments for the excellent performance of the LHC machine. We thank the technical and administrative staff at CERN and other CMS institutes, and acknowledge support from: BMWF and

FWF (Austria); FNRS and FWO (Belgium); CNPq, CAPES, FAPERJ, and FAPESP (Brazil); MES (Bulgaria); CERN; CAS, MoST, and NSFC (China); COLCIENCIAS (Colombia); MSES (Croatia); RPF (Cyprus); MoER, SF0690030s09 and ERDF (Estonia); Academy of Finland, MEC, and HIP (Finland); CEA and CNRS/IN2P3 (France); BMBF, DFG, and HGF (Germany); GSRT (Greece); OTKA and NKTH (Hungary); DAE and DST (India); IPM (Iran); SFI (Ireland); INFN (Italy); NRF and WCU (Korea); LAS (Lithuania); CINVESTAV, CONACYT, SEP, and UASLP-FAI (Mexico); MSI (New Zealand); PAEC (Pakistan); MSHE and NSC (Poland); FCT (Portugal); JINR (Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, Ukraine, Uzbekistan); MON, RosAtom, RAS and RFBR (Russia); MSTD (Serbia); SEIDI and CPAN (Spain); Swiss Funding Agencies (Switzerland); NSC (Taipei); TUBITAK and TAIEK (Turkey); STFC (United Kingdom); DOE and NSF (USA).

Individuals have received support from the Marie-Curie programme and the European Research Council (European Union); the Leventis Foundation; the A.P. Sloan Foundation; the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation; the Austrian Science Fund (FWF); 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 Council of Science and Industrial Research, India; the Compagnia di San Paolo (Torino); and the HOMING PLUS programme of Foundation for Polish Science, cofinanced from European Union, Regional Development Fund.

Open Access This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License which permits any use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and the source are credited.

References

1. ALEPH, CDF, D0, DELPHI, L3, OPAL, SLD Collaborations, the LEP Electroweak Working Group, the Tevatron Electroweak Working Group, and the SLD Electroweak and Heavy Flavour Groups, Precision electroweak measurements and constraints on the Standard Model (2010). [arXiv:1012.2367](https://arxiv.org/abs/1012.2367)
2. H. Flücher et al., Revisiting the global electroweak fit of the Standard Model and beyond with Gfitter. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **60**, 543 (2009). doi:[10.1140/epjc/s10052-009-0966-6](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-009-0966-6), [arXiv:0811.0009](https://arxiv.org/abs/0811.0009)
3. CDF and D0 Collaborations, Combination of the top-quark mass measurements from the Tevatron collider. *Phys. Rev. D* (2012 submitted). [arXiv:1207.1069](https://arxiv.org/abs/1207.1069)
4. CDF Collaboration, Top quark mass measurement using the template method at CDF. *Phys. Rev. D* **83**, 111101 (2011). doi:[10.1103/PhysRevD.83.111101](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.83.111101), [arXiv:1105.0192](https://arxiv.org/abs/1105.0192)
5. D0 Collaboration, Measurement of the top quark mass in $p\bar{p}$ collisions using events with two leptons. *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 051103 (2012). doi:[10.1103/PhysRevD.86.051103](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.86.051103), [arXiv:1201.5172](https://arxiv.org/abs/1201.5172)
6. CMS Collaboration, Measurement of the $t\bar{t}$ production cross section and the top quark mass in the dilepton channel in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7 \text{ TeV}$. *J. High Energy Phys.* **1107**, 049 (2011). doi:[10.1007/JHEP07\(2011\)049](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07(2011)049), [arXiv:1105.5661](https://arxiv.org/abs/1105.5661)
7. ATLAS Collaboration, Measurement of the top quark mass with the template method in the $t\bar{t} \rightarrow$ lepton + jets channel using ATLAS data. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **72**, 2046 (2012). doi:[10.1140/epjc/s10052-012-2046-6](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-012-2046-6), [arXiv:1203.5755](https://arxiv.org/abs/1203.5755)
8. CMS Collaboration, Measurement of the top-quark mass in the lepton + jets final states in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7 \text{ TeV}$. *J. High Energy Phys.* (2012 submitted). [arXiv:1209.2319](https://arxiv.org/abs/1209.2319)
9. CMS Collaboration, The CMS experiment at the CERN LHC. *J. Instrum.* **03**, S08004 (2008). doi:[10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08004](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08004)

10. J. Alwall et al., MadGraph 5: going beyond. *J. High Energy Phys.* **1106**, 128 (2011). doi:[10.1007/JHEP06\(2011\)128](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP06(2011)128), arXiv:[1106.0522](https://arxiv.org/abs/1106.0522)
11. T. Sjöstrand, S. Mrenna, P.Z. Skands, PYTHIA 6.4 physics and manual. *J. High Energy Phys.* **05**, 026 (2006). doi:[10.1088/1126-6708/2006/05/026](https://doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2006/05/026), arXiv:[hep-ph/0603175](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0603175)
12. M.L. Mangano et al., Matching matrix elements and shower evolution for top-quark production in hadronic collisions. *J. High Energy Phys.* **01**, 013 (2007). doi:[10.1088/1126-6708/2007/01/013](https://doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2007/01/013), arXiv:[hep-ph/0611129](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0611129)
13. CMS Collaboration, Measurement of the underlying event activity at the LHC with $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV and comparison with $\sqrt{s} = 0.9$ TeV. *J. High Energy Phys.* **09**, 109 (2011). doi:[10.1007/JHEP09\(2011\)109](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP09(2011)109), arXiv:[1107.0330](https://arxiv.org/abs/1107.0330)
14. P.M. Nadolsky et al., Implications of CTEQ global analysis for collider observables. *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 013004 (2008). doi:[10.1103/PhysRevD.78.013004](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.78.013004), arXiv:[0802.0007](https://arxiv.org/abs/0802.0007)
15. N. Davidson et al., Universal interface of TAUOLA technical and physics documentation. *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **183**, 821 (2012). doi:[10.1016/j.cpc.2011.12.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpc.2011.12.009), arXiv:[1002.0543](https://arxiv.org/abs/1002.0543)
16. S. Frixione, P. Nason, C. Oleari, Matching NLO QCD computations with parton shower simulations: the POWHEG method. *J. High Energy Phys.* **11**, 070 (2007). doi:[10.1088/1126-6708/2007/11/070](https://doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2007/11/070), arXiv:[0709.2092](https://arxiv.org/abs/0709.2092)
17. U. Langenfeld, S. Moch, P. Uwer, Measuring the running top-quark mass. *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 054009 (2009). doi:[10.1103/PhysRevD.80.054009](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.80.054009), arXiv:[0906.5273](https://arxiv.org/abs/0906.5273)
18. M. Aliev et al., HATHOR: HAdronic Top and Heavy quarks crOss section calculator. *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **182**, 1034 (2011). doi:[10.1016/j.cpc.2010.12.040](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpc.2010.12.040), arXiv:[1007.1327](https://arxiv.org/abs/1007.1327)
19. N. Kidonakis, Two-loop soft anomalous dimensions for single top quark associated production with a W^- or H^- . *Phys. Rev. D* **82**, 054018 (2010). doi:[10.1103/PhysRevD.82.054018](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.82.054018), arXiv:[1005.4451](https://arxiv.org/abs/1005.4451)
20. K. Melnikov, F. Petriello, Electroweak gauge boson production at hadron colliders through $O(\alpha_s^2)$. *Phys. Rev. D* **74**, 114017 (2006). doi:[10.1103/PhysRevD.74.114017](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.74.114017), arXiv:[hep-ph/0609070](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0609070)
21. Particle Data Group Collaboration, Review of particle physics. *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 010001 (2012). doi:[10.1103/PhysRevD.86.010001](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.86.010001)
22. J.M. Campbell, R.K. Ellis, C. Williams, Vector boson pair production at the LHC. *J. High Energy Phys.* **1107**, 018 (2011). doi:[10.1007/JHEP07\(2011\)018](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07(2011)018), arXiv:[1105.0020](https://arxiv.org/abs/1105.0020)
23. GEANT4 Collaboration, GEANT4: a simulation toolkit. *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A, Accel. Spectrom. Detect. Assoc. Equip.* **506**, 250 (2003). doi:[10.1016/S0168-9002\(03\)01368-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9002(03)01368-8)
24. CMS Collaboration, Commissioning of the particle-flow reconstruction in minimum-bias and jet events from pp collisions at 7 TeV. CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-PFT-10-002 (2010)
25. M. Cacciari, G.P. Salam, G. Soyez, The anti- k_T jet clustering algorithm. *J. High Energy Phys.* **0804**, 063 (2008). doi:[10.1088/1126-6708/2008/04/063](https://doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2008/04/063), arXiv:[0802.1189](https://arxiv.org/abs/0802.1189)
26. CMS Collaboration, Determination of jet energy calibration and transverse momentum resolution in CMS. *J. Instrum.* **06**, P11002 (2011). doi:[10.1088/1748-0221/6/11/P11002](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/6/11/P11002), arXiv:[1107.4277](https://arxiv.org/abs/1107.4277)
27. CMS Collaboration, b-Jet identification in the CMS experiment. CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-BTV-11-004 (2012)
28. CMS Collaboration, Measurement of btagging efficiency using $t\bar{t}$ events. CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-BTV-11-003 (2012)
29. CMS Collaboration, Measurement of the $t\bar{t}$ production cross section in the dilepton channel in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV. *J. High Energy Phys.* (2012 submitted). arXiv:[1208.2671](https://arxiv.org/abs/1208.2671) [hep-ex]
30. CMS Collaboration, Measurement of the mass difference between top and antitop quarks. *J. High Energy Phys.* **1206**, 109 (2012). doi:[10.1007/JHEP06\(2012\)109](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP06(2012)109), arXiv:[1204.2807](https://arxiv.org/abs/1204.2807)
31. D0 Collaboration, Measurement of the top quark mass using dilepton events. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 2063 (1998). doi:[10.1103/PhysRevLett.80.2063](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.80.2063), arXiv:[hep-ex/9706014](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ex/9706014)
32. CDF Collaboration, Measurement of the top quark mass and $t\bar{t}$ production cross section from dilepton events at the collider detector at Fermilab. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 2779 (1998). doi:[10.1103/PhysRevLett.80.2779](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.80.2779), arXiv:[hep-ex/9802017](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ex/9802017)
33. L. Sonnenschein, Analytical solution of $t\bar{t}$ dilepton equations. *Phys. Rev. D* **73**(5), 054015 (2006). doi:[10.1103/PhysRevD.73.054015](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.73.054015), arXiv:[hep-ph/0603011](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0603011)
34. L. Sonnenschein, Erratum. *Phys. Rev. D* **78**(7), 079902 (2008). doi:[10.1103/PhysRevD.78.079902](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.78.079902)
35. L. Sonnenschein, Algebraic approach to solve $t\bar{t}$ dilepton equations. *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 095020 (2005). doi:[10.1103/PhysRevD.72.095020](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.72.095020), arXiv:[hep-ph/0510100](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0510100)
36. R.H. Dalitz, G.R. Goldstein, Decay and polarization properties of the top quark. *Phys. Rev. D* **45**, 1531 (1992). doi:[10.1103/PhysRevD.45.1531](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.45.1531)
37. H.-L. Lai et al., Uncertainty induced by QCD coupling in the CTEQ global analysis of parton distributions. *Phys. Rev. D* **82**, 054021 (2010). doi:[10.1103/PhysRevD.82.054021](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.82.054021), arXiv:[1004.4624](https://arxiv.org/abs/1004.4624)
38. M. Botje et al., The PDF4LHC working group interim recommendations. arXiv:[1101.0538](https://arxiv.org/abs/1101.0538) (2011)
39. D. Wicke, P.Z. Skands, Non-perturbative QCD effects and the top mass at the Tevatron. *Nuovo Cimento B* **123**, S1 (2008). doi:[10.1393/ncb/i2009-10749-y](https://doi.org/10.1393/ncb/i2009-10749-y), arXiv:[0807.3248](https://arxiv.org/abs/0807.3248)
40. P.Z. Skands, Tuning Monte Carlo generators: the Perugia tunes. *Phys. Rev. D* **82**, 074018 (2010). doi:[10.1103/PhysRevD.82.074018](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.82.074018), arXiv:[1005.3457](https://arxiv.org/abs/1005.3457)
41. CMS Collaboration, Search for neutral Higgs bosons decaying to tau pairs in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV. *Phys. Lett. B* **713**, 68 (2012). doi:[10.1016/j.physletb.2012.05.028](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2012.05.028), arXiv:[1202.4083](https://arxiv.org/abs/1202.4083)

The CMS Collaboration

Yerevan Physics Institute, Yerevan, Armenia

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

Institut für Hochenergiephysik der OeAW, Wien, Austria

W. Adam, E. Aguilo, T. Bergauer, M. Dragicevic, J. Erö, C. Fabjan¹, M. Friedl, R. Frühwirth¹, V.M. Ghete, J. Hammer, N. Hörmann, J. Hrubec, M. Jeitler¹, W. Kiesenhofer, V. Knünz, M. Krammer¹, I. Krätschmer, D. Liko, I. Mikulec, M. Pernicka[†], B. Rahbaran, C. Rohringer, H. Rohringer, R. Schöfbeck, J. Strauss, A. Taurok, W. Waltenberger, G. Walzel, E. Widl, C.-E. Wulz¹

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

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

Universiteit Antwerpen, Antwerpen, Belgium

M. Bansal, S. Bansal, T. Cornelis, E.A. De Wolf, X. Janssen, S. Luyckx, L. Mucibello, S. Ochesanu, B. Roland, R. Rougny, M. Selvaggi, Z. Staykova, H. Van Haeve, P. Van Mechelen, N. Van Remortel, A. Van Spilbeeck

Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussel, Belgium

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

Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium

B. Clerbaux, G. De Lentdecker, V. Dero, A.P.R. Gay, T. Hreus, A. Léonard, P.E. Marage, A. Mohammadi, T. Reis, L. Thomas, G. Vander Marcken, C. Vander Velde, P. Vanlaer, J. Wang

Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

V. Adler, K. Beernaert, A. Cimmino, S. Costantini, G. Garcia, M. Grunewald, B. Klein, J. Lellouch, A. Marinov, J. McCartin, A.A. Ocampo Rios, D. Ryckbosch, N. Strobbe, F. Thyssen, M. Tytgat, P. Verwilligen, S. Walsh, E. Yazgan, N. Zaganidis

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

S. Basegmez, G. Bruno, R. Castello, L. Ceard, C. Delaere, T. du Pree, D. Favart, L. Forthomme, A. Giammanco², J. Hollar, V. Lemaitre, J. Liao, O. Militaru, C. Nuttens, D. Pagano, A. Pin, K. Piotrkowski, N. Schul, J.M. Vizan Garcia

Université de Mons, Mons, Belgium

N. Bely, T. Caeberts, E. Daubie, G.H. Hammad

Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Físicas, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

G.A. Alves, M. Correa Martin Junior, D. De Jesus Damiao, T. Martins, M.E. Pol, M.H.G. Souza

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

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

Instituto de Física Teórica, Universidade Estadual Paulista, Sao Paulo, Brazil

T.S. Anjos³, C.A. Bernardes³, F.A. Dias⁴, T.R. Fernandez Perez Tomei, E.M. Gregores³, C. Lagana, F. Marinho, P.G. Mercadante³, S.F. Novaes, S.S. Padula

Institute for Nuclear Research and Nuclear Energy, Sofia, Bulgaria

V. Genchev⁵, P. Iaydjiev⁵, S. Piperov, M. Rodozov, S. Stoykova, G. Sultanov, V. Tcholakov, R. Trayanov, M. Vutova

University of Sofia, Sofia, Bulgaria

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

Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing, China

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

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

C. Asawatangtrakuldee, Y. Ban, S. Guo, Y. Guo, W. Li, S. Liu, Y. Mao, S.J. Qian, H. Teng, D. Wang, L. Zhang, B. Zhu, W. Zou

Universidad de Los Andes, Bogota, Colombia

C. Avila, J.P. Gomez, B. Gomez Moreno, A.F. Osorio Oliveros, J.C. Sanabria

Technical University of Split, Split, Croatia

N. Godinovic, D. Lelas, R. Plestina⁶, D. Polic, I. Puljak⁵

University of Split, Split, Croatia

Z. Antunovic, M. Kovac

Institute Rudjer Boskovic, Zagreb, Croatia

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

University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus

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

Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

M. Finger, M. Finger Jr.

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

Y. Assran⁷, S. Elgammal⁸, A. Ellithi Kamel⁹, S. Khalil⁸, M.A. Mahmoud¹⁰, A. Radi^{11,12}

National Institute of Chemical Physics and Biophysics, Tallinn, Estonia

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

Department of Physics, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

P. Eerola, G. Fedi, M. Voutilainen

Helsinki Institute of Physics, Helsinki, Finland

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

Lappeenranta University of Technology, Lappeenranta, Finland

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

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

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

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

S. Baffioni, F. Beaudette, L. Benhabib, L. Bianchini, M. Bluj¹³, C. Broutin, P. Busson, C. Charlot, N. Daci, T. Dahms, L. Dobrzynski, R. Granier de Cassagnac, M. Haguenaue, P. Miné, C. Mironov, I.N. Naranjo, M. Nguyen, C. Ochando, P. Paganini, D. Sabes, R. Salerno, Y. Sirois, C. Veelken, A. Zabi

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

J.-L. Agram¹⁴, J. Andrea, D. Bloch, D. Bodin, J.-M. Brom, M. Cardaci, E.C. Chabert, C. Collard, E. Conte¹⁴, F. Drouhin¹⁴, C. Ferro, J.-C. Fontaine¹⁴, D. Gelé, U. Goerlach, P. Juillot, A.-C. Le Bihan, P. Van Hove

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

F. Fassi, D. Mercier

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

S. Beauceron, N. Beaupere, O. Bondu, G. Boudoul, J. Chasserat, R. Chierici⁵, D. Contardo, P. Depasse, H. El Mamouni, J. Fay, S. Gascon, M. Gouzevitch, B. Ille, T. Kurca, M. Lethuillier, L. Mirabito, S. Perries, V. Sordini, Y. Tschudi, P. Verdier, S. Viret

E. Andronikashvili Institute of Physics, Academy of Science, Tbilisi, Georgia

V. Roinishvili

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

G. Anagnostou, S. Beranek, M. Edelhoff, L. Feld, N. Heracleous, O. Hindrichs, R. Jussen, K. Klein, J. Merz, A. Ostapchuk, A. Perieanu, F. Raupach, J. Sammet, S. Schael, D. Sprenger, H. Weber, B. Wittmer, V. Zhukov¹⁵

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

M. Ata, J. Caudron, E. Dietz-Laursonn, D. Duchardt, M. Erdmann, R. Fischer, A. Güth, T. Hebbeker, C. Heidemann, K. Hoepfner, D. Klingebiel, P. Kreuzer, C. Magass, M. Merschmeyer, A. Meyer, M. Olschewski, P. Papacz, H. Pieta, H. Reithler, S.A. Schmitz, L. Sonnenschein, J. Steggemann, D. Teyssier, M. Weber

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

M. Bontenackels, V. Cherepanov, Y. Erdogan, G. Flügge, H. Geenen, M. Geisler, W. Haj Ahmad, F. Hoehle, B. Kargoll, T. Kress, Y. Kuessel, A. Nowack, L. Perchalla, O. Pooth, P. Sauerland, A. Stahl

Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Hamburg, Germany

M. Aldaya Martin, J. Behr, W. Behrenhoff, U. Behrens, M. Bergholz¹⁶, A. Bethani, K. Borras, A. Burgmeier, A. Cakir, L. Calligaris, A. Campbell, E. Castro, F. Costanza, D. Dammann, C. Diez Pardos, G. Eckerlin, D. Eckstein, G. Flucke, A. Geiser, I. Glushkov, P. Gunnellini, S. Habib, J. Hauk, G. Hellwig, H. Jung, M. Kasemann, P. Katsas, C. Kleinwort, H. Kluge, A. Knutsson, M. Krämer, D. Krücker, E. Kuznetsova, W. Lange, W. Lohmann¹⁶, B. Lutz, R. Mankel, I. Marfin, M. Marienfeld, I.-A. Melzer-Pellmann, A.B. Meyer, J. Mnich, A. Mussgiller, S. Naumann-Emme, J. Olzem, H. Perrey, A. Petrukhin, D. Pitzl, A. Raspereza, P.M. Ribeiro Cipriano, C. Riedl, E. Ron, M. Rosin, J. Salfeld-Nebgen, R. Schmidt¹⁶, T. Schoerner-Sadenius, N. Sen, A. Spiridonov, M. Stein, R. Walsh, C. Wissing

University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany

C. Autermann, V. Blobel, J. Draeger, H. Enderle, J. Erfle, U. Gebbert, M. Görner, T. Hermanns, R.S. Höing, K. Kaschube, G. Kaussen, H. Kirschenmann, R. Klanner, J. Lange, B. Mura, F. Nowak, T. Peiffer, N. Pietsch, D. Rathjens, C. Sander, H. Schettler, P. Schleper, E. Schlieckau, A. Schmidt, M. Schröder, T. Schum, M. Seidel, V. Sola, H. Stadie, G. Steinbrück, J. Thomsen, L. Vanelderen

Institut für Experimentelle Kernphysik, Karlsruhe, Germany

C. Barth, J. Berger, C. Böser, T. Chwalek, W. De Boer, A. Descroix, A. Dierlamm, M. Feindt, M. Guthoff⁵, C. Hackstein, F. Hartmann, T. Hauth⁵, M. Heinrich, H. Held, K.H. Hoffmann, S. Honc, I. Katkov¹⁵, J.R. Komaragiri, P. Lobelle Pardo, D. Martschei, S. Mueller, Th. Müller, M. Niegel, A. Nürnberg, O. Oberst, A. Oehler, J. Ott, G. Quast, K. Rabbertz, F. Ratnikov, N. Ratnikova, S. Röcker, A. Scheurer, F.-P. Schilling, G. Schott, H.J. Simonis, F.M. Stober, D. Troendle, R. Ulrich, J. Wagner-Kuhr, S. Wayand, T. Weiler, M. Zeise

Institute of Nuclear Physics “Demokritos”, Aghia Paraskevi, Greece

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

University of Athens, Athens, Greece

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

University of Ioánnina, Ioánnina, Greece

I. Evangelou, C. Foudas, P. Kokkas, N. Manthos, I. Papadopoulos, V. Patras

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

G. Bencze, C. Hajdu, P. Hidas, D. Horvath¹⁷, F. Sikler, V. Veszpremi, G. Vesztergombi¹⁸

Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary

N. Beni, S. Czellar, J. Molnar, J. Palinkas, Z. Szillasi

University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary

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

Panjab University, Chandigarh, India

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

University of Delhi, Delhi, India

Ashok Kumar, Arun Kumar, S. Ahuja, A. Bhardwaj, B.C. Choudhary, S. Malhotra, M. Naimuddin, K. Ranjan, V. Sharma, R.K. Shivpuri

Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, Kolkata, India

S. Banerjee, S. Bhattacharya, S. Dutta, B. Gomber, Sa. Jain, Sh. Jain, R. Khurana, S. Sarkar, M. Sharan

Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, Mumbai, India

A. Abdulsalam, R.K. Choudhury, D. Dutta, S. Kailas, V. Kumar, P. Mehta, A.K. Mohanty⁵, L.M. Pant, P. Shukla

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-EHEP, Mumbai, India

T. Aziz, S. Ganguly, M. Guchait¹⁹, M. Maity²⁰, G. Majumder, K. Mazumdar, G.B. Mohanty, B. Parida, K. Sudhakar, N. Wickramage

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-HECR, Mumbai, India

S. Banerjee, S. Dugad

Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM), Tehran, IranH. Arfaei, H. Bakhshiansohi²¹, S.M. Etesami²², A. Fahim²¹, M. Hashemi, H. Hesari, A. Jafari²¹, M. Khakzad, M. Mohammadi Najafabadi, S. Paktinat Mehdiabadi, B. Safarzadeh²³, M. Zeinali²²**INFN Sezione di Bari^a, Università di Bari^b, Politecnico di Bari^c, Bari, Italy**M. Abbrescia^{a,b}, L. Barbone^{a,b}, C. Calabria^{a,b,5}, S.S. Chhibra^{a,b}, A. Colaleo^a, D. Creanza^{a,c}, N. De Filippis^{a,c,5}, M. De Palma^{a,b}, L. Fiore^a, G. Iaselli^{a,c}, L. Lusito^{a,b}, G. Maggi^{a,c}, M. Maggi^a, B. Marangelli^{a,b}, S. My^{a,c}, S. Nuzzo^{a,b}, N. Pacifico^{a,b}, A. Pompili^{a,b}, G. Pugliese^{a,c}, G. Selvaggi^{a,b}, L. Silvestris^a, G. Singh^{a,b}, R. Venditti^{a,b}, G. Zito^a**INFN Sezione di Bologna^a, Università di Bologna^b, Bologna, Italy**G. Abbiendi^a, A.C. Benvenuti^a, D. Bonacorsi^{a,b}, S. Braibant-Giacomelli^{a,b}, L. Brigliadori^{a,b}, P. Capiluppi^{a,b}, A. Castro^{a,b}, F.R. Cavallo^a, M. Cuffiani^{a,b}, G.M. Dallavalle^a, F. Fabbri^a, A. Fanfani^{a,b}, D. Fasanella^{a,b,5}, P. Giacomelli^a, C. Grandi^a, L. Guiducci^{a,b}, S. Marcellini^a, G. Masetti^a, M. Meneghelli^{a,b,5}, A. Montanari^a, F.L. Navarria^{a,b}, F. Odorici^a, A. Perrotta^a, F. Primavera^{a,b}, A.M. Rossi^{a,b}, T. Rovelli^{a,b}, G.P. Siroli^{a,b}, R. Travaglini^{a,b}**INFN Sezione di Catania^a, Università di Catania^b, Catania, Italy**S. Albergo^{a,b}, G. Cappello^{a,b}, M. Chiorboli^{a,b}, S. Costa^{a,b}, R. Potenza^{a,b}, A. Tricomi^{a,b}, C. Tuve^{a,b}**INFN Sezione di Firenze^a, Università di Firenze^b, Firenze, Italy**G. Barbagli^a, V. Ciulli^{a,b}, C. Civinini^a, R. D'Alessandro^{a,b}, E. Focardi^{a,b}, S. Frosali^{a,b}, E. Gallo^a, S. Gonzi^{a,b}, M. Meschini^a, S. Paoletti^a, G. Sguazzoni^a, A. Tropiano^a**INFN Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, Frascati, Italy**L. Benussi, S. Bianco, S. Colafranceschi²⁴, F. Fabbri, D. Piccolo**INFN Sezione di Genova^a, Università di Genova^b, Genova, Italy**P. Fabbricatore^a, R. Musenich^a, S. Tosi^{a,b}**INFN Sezione di Milano-Bicocca^a, Università di Milano-Bicocca^b, Milano, Italy**A. Benaglia^{a,b,5}, F. De Guio^{a,b}, L. Di Matteo^{a,b,5}, S. Fiorendi^{a,b}, S. Gennai^{a,5}, A. Ghezzi^{a,b}, S. Malvezzi^a, R.A. Manzoni^{a,b}, A. Martelli^{a,b}, A. Massironi^{a,b,5}, D. Menasce^a, L. Moroni^a, M. Paganoni^{a,b}, D. Pedrini^a, S. Ragazzi^{a,b}, N. Redaelli^a, S. Sala^a, T. Tabarelli de Fatis^{a,b}**INFN Sezione di Napoli^a, Università di Napoli "Federico II"^b, Napoli, Italy**S. Buontempo^a, C.A. Carrillo Montoya^a, N. Cavallo^{a,25}, A. De Cosa^{a,b,5}, O. Dogangun^{a,b}, F. Fabozzi^{a,25}, A.O.M. Iorio^a, L. Lista^a, S. Meola^{a,26}, M. Merola^{a,b}, P. Paolucci^{a,5}**INFN Sezione di Padova^a, Università di Padova^b, Università di Trento (Trento)^c, Padova, Italy**P. Azzi^a, N. Bacchetta^{a,5}, D. Bisello^{a,b}, A. Branca^{a,5}, R. Carlin^{a,b}, P. Checchia^a, T. Dorigo^a, F. Gasparini^{a,b}, U. Gasparini^{a,b}, A. Gozzelino^a, K. Kanishchev^{a,c}, S. Lacaprarà^a, I. Lazzizzera^{a,c}, M. Margoni^{a,b}, A.T. Meneguzzo^{a,b}, M. Michelotto^a, J. Pazzini^{a,b}, N. Pozzobon^{a,b}, P. Ronchese^{a,b}, F. Simonetto^{a,b}, E. Torassa^a, M. Tosi^{a,b,5}, S. Vanini^{a,b}, P. Zotto^{a,b}, G. Zumerle^{a,b}**INFN Sezione di Pavia^a, Università di Pavia^b, Pavia, Italy**M. Gabusi^{a,b}, S.P. Ratti^{a,b}, C. Riccardi^{a,b}, P. Torre^{a,b}, P. Vitulo^{a,b}**INFN Sezione di Perugia^a, Università di Perugia^b, Perugia, Italy**M. Biasini^{a,b}, G.M. Bilei^a, L. Fanò^{a,b}, P. Lariccia^{a,b}, A. Lucaroni^{a,b,5}, G. Mantovani^{a,b}, M. Menichelli^a, A. Nappi^{a,b,†}, F. Romeo^{a,b}, A. Saha^a, A. Santocchia^{a,b}, A. Spiezia^{a,b}, S. Taroni^{a,b}**INFN Sezione di Pisa^a, Università di Pisa^b, Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa^c, Pisa, Italy**P. Azzurri^{a,c}, G. Bagliesi^a, T. Boccali^a, G. Broccolo^{a,c}, R. Castaldi^a, R.T. D'Agnolo^{a,c}, R. Dell'Orso^a, F. Fiori^{a,b,5}, L. Foà^{a,c}, A. Giassi^a, A. Kraan^a, F. Ligabue^{a,c}, T. Lomtadze^a, L. Martini^{a,27}, A. Messineo^{a,b}, F. Palla^a, A. Rizzi^{a,b}, A.T. Serban^{a,28}, P. Spagnolo^a, P. Squillacioti^{a,5}, R. Tenchini^a, G. Tonelli^{a,b,5}, A. Venturi^a, P.G. Verdini^a**INFN Sezione di Roma^a, Università di Roma "La Sapienza"^b, Roma, Italy**L. Barone^{a,b}, F. Cavallari^a, D. Del Re^{a,b}, M. Diemoz^a, C. Fanelli^{a,b}, M. Grassi^{a,b,5}, E. Longo^{a,b}, P. Meridiani^{a,5}, F. Micheli^{a,b}, S. Nourbakhsh^{a,b}, G. Organtini^{a,b}, R. Paramatti^a, S. Rahatlou^{a,b}, M. Sigamani^a, L. Soffi^{a,b}

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

N. Amapane^{a,b}, R. Arcidiacono^{a,c}, S. Argiro^{a,b}, M. Arneodo^{a,c}, C. Biino^a, N. Cartiglia^{a,b}, M. Costa^{a,b}, G. Dellacasa^a, N. Demaria^a, C. Mariotti^{a,5}, S. Maselli^a, E. Migliore^{a,b}, V. Monaco^{a,b}, M. Musich^{a,5}, M.M. Obertino^{a,c}, N. Pastrone^a, M. Pelliccioni^a, A. Potenza^{a,b}, A. Romero^{a,b}, R. Sacchi^{a,b}, A. Solano^{a,b}, A. Staiano^a, A. Vilela Pereira^a

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

S. Belforte^a, V. Candelise^{a,b}, F. Cossutti^a, G. Della Ricca^{a,b}, B. Gobbo^a, M. Marone^{a,b,5}, D. Montanino^{a,b,5}, A. Penzo^a, A. Schizzi^{a,b}

Kangwon National University, Chunchon, Korea

S.G. Heo, T.Y. Kim, S.K. Nam

Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea

S. Chang, D.H. Kim, G.N. Kim, D.J. Kong, H. Park, S.R. Ro, D.C. Son, T. Son

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

J.Y. Kim, Z.J. Kim, S. Song

Korea University, Seoul, Korea

S. Choi, D. Gyun, B. Hong, M. Jo, H. Kim, T.J. Kim, K.S. Lee, D.H. Moon, S.K. Park

University of Seoul, Seoul, Korea

M. Choi, J.H. Kim, C. Park, I.C. Park, S. Park, G. Ryu

Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon, Korea

Y. Cho, Y. Choi, Y.K. Choi, J. Goh, M.S. Kim, E. Kwon, B. Lee, J. Lee, S. Lee, H. Seo, I. Yu

Vilnius University, Vilnius, Lithuania

M.J. Bilinskas, I. Grigelionis, M. Janulis, A. Juodagalvis

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

H. Castilla-Valdez, E. De La Cruz-Burelo, I. Heredia-de La Cruz, R. Lopez-Fernandez, R. Magaña Villalba, J. Martínez-Ortega, A. Sánchez-Hernández, L.M. Villaseñor-Cendejas

Universidad Iberoamericana, Mexico City, Mexico

S. Carrillo Moreno, F. Vazquez Valencia

Benemerita Universidad Autonoma de Puebla, Puebla, Mexico

H.A. Salazar Ibarquen

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

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

University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

D. Krofcheck

University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand

A.J. Bell, P.H. Butler, R. Doesburg, S. Reucroft, H. Silverwood

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

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

National Centre for Nuclear Research, Swierk, Poland

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

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

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

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

N. Almeida, A. Alves, P. Bargassa, A. David, P. Faccioli, P.G. Ferreira Parracho, M. Gallinaro, J. Seixas, J. Varela, P. Vischia

Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia

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

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

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

Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia

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

Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia

V. Epshteyn, M. Erofeeva, V. Gavrillov, M. Kossov, N. Lychkovskaya, V. Popov, G. Safronov, S. Semenov, V. Stolin, E. Vlasov, A. Zhokin

Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia

A. Belyaev, E. Boos, V. Bunichev, M. Dubinin⁴, L. Dudko, A. Ershov, V. Klyukhin, O. Kodolova, I. Lokhtin, A. Markina, S. Obraztsov, M. Perfilov, S. Petrushanko, A. Popov, L. Sarycheva[†], V. Savrin, A. Snigirev

P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia

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

State Research Center of Russian Federation, Institute for High Energy Physics, Protvino, Russia

I. Azhgirey, I. Bayshev, S. Bitioukov, V. Grishin⁵, V. Kachanov, D. Konstantinov, A. Korablev, V. Krychkin, V. Petrov, R. Ryutin, A. Sobol, L. Tourtchanovitch, S. Troshin, N. Tyurin, A. Uzunian, A. Volkov

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

P. Adzic²⁹, M. Djordjevic, M. Ekmedzic, D. Krpic²⁹, J. Milosevic

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

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

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain

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

Universidad de Oviedo, Oviedo, Spain

H. Brun, J. Cuevas, J. Fernandez Menendez, S. Folgueras, I. Gonzalez Caballero, L. Lloret Iglesias, J. Piedra Gomez

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

J.A. Brochero Cifuentes, I.J. Cabrillo, A. Calderon, S.H. Chuang, J. Duarte Campderros, M. Felcini³⁰, M. Fernandez, G. Gomez, J. Gonzalez Sanchez, A. Graziano, C. Jorda, A. Lopez Virto, J. Marco, R. Marco, C. Martinez Rivero, F. Matorras, F.J. Munoz Sanchez, T. Rodrigo, A.Y. Rodríguez-Marrero, A. Ruiz-Jimeno, L. Scodellaro, M. Sobron Sanudo, I. Vila, R. Vilar Cortabitarte

CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland

D. Abbaneo, E. Auffray, G. Auzinger, P. Baillon, A.H. Ball, D. Barney, J.F. Benitez, C. Bernet⁶, G. Bianchi, P. Bloch, A. Bocci, A. Bonato, C. Botta, H. Breuker, T. Camporesi, G. Cerminara, T. Christiansen, J.A. Coarasa Perez, D. D'Enterria, A. Dabrowski, A. De Roeck, S. Di Guida, M. Dobson, N. Dupont-Sagorin, A. Elliott-Peisert, B. Frisch, W. Funk, G. Georgiou, M. Giffels, D. Gigi, K. Gill, D. Giordano, M. Giunta, F. Glege, R. Gomez-Reino Garrido, P. Govoni, S. Gowdy, R. Guida, M. Hansen, P. Harris, C. Hartl, J. Harvey, B. Hegner, A. Hinzmann, V. Innocente, P. Janot, K. Kaadze, E. Karavakis, K. Kousouris, P. Lecoq, Y.-J. Lee, P. Lenzi, C. Lourenço, T. Mäki, M. Malberti, L. Malgeri, M. Mannelli, L. Masetti, F. Meijers, S. Mersi, E. Meschi, R. Moser, M.U. Mozer, M. Mulders, P. Musella, E. Nesvold, T. Orimoto, L. Orsini, E. Palencia Cortezon, E. Perez, L. Perrozzi, A. Petrilli, A. Pfeiffer, M. Pierini, M. Pimiä, D. Piparo, G. Polese, L. Quertenmont, A. Racz, W. Reece, J. Rodrigues Antunes, G. Rolandi³¹, C. Rovelli³², M. Rovere, H. Sakulin, F. Santanastasio, C. Schäfer, C. Schwick, I. Segoni, S. Sekmen, A. Sharma, P. Siegrist, P. Silva, M. Simon, P. Sphicas³³, D. Spiga, A. Tsirou, G.I. Veres¹⁸, J.R. Vlimant, H.K. Wöhri, S.D. Worm³⁴, W.D. Zeuner

Paul Scherrer Institut, Villigen, Switzerland

W. Bertl, K. Deiters, W. Erdmann, K. Gabathuler, R. Horisberger, Q. Ingram, H.C. Kaestli, S. König, D. Kotlinski, U. Langenegger, F. Meier, D. Renker, T. Rohe, J. Sibille³⁵

Institute for Particle Physics, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

L. Bäni, P. Bortignon, M.A. Buchmann, B. Casal, N. Chanon, A. Deisher, G. Dissertori, M. Dittmar, M. Donegà, M. Dünser, J. Eugster, K. Freudenreich, C. Grab, D. Hits, P. Lecomte, W. Luster, A.C. Marini, P. Martinez Ruiz del Arbol, N. Mohr, F. Moortgat, C. Nägeli³⁶, P. Nef, F. Nessi-Tedaldi, F. Pandolfi, L. Pape, F. Pauss, M. Peruzzi, F.J. Ronga, M. Rossini, L. Sala, A.K. Sanchez, A. Starodumov³⁷, B. Stieger, M. Takahashi, L. Tauscher[†], A. Thea, K. Theofilatos, D. Treille, C. Urscheler, R. Wallny, H.A. Weber, L. Wehrli

Universität Zürich, Zurich, Switzerland

C. AMSLER, V. Chiochia, S. De Visscher, C. Favaro, M. Ivova Rikova, B. Millan Mejias, P. Otiougova, P. Robmann, H. Snoek, S. Toppiti, M. Verzetti

National Central University, Chung-Li, Taiwan

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

National Taiwan University (NTU), Taipei, Taiwan

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

Cukurova University, Adana, Turkey

A. Adiguzel, M.N. Bakirci³⁸, S. Cerci³⁹, C. Dozen, I. Dumanoglu, E. Eskut, S. Girgis, G. Gokbulut, E. Gurpinar, I. Hos, E.E. Kangal, T. Karaman, G. Karapinar⁴⁰, A. Kayis Topaksu, G. Onengut, K. Ozdemir, S. Ozturk⁴¹, A. Polatoz, K. Sogut⁴², D. Sunar Cerci³⁹, B. Tali³⁹, H. Topakli³⁸, L.N. Vergili, M. Vergili

Middle East Technical University, Physics Department, Ankara, Turkey

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

Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey

E. Gülmez, B. Isildak⁴³, M. Kaya⁴⁴, O. Kaya⁴⁴, S. Ozkorucuklu⁴⁵, N. Sonmez⁴⁶

Istanbul Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey

K. Cankocak

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

L. Levchuk

University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom

F. Bostock, J.J. Brooke, E. Clement, D. Cussans, H. Flacher, R. Frazier, J. Goldstein, M. Grimes, G.P. Heath, H.F. Heath, L. Kreczko, S. Metson, D.M. Newbold³⁴, K. Nirunpong, A. Poll, S. Senkin, V.J. Smith, T. Williams

Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom

L. Basso⁴⁷, K.W. Bell, A. Belyaev⁴⁷, C. Brew, R.M. Brown, D.J.A. Cockerill, J.A. Coughlan, K. Harder, S. Harper, J. Jackson, B.W. Kennedy, E. Olaiya, D. Petyt, B.C. Radburn-Smith, C.H. Shepherd-Themistocleous, I.R. Tomalin, W.J. Womersley

Imperial College, London, United Kingdom

R. Bainbridge, G. Ball, R. Beuselinck, O. Buchmuller, D. Colling, N. Cripps, M. Cutajar, P. Dauncey, G. Davies, M. Della Negra, W. Ferguson, J. Fulcher, D. Futyan, A. Gilbert, A. Guneratne Bryer, G. Hall, Z. Hatherell, J. Hays, G. Iles, M. Jarvis, G. Karapostoli, L. Lyons, A.-M. Magnan, J. Marrouche, B. Mathias, R. Nandi, J. Nash, A. Nikitenko³⁷, A. Papageorgiou, J. Pela, M. Pesaresi, K. Petridis, M. Pioppi⁴⁸, D.M. Raymond, S. Rogerson, A. Rose, M.J. Ryan, C. Seez, P. Sharp[†], A. Sparrow, M. Stoye, A. Tapper, M. Vazquez Acosta, T. Virdee, S. Wakefield, N. Wardle, T. Whyntie

Brunel University, Uxbridge, United Kingdom

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

Baylor University, Waco, USA

K. Hatakeyama, H. Liu, T. Scarborough

The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, USA

O. Charaf, C. Henderson, P. Rumerio

Boston University, Boston, USA

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

Brown University, Providence, USA

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

University of California, Davis, Davis, USA

R. Breedon, G. Breto, M. Calderon De La Barca Sanchez, S. Chauhan, M. Chertok, J. Conway, R. Conway, P.T. Cox, J. Dolen, R. Erbacher, M. Gardner, R. Houtz, W. Ko, A. Kopecky, R. Lander, T. Miceli, D. Pellett, F. Ricci-tam, B. Rutherford, M. Searle, J. Smith, M. Squires, M. Tripathi, R. Vasquez Sierra

University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, USA

V. Andreev, D. Cline, R. Cousins, J. Duris, S. Erhan, P. Everaerts, C. Farrell, J. Hauser, M. Ignatenko, C. Jarvis, C. Plager, G. Rakness, P. Schlein[†], P. Traczyk, V. Valuev, M. Weber

University of California, Riverside, Riverside, USA

J. Babb, R. Clare, M.E. Dinardo, J. Ellison, J.W. Gary, F. Giordano, G. Hanson, G.Y. Jeng⁴⁹, H. Liu, O.R. Long, A. Luthra, H. Nguyen, S. Paramesvaran, J. Sturdy, S. Sumowidagdo, R. Wilken, S. Wimpenny

University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, USA

W. Andrews, J.G. Branson, G.B. Cerati, S. Cittolin, D. Evans, F. Golf, A. Holzner, R. Kelley, M. Lebourgeois, J. Letts, I. Macneill, B. Mangano, S. Padhi, C. Palmer, G. Petrucciani, M. Pieri, M. Sani, V. Sharma, S. Simon, E. Sudano, M. Tadel, Y. Tu, A. Vartak, S. Wasserbaech⁵⁰, F. Würthwein, A. Yagil, J. Yoo

University of California, Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, USA

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

California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA

A. Apresyan, A. Bornheim, Y. Chen, E. Di Marco, J. Duarte, M. Gataullin, Y. Ma, A. Mott, H.B. Newman, C. Rogan, M. Spiropulu, V. Timciuc, J. Veverka, R. Wilkinson, S. Xie, Y. Yang, R. Y. Zhu

Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, USA

B. Akgun, V. Azzolini, A. Calamba, R. Carroll, T. Ferguson, Y. Iiyama, D.W. Jang, Y.F. Liu, M. Paulini, H. Vogel, I. Vorobiev

University of Colorado at Boulder, Boulder, USA

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

Cornell University, Ithaca, USA

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

Fairfield University, Fairfield, USA

D. Winn

Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, USA

S. Abdullin, M. Albrow, J. Anderson, L.A.T. Bauerdick, A. Beretvas, J. Berryhill, P.C. Bhat, I. Bloch, K. Burkett, J.N. Butler, V. Chetluru, H.W.K. Cheung, F. Chlebana, V.D. Elvira, I. Fisk, J. Freeman, Y. Gao, D. Green, O. Gutsche, J. Hanlon, R.M. Harris, J. Hirschauer, B. Hooperman, S. Jindariani, M. Johnson, U. Joshi, B. Kilminster, B. Klima, S. Kunori, S. Kwan, C. Leonidopoulos, J. Linacre, D. Lincoln, R. Lipton, J. Lykken, K. Maeshima, J.M. Marraffino, S. Maruyama, D. Mason, P. McBride, K. Mishra, S. Mrenna, Y. Musienko⁵¹, C. Newman-Holmes, V. O'Dell, O. Prokofyev, E. Sexton-Kennedy, S. Sharma, W.J. Spalding, L. Spiegel, P. Tan, L. Taylor, S. Tkaczyk, N.V. Tran, L. Uplegger, E.W. Vaandering, R. Vidal, J. Whitmore, W. Wu, F. Yang, F. Yumiceva, J.C. Yun

University of Florida, Gainesville, USA

D. Acosta, P. Avery, D. Bourilkov, M. Chen, T. Cheng, S. Das, M. De Gruttola, G.P. Di Giovanni, D. Dobur, A. Drozdetskiy, R.D. Field, M. Fisher, Y. Fu, I.K. Furic, J. Gartner, J. Hugon, B. Kim, J. Konigsberg, A. Korytov, A. Kropivnitskaya, T. Kypreos, J.F. Low, K. Matchev, P. Milenovic⁵², G. Mitselmakher, L. Muniz, R. Remington, A. Rinkevicius, P. Sellers, N. Skhirtladze, M. Snowball, J. Yelton, M. Zakaria

Florida International University, Miami, USA

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

Florida State University, Tallahassee, USA

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

Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, USA

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

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

M.R. Adams, I.M. Anghel, L. Apanasevich, Y. Bai, V.E. Bazterra, R.R. Betts, I. Bucinskaite, J. Callner, R. Cavanaugh, C. Dragoiu, O. Evdokimov, L. Gauthier, C.E. Gerber, D.J. Hofman, S. Khalatyan, F. Lacroix, M. Malek, C. O'Brien, C. Silkworth, D. Strom, N. Varelas

The University of Iowa, Iowa City, USA

U. Akgun, E.A. Albayrak, B. Bilki⁵³, W. Clarida, F. Duru, S. Griffiths, J.-P. Merlo, H. Mermerkaya⁵⁴, A. Mestvirishvili, A. Moeller, J. Nachtman, C.R. Newsom, E. Norbeck, Y. Onel, F. Ozok, S. Sen, E. Tiras, J. Wetzel, T. Yetkin, K. Yi

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA

B.A. Barnett, B. Blumenfeld, S. Bolognesi, D. Fehling, G. Giurciu, A.V. Gritsan, Z.J. Guo, G. Hu, P. Maksimovic, S. Rappoccio, M. Swartz, A. Whitbeck

The University of Kansas, Lawrence, USA

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

Kansas State University, Manhattan, USA

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

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, USA

J. Gronberg, D. Lange, D. Wright

University of Maryland, College Park, USA

A. Baden, M. Boutemour, B. Calvert, S.C. Eno, J.A. Gomez, N.J. Hadley, R.G. Kellogg, M. Kirn, T. Kolberg, Y. Lu, M. Marionneau, A.C. Mignerey, K. Pedro, A. Peterman, A. Skuja, J. Temple, M.B. Tonjes, S.C. Tonwar, E. Twedt

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, USA

A. Apyan, G. Bauer, J. Bendavid, W. Busza, E. Butz, I.A. Cali, M. Chan, V. Dutta, G. Gomez Ceballos, M. Goncharov, K.A. Hahn, Y. Kim, M. Klute, K. Krajczar⁵⁵, W. Li, P.D. Luckey, T. Ma, S. Nahn, C. Paus, D. Ralph, C. Roland, G. Roland, M. Rudolph, G.S.F. Stephans, F. Stöckli, K. Sumorok, K. Sung, D. Velicanu, E.A. Wenger, R. Wolf, B. Wyslouch, M. Yang, Y. Yilmaz, A.S. Yoon, M. Zanetti

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, USA

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

University of Mississippi, Oxford, USA

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

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, USA

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

State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, USA

U. Baur, A. Godshalk, I. Iashvili, S. Jain, A. Kharchilava, A. Kumar, S.P. Shipkowski, K. Smith

Northeastern University, Boston, USA

G. Alverson, E. Barberis, D. Baumgartel, M. Chasco, J. Haley, D. Nash, D. Trocino, D. Wood, J. Zhang

Northwestern University, Evanston, USA

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

University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, USA

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

The Ohio State University, Columbus, USA

B. Bylsma, L.S. Durkin, C. Hill, R. Hughes, R. Hughes, K. Kotov, T.Y. Ling, D. Puigh, M. Rodenburg, C. Vuosalo, G. Williams, B.L. Winer

Princeton University, Princeton, USA

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

University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez, USA

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

Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA

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

Purdue University Calumet, Hammond, USA

S. Guragain, N. Parashar

Rice University, Houston, USA

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

University of Rochester, Rochester, USA

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

The Rockefeller University, New York, USA

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

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

S. Arora, A. Barker, J.P. Chou, C. Contreras-Campana, E. Contreras-Campana, D. Duggan, D. Ferencek, Y. Gershtein, R. Gray, E. Halkiadakis, D. Hidas, A. Lath, S. Panwalkar, M. Park, R. Patel, V. Rekovic, J. Robles, K. Rose, S. Salur, S. Schnetzer, C. Seitz, S. Somalwar, R. Stone, S. Thomas

University of Tennessee, Knoxville, USA

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

Texas A&M University, College Station, USA

R. Eusebi, W. Flanagan, J. Gilmore, T. Kamon⁵⁶, V. Khotilovich, R. Montalvo, I. Osipenkov, Y. Pakhotin, A. Perloff, J. Roe, A. Safonov, T. Sakuma, S. Sengupta, I. Suarez, A. Tatarinov, D. Toback

Texas Tech University, Lubbock, USA

N. Akchurin, J. Damgov, P.R. Duderu, C. Jeong, K. Kovitangoon, S.W. Lee, T. Libeiro, Y. Roh, I. Volobouev

Vanderbilt University, Nashville, USA

E. Appelt, A.G. Delannoy, C. Florez, S. Greene, A. Gurrola, W. Johns, C. Johnston, P. Kurt, C. Maguire, A. Melo, M. Sharma, P. Sheldon, B. Snook, S. Tuo, J. Velkovska

University of Virginia, Charlottesville, USA

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

Wayne State University, Detroit, USA

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

University of Wisconsin, Madison, USA

M. Anderson, M. Bachtis, D. Belknap, L. Borrello, D. Carlsmith, M. Cepeda, S. Dasu, E. Friis, L. Gray, K.S. Grogg, M. Grothe, R. Hall-Wilton, M. Herndon, A. Hervé, P. Klabbbers, J. Klukas, A. Lanaro, C. Lazaridis, J. Leonard, R. Loveless, A. Mohapatra, I. Ojalvo, F. Palmonari, G.A. Pierro, I. Ross, A. Savin, W.H. Smith, J. Swanson

†: Deceased

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

- 46: Also at Ege University, Izmir, Turkey
- 47: Also at School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southampton, Southampton, United Kingdom
- 48: Also at INFN Sezione di Perugia; Università di Perugia, Perugia, Italy
- 49: Also at University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia
- 50: Also at Utah Valley University, Orem, USA
- 51: Also at Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia
- 52: Also at University of Belgrade, Faculty of Physics and Vinca Institute of Nuclear Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia
- 53: Also at Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, USA
- 54: Also at Erzincan University, Erzincan, Turkey
- 55: Also at KFKI Research Institute for Particle and Nuclear Physics, Budapest, Hungary
- 56: Also at Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea