

CERN-EP/2016-249
2016/11/01

CMS-TOP-12-031

Measurement of the mass difference between top quark and antiquark in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV

The CMS Collaboration*

Abstract

The invariance of the standard model (SM) under the CPT transformation predicts equality of particle and antiparticle masses. This prediction is tested by measuring the mass difference between the top quark and antiquark ($\Delta m_t = m_t - m_{\bar{t}}$) that are produced in pp collisions at a center-of-mass energy of 8 TeV, using events with a muon or an electron and at least four jets in the final state. The analysis is based on data corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 19.6 fb^{-1} collected by the CMS experiment at the LHC, and yields a value of $\Delta m_t = -0.15 \pm 0.19 \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.09 \text{ (syst)} \text{ GeV}$, which is consistent with the SM expectation. This result is significantly more precise than previously reported measurements.

Submitted to Physics Letters B

1 Introduction

Symmetries such as charge conjugation (C), parity or space reflection (P), and time reversal (T) play a fundamental role in the standard model (SM) of particle physics [1–3]. The invariance of the SM under their combination, the CPT symmetry, predicts equality of particle and antiparticle masses, and thus far experiments have confirmed this prediction [4]. In some extensions of the SM, however, CPT-violating effects are present [5–8]. The large number of top quarks produced in proton-proton (pp) collisions at the CERN LHC provides an opportunity to test CPT symmetry in the quark sector for the most massive particle of the SM through a precise measurement of the difference in mass between the top quark (t) and its antiparticle (\bar{t}), $\Delta m_t \equiv m_t - m_{\bar{t}}$. This quantity has been measured previously in $p\bar{p}$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 1.96$ TeV by the CDF and D0 experiments, and in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV by the ATLAS and CMS experiments. The CDF measurement of $\Delta m_t = -3.3 \pm 1.4$ (stat) ± 1.0 (syst) GeV [9] is almost two standard deviations away from the SM value. However, the subsequent measurements by D0, CMS, and ATLAS, yielding 0.8 ± 1.8 (stat) ± 0.5 (syst) GeV [10], -0.44 ± 0.46 (stat) ± 0.27 (syst) GeV [11], and 0.67 ± 0.61 (stat) ± 0.41 (syst) GeV [12], respectively, are all in agreement with CPT symmetry. This article presents a measurement performed with the CMS [13] detector at the LHC. It represents the first determination of Δm_t at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV. While the same techniques as for the previous Δm_t measurement by CMS [11] are used, both the statistical and the systematic uncertainty are significantly reduced. The event selection is optimized for $t\bar{t}$ production where one of the W bosons decays hadronically ($t \rightarrow bW^+ \rightarrow bq\bar{q}'$, or its charge conjugate) and the other decays leptonically ($t \rightarrow bW^+ \rightarrow b\ell^+\nu_\ell$, or its charge conjugate), with ℓ corresponding to either an electron or a muon (including also decays to τ leptons where the τ decays leptonically). The data are split into ℓ^- and ℓ^+ samples that contain three-jet decays of the associated top quarks or antiquarks, respectively. For each event category, the ideogram likelihood method [14] is used to measure m_t and $m_{\bar{t}}$, from which their difference is obtained.

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. The field volume houses a silicon pixel and strip tracker, a crystal electromagnetic calorimeter (ECAL), and a brass/scintillator hadron calorimeter (HCAL). The inner tracker reconstructs charged-particle trajectories within the pseudorapidity range $|\eta| < 2.5$. The tracker provides an impact parameter resolution of 20–30 μm and a resolution of the momentum transverse to the beam direction (p_T) of 1–3% for 10 GeV charged particles. Muons are measured for $|\eta| < 2.4$ using detection planes based on three technologies: drift tubes, cathode-strip chambers, and resistive plate chambers. Matching outer muon trajectories to tracks measured in the silicon tracker provides a p_T resolution of 1–6% for the p_T values relevant to this analysis [15]. In the region of $|\eta| < 1.74$, the HCAL cells have widths of 0.087 in pseudorapidity and 0.087 rad in azimuth (ϕ). In the (η, ϕ) plane, for $|\eta| < 1.48$, the HCAL cells map onto arrays of 5×5 ECAL crystals to form calorimeter towers that project radially outwards from near the center of the CMS detector. At larger values of $|\eta|$, the size of the towers increases and the matching ECAL arrays contain fewer crystals. The energy resolution is less than 5% for the electron energies considered in this analysis [16, 17]. In addition to the barrel and endcap detectors, CMS has extensive forward calorimetry. 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. [13].

3 Data and simulation

The data used in this analysis correspond to an integrated luminosity of $19.6 \pm 0.5 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ [18], collected during the 2012 pp collision run of the LHC at a center-of-mass energy of 8 TeV. Events are selected online using a trigger that requires an isolated electron with $p_T > 27 \text{ GeV}$ and $|\eta| < 2.5$ or an isolated muon with $p_T > 24 \text{ GeV}$ and $|\eta| < 2.1$. Simulated Monte Carlo (MC) samples of $t\bar{t}$, W , and Z boson production are generated with MADGRAPH 5.1.3.30 [19] interfaced with PYTHIA 6.4.26 [20] for parton showering. Single top quark events are simulated using the POWHEG generator [21–24], also interfaced to PYTHIA. For studies of systematic effects, a sample of $t\bar{t}$ events is generated with MC@NLO 3.14 [25], combined with HERWIG 6.520 [26] for parton showering. All generated events are passed through a simulation of the CMS detector based on GEANT4 [27]. The simulation includes the effect of pileup, i.e. additional pp collisions occurring during the same bunch-crossing or immediately preceding or following the primary crossing. The theoretical cross sections for W boson and Z boson production are calculated with FEWZ [28] at next-to-next-to-leading-order (NNLO) precision of quantum chromodynamics (QCD). The $t\bar{t}$ and single top quark production cross sections are from calculations at NNLO [29] and approximate NNLO [30] precision, respectively.

4 Event reconstruction and selection

All events are reconstructed using the standard CMS particle-flow (PF) techniques [31], where the information from all CMS subdetectors is combined in a coherent manner to identify and reconstruct individual electrons, muons, photons, charged hadrons, and neutral hadrons. Only the charged particles associated with the primary collision vertex are used in the analysis, where the primary vertex is defined as having the largest value of $\sum p_T^2$ of its associated tracks. Reconstructed charged particles from the primary collision vertex, with the exception of isolated electrons and muons, and all neutral particles are used for jet clustering. Jets are formed using the anti- k_T clustering algorithm [32] with a distance parameter of 0.5. The momentum of a jet, determined from the vectorial sum of the momenta of all particles within a jet, is found from simulation to lie typically within 5–10% of the true jet momentum. Jet energies are corrected for contributions from additional pileup interactions expected within the area of the jet. Afterwards, simulation-based p_T - and η -dependent jet energy scale corrections are applied to all jets both in the data and simulation [33]. Through these means, a uniform energy response is achieved at the reconstructed particle level with only weak pileup dependence. Jets in the data have an additional residual correction that is determined by assuming momentum balance in dijet, photon+jet, and Z +jet events. The jet energy resolution is measured in the data to be about 10% worse than in simulation [33] which is corrected by smearing the jet energy in simulated events by the corresponding amount. The amount of missing transverse momentum (E_T^{miss}) is calculated as the magnitude of the vector sum of the transverse momenta of all reconstructed particles [34]. The effect of jet energy scale corrections on the jet momenta is propagated to E_T^{miss} . A particle-based relative isolation is computed for each lepton and is corrected on an event-by-event basis for contributions from pileup events [35]. The scalar sum of the transverse momenta of all reconstructed particle candidates, except for the leptons themselves, within a cone of size $\Delta R = \sqrt{(\Delta\eta)^2 + (\Delta\phi)^2} = 0.3$ ($= 0.4$ for muons) built around the lepton direction must be less than 10% of the electron p_T and less than 12% of the muon p_T . Events are required to contain only one isolated light lepton, either an electron with $p_T > 32 \text{ GeV}$ and $|\eta| < 2.5$ or a muon with $p_T > 25 \text{ GeV}$ and $|\eta| < 2.1$. Events must have at least four jets with $p_T > 30 \text{ GeV}$ and $|\eta| < 2.4$. Jets originating from a bottom quark (b jets) are identified with the combined secondary vertex (CSV) algorithm [36] which combines the

Table 1: Expected and observed yield of events passing the full selection of e^+ +jets, e^- +jets, μ^+ +jets, and μ^- +jets channels. Simulations are used to obtain the expected number of events except for the QCD multijet background, which is derived from data, as described in the text. The uncertainties on the event numbers are statistical and reflect the limited number of events in simulation or data for the individual processes.

Sample	e^+ +jets	e^- +jets	μ^+ +jets	μ^- +jets
$t\bar{t}$	55922 ± 68	55476 ± 68	72020 ± 77	72094 ± 77
W+jets	5448 ± 50	4128 ± 45	7146 ± 59	5174 ± 51
Z/ γ^* +jets	835 ± 12	800 ± 11	812 ± 12	816 ± 11
Single top	3107 ± 35	2659 ± 34	3908 ± 40	3412 ± 38
QCD multijet	7922 ± 89	7235 ± 85	7148 ± 85	7173 ± 85
Total	73234 ± 128	70298 ± 123	91034 ± 136	88669 ± 132
Observed	71952	70396	87039	84024

information from reconstructed secondary vertices and from displaced tracks within the jets to form a multi-variant discriminator output. It is tuned such that its efficiency to tag b jets is about 68% and the rate of mistagging light-flavor, gluon, and c jets is about 4%, for jets within the considered p_T range. Each event is required to have at least one b-tagged jet. An additional event selection requirement based on the χ^2 of a kinematic fit to the $t\bar{t}$ hypothesis described in Section 5 is also applied in the analysis. The number of events observed in the data and the corresponding predictions from simulated events and from data control regions (for the QCD multijet background) are shown in Table 1 separately for e^+ +jets, e^- +jets, μ^+ +jets, and μ^- +jets events. The fraction of QCD multijet events is estimated with a binned maximum-likelihood fit to the E_T^{miss} distribution observed in the data, separately in the e +jets and μ +jets channels. The mass shape for the QCD multijet background is obtained from the data by using a dedicated sample of events where the isolation and identification criteria (for e +jets) or the isolation criterion alone (for μ +jets) have been inverted. A difference of less than 6% is found between the observed and expected total yields. Differences between the data and simulation in the overall yield do not affect this analysis directly, unlike possible differences in the kinematic properties of the events or in the relative fractions of the yields of the various processes. Figure 1 shows the distribution of the transverse momenta of the four leading jets in each event for both the ℓ^+ +jets and the ℓ^- +jets samples. The overall number of simulated events is normalized to the event yield observed in the data, while keeping their relative fractions fixed to the prediction. In general, the data appear to be well modeled by the simulation, except for a small but statistically significant deviation in the jet transverse momenta, visible as a slope in the ratio plots. This is related to the modeling of the top quark transverse momentum in the simulation, which is known to predict a slightly harder spectrum than observed in data [37–39]. The effect on the top quark mass measurement is approximately 100 MeV, as measured in an equivalent analysis in the ℓ +jets channel [40]. As it identically affects the ℓ^+ +jets and ℓ^- +jets samples, the impact on the Δm_t measurement is negligible.

5 The kinematic fit and the ideogram method

A kinematic fit to the $t\bar{t}$ hypothesis [41–43] is employed in this analysis to reconstruct the mass of the hadronically decaying top quark by varying the momenta of the two jets that are assigned to the $W \rightarrow q\bar{q}'$ decay, using a W boson mass value of 80.4 GeV [4] as a constraint, while keeping the ratio of energy to momentum of each jet fixed. The W^+ and W^- bosons are assumed to have equal mass in this procedure. For each event, the four jets with the largest




Figure 1: Comparison of the data to simulation for the transverse momenta of the four leading jets in each event for ℓ^+ +jets events (left) and ℓ^- +jets events (right). The last bin of each distribution includes all jets with $p_T > 530$ GeV. The bin-by-bin ratio of the observed to the simulated spectra one is shown at the bottom of each plot. The uncertainties are purely statistical. The total simulated event yields are normalized to the observed yields in the data, while keeping the relative fractions of the individual components fixed.

transverse momentum are considered in the fit. These four jets can be associated with the four quarks from the hypothesized $t\bar{t}$ -decay ($t\bar{t} \rightarrow b\bar{b}W^+W^- \rightarrow b\bar{b}q\bar{q}'\ell\nu_\ell$) in 12 possible ways. The kinematic fit is performed for each of these 12 jet-to-quark assignments. However, before carrying out the fit, additional corrections are applied to the data and simulation in order to correct jet energies to the parton level. These corrections are derived separately for jets associated with hadronic W boson decays and for b jets in bins of p_T and $|\eta|$ of these jets by comparing the transverse energy of reconstructed jets with that of the corresponding generated partons in simulated $t\bar{t}$ events. Only solutions for which the kinematic fit returns a $\chi^2/n_{\text{dof}} < 10$ are accepted, where $n_{\text{dof}} (= 1)$ is the number of degrees of freedom in the fit. An event is rejected if no combination of jets passes the χ^2 requirement. For each combination of jets i , m_i is the top quark mass value that yields the smallest χ_i^2 , and the uncertainty σ_i corresponds to the mass range that is compatible with an increase of the χ^2 by 1. The values of m_i , σ_i , and χ_i^2 are used as input to the ideogram method as described below. A comparison of m_i and χ_i^2 between the data and simulation is given in Fig. 2, for the jet combination with the smallest overall χ^2 in each event. Agreement is observed between the data and simulation. In the ideogram method [14, 36], an approximate event-by-event likelihood model is constructed as a function of m_i . This likelihood contains a signal and a background term. The signal part is a weighted sum over all combinations of jets, containing two terms: a correct jet-to-quark assignment term and a wrong jet-to-quark assignment term. The shapes of the background term and the wrong jet-to-quark assignment term are both taken from simulation, which represents our best knowledge of the kinematic properties of the events. The correct jet-to-quark assignment term, on the other hand, is defined by the convolution of a Gaussian resolution function and a relativistic Breit-Wigner distribution. The Gaussian function has a width equal to the uncertainty σ_i resulting from the kinematic fit for the given combination of jets. The weights applied in the sum over jet combinations are calculated for each combination using the χ_i^2 of the kinematic fit and the compatibility of the b jet assignments, calculated from the known b tagging efficiency and mistagging rate. The reweighting significantly reduces the contribution of combinations for which the b jet assignments are highly incompatible with the results of the b tagging algorithm and of combinations that badly fulfill the mass constraints. The combined likelihood for the full event sample is calculated as the product of the individual event likelihoods for all




Figure 2: Comparison between the data and simulation for the fitted top quark mass of the jet-quark assignment with the smallest χ^2 (top) and these smallest χ^2 values (bottom), for ℓ^+ +jets events (left) and ℓ^- +jets events (right). The last bin of the top quark mass distributions includes all masses above 980 GeV. The bin-by-bin ratio of the observed spectrum to the simulated one is shown at the bottom of each plot. The uncertainties are purely statistical.

selected events. The fitted top quark mass and its statistical uncertainty are extracted from this combined likelihood. More details about the exact implementation of the kinematic fit and the ideogram method can be found in Ref. [11]. The event likelihoods are calculated under certain assumptions and simplifications and hence the result of the combination is first calibrated using pseudo-experiments where the mass shapes are generated from the expected distributions of signal and background events. The standard deviation (width) of the pull distribution and the observed bias on the estimated top quark mass before calibration is shown as a function of the generated mass in Fig. 3. The pull is defined as $\text{pull}_j = (m_j - \langle m \rangle) / \sigma_j$, where m_j is the estimated top quark mass in each pseudo-experiment j , σ_j the corresponding statistical uncertainty, and $\langle m \rangle$ the mean of the estimated top quark masses over all pseudo-experiments. Since the width of the pull distribution is about 1.13, the statistical uncertainty of the final mass measurement needs to be scaled up by about 13%. The biases are within 3 GeV for most of the range of interest. The obtained top quark mass is corrected using the fitted linear function shown in Fig. 3 (right). The residual bias on the estimated top quark mass as a function of the generated top quark mass after applying this calibration is shown in Fig. 4, separately for ℓ^+ +jets and ℓ^- +jets events. These plots demonstrate that an inclusive ℓ +jets calibration can be used for both the positive and negative channels.




Figure 3: Width of the pull distribution (left) and bias on the estimated top quark mass (right) as a function of the generated top quark mass for ℓ +jets events. The dashed blue line represents the ideal outcome.




Figure 4: Residual bias on the estimated top quark mass as a function of the generated top quark mass using ℓ^+ +jets events (left) and ℓ^- +jets events (right) after the inclusive ℓ +jets calibration. The dashed blue line represents the ideal outcome.

6 Measurement of Δm_t

The analysis is applied separately to events with positively and negatively charged leptons, for each of which the top quark mass is measured using the hadronically decaying top quark. The difference between the two resulting mass measurements is then taken as the final measurement of the mass difference between the top quark and antiquark. In the inclusive e+jets and μ +jets sample a mass difference of $\Delta m_t = -0.15 \pm 0.19$ (stat) GeV is measured. In the individual e+jets and μ +jets channels, respective mass differences of $\Delta m_t = -0.19 \pm 0.28$ (stat) GeV and $\Delta m_t = -0.13 \pm 0.26$ (stat) GeV are obtained. These results are compatible with the hypothesis of CPT conservation. The average top quark mass is measured to be $m_t = 172.84 \pm 0.10$ (stat) GeV, which is in agreement with previous measurements [40, 44], even ignoring systematic uncertainties.

7 Systematic uncertainties

Many of the systematic uncertainties that affect the top quark mass measurement have a significantly reduced impact in the mass difference because of their correlated effect on the individual top quark and antiquark mass extractions. Some systematic uncertainties related to the modeling of the physics processes are not expected to affect the Δm_t measurement and are

not considered in this analysis. These are the modeling of the hadronization, the underlying event, initial- and final-state radiation, the factorization and renormalization scales, and the matching between matrix-element and parton shower calculations. Other effects considered in the measurement of m_t are included together with additional sources potentially relevant for the Δm_t measurement, such as lepton-charge identification and a possible difference in jet energy response to b and \bar{b} quarks. A summary of these effects is given in Table 2. The effects are evaluated by comparing the nominal simulation to a sample of simulated events where the source of the systematic uncertainty under study is varied within its uncertainty. Since most sources of systematic uncertainty yield only a small change in the Δm_t measurement, statistical uncertainties on the observed changes are evaluated using a jackknife re-sampling technique [45] and the larger among the estimated change and its statistical uncertainty is quoted as the final systematic uncertainty. The total systematic uncertainty is taken to be the quadratic sum of all individual values. The uncertainties presented here are significantly smaller than those reported in Ref. [11]. All systematic uncertainties in the previous result were statistically compatible with zero and the total uncertainty included a sizable component from the limited size of the simulated data samples. Much larger samples of simulated signal and background events have been produced for this new result, resulting in more accurate estimates of the systematic uncertainties and a reduction of the total uncertainties. Some uncertainties, such as the jet energy scale and the b tagging efficiency also profit from more accurate corrections.

Table 2: Summary of systematic uncertainties on Δm_t . For each contribution, the first value is the observed systematic shift, whereas the second number is the uncertainty of the shift due to the limited number of generated events. In all cases, the larger among the two is considered as the final systematic uncertainty and is indicated in the bold font. The total uncertainty is obtained from the sum in quadrature of the individual terms.

Source	Uncertainty in Δm_t (MeV)
Jet energy scale	$7 \pm \mathbf{16}$
Jet energy resolution	$7 \pm \mathbf{11}$
b vs. \bar{b} jet response	$\mathbf{51} \pm 1$
Signal fraction	$\mathbf{27} \pm 2$
Background charge asymmetry	$\mathbf{11.9} \pm 0.1$
Background composition	$\mathbf{28} \pm 1$
Pileup	$\mathbf{9.1} \pm 0.3$
b tagging efficiency	$\mathbf{24} \pm 7$
b vs. \bar{b} tagging efficiency	$\mathbf{11} \pm 7$
Method calibration	$3 \pm \mathbf{53}$
Parton distribution functions	$\mathbf{9} \pm 3$
Total	91

The individual contributions to the total systematic uncertainty are described in more detail below.

Jet energy scale. Since top quarks and antiquarks are produced at the LHC with slightly different rapidity distributions, the η -dependence of the jet energy scale uncertainty can lead to an effect on Δm_t . To evaluate this effect the energy of all jets is scaled up/down within their p_T - and η -dependent uncertainties (ranging between 1 and 5%) [33]. This results in a shift in mass difference of 7 ± 16 MeV.

Jet energy resolution. To evaluate the systematic uncertainty arising from the uncertainty in the measured jet energy resolution, the jet energy in simulation is smeared up/down within the uncertainty of this jet energy resolution. The jet energy resolution uncertainty is $|\eta|$ -dependent and ranges between 6 and 9% for the jets considered in this analysis. A shift of 7 ± 11 MeV in Δm_t is observed.

b vs. \bar{b} jet response. A difference in the fraction of jet energy reconstructed by the detector between b and \bar{b} jets can introduce a bias in the Δm_t measurement. The p_T of the reconstructed jets is compared with the original parton p_T in two simulated $t\bar{t}$ samples: the nominal sample, generated with MADGRAPH with showering from PYTHIA, and a sample generated with MC@NLO with showering from HERWIG. The ratio of b to \bar{b} response is measured in both samples and a difference of $0.078 \pm 0.040\%$ is observed. When the difference of 0.078% is propagated to our nominal sample of simulated events a shift of 51 ± 1 MeV is observed, which is quoted as systematic uncertainty.

Signal fraction. A change in the signal fraction (as calculated from Table 1) will bias the measured top quark mass, since signal and background events have different fitted top quark mass distributions. This will also introduce a bias in Δm_t because it will influence the ℓ^+ +jets and ℓ^- +jets samples in a different way since these have a different signal fraction. The signal fraction is changed by a relative $\pm 10\%$, corresponding to the agreement between the expected and observed $t\bar{t}$ cross sections in this channel [46], and the resulting shift of 27 ± 2 MeV is taken as a systematic uncertainty.

Background charge asymmetry. A difference in the estimated charge asymmetry of the backgrounds leads to different levels of background and to a different background composition in the ℓ^+ +jets and ℓ^- +jets channels, which can bias the Δm_t measurement. The measured inclusive W^+/W^- production ratio at 8 TeV is in agreement with theoretical predictions within a precision of 2% [47, 48], but since this ratio depends on the number of jets, the uncertainty is inflated by a factor of two, yielding a variation of 4%. When the fractions of W^+ and W^- events are varied by 2% in opposite directions, thereby affecting the relative ratio of W^+ and W^- events by 4%, Δm_t changes by 3.72 ± 0.01 MeV. The W +jets background contains non-negligible contributions from $W+c\bar{c}$ and $W+b\bar{b}$ events, whose relative W^+/W^- ratio is affected by a larger uncertainty. The estimated uncertainty in this relative ratio is $\pm 20\%$, corresponding to a shift in Δm_t of 9.05 ± 0.02 MeV and 5.83 ± 0.02 MeV for the $W^+c\bar{c}$ and $W^+b\bar{b}$ contributions, respectively. Single top quarks produced via the t channel also possess a charge asymmetry, measured to be in agreement with theory predictions within 15% [49]. Changing this charge asymmetry by a relative $\pm 15\%$ results in a shift on Δm_t of 3.298 ± 0.005 MeV. The quadratic sum of all these observed shifts is quoted as the systematic uncertainty.

Background composition. Possible residual effects due to the composition of the background are evaluated by scaling each background source up and down, keeping the signal fraction fixed. A shift in Δm_t is observed when we scale W +jets (1.3 ± 0.3 MeV), Z +jets (1.99 ± 0.03 MeV), t -channel single top quark production (6.9 ± 0.1 MeV), and tW single top quark production (1.4 ± 0.3 MeV) up/down by 30%; and when we scale QCD multijet events (26.8 ± 0.3 MeV) up/down by 50%. The size of each variation was chosen to cover the modeling uncertainty in predictions of the MC simulation in the phase space of the analysis or, in the case of the QCD multijet sample, differences between estimates obtained with different methods to determine the normalization from data. The systematic uncertainty is obtained by summing in quadrature each of the observed shifts.

Pileup. Pileup collisions are included in the sample of simulated events used in this analysis. Events are reweighted to reproduce the pileup distribution measured in the data. The systematic uncertainty is estimated by changing the mean value of the number of interactions by $\pm 6\%$, resulting in a shift in Δm_t of 9.1 ± 0.3 MeV.

b tagging efficiency and b vs. \bar{b} tagging efficiency. A mismodeling in simulation of the b tagging efficiency can bias the measurement by altering the observed b tagging assignments, which are used in the ideogram method. To quantify the impact of the uncertainty in the b tagging efficiency, we change the working point of the b tagging algorithm. Working points corresponding to an absolute change of $\pm 1.2\%$ [36] in the b tagging efficiency produce a shift in Δm_t of 24 ± 7 MeV (“b tagging efficiency” in Table 2). The use of different working points for the ℓ^+ +jets and ℓ^- +jets samples, yielding an absolute 1.2% difference in b tagging efficiency between b and \bar{b} jets, produces a shift of 11 ± 7 MeV (“b versus \bar{b} tagging efficiency” in Table 2).

Misassignment of lepton charge. In this analysis the leptons are only used in the trigger, in the event selection, and in the splitting of the data into ℓ^+ +jets and ℓ^- +jets samples, but not in the mass reconstruction. A misassignment of the lepton charge can affect the calibration and it can also lead to a dilution of the measurement. For muons the charge misassignment rate is measured with cosmic muons [15] and collision data [47, 48] to be of the order of 10^{-5} to 10^{-4} in the considered p_T range. For electrons this rate ranges between 0.1% and 0.4% [47, 48]. This means that the systematic uncertainty from charge misassignment is below 1% of the measured Δm_t value, which is negligible and is therefore ignored.

Trigger, lepton identification, and lepton isolation. As the trigger is based on an isolated single lepton, and the lepton is not used in the mass reconstruction, no systematic effect is expected from an uncertainty in the trigger efficiency or on the lepton energy scale. Similarly, the lepton identification and isolation are also not expected to affect the measurement.

Method calibration. The difference in mass between the ℓ^+ +jets and ℓ^- +jets samples in the nominal MADGRAPH+PYTHIA sample with $m_t = 172.5$ GeV, is found to be 3 ± 53 MeV. This result is statistically compatible with zero and confirms our expectation that there is no known effect in simulation that would lead to a difference in mass calibration between the two channels. The statistical uncertainty of this result is quoted as the systematic uncertainty arising from the method calibration.

Parton distribution functions. The choice of the parton distribution functions (PDFs) can affect the Δm_t measurement in multiple ways. They determine, for example, the difference in production of W^+ and W^- events. The simulated samples are generated using the CTEQ 6.6 PDF [50], for which the uncertainties can be described by 22 independent parameters. Varying each of these parameters within the quoted uncertainties and summing the larger shifts in quadrature results in an uncertainty in Δm_t of 9 ± 3 MeV.

8 Results and summary

Data collected by the CMS experiment in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV and corresponding to an integrated luminosity of $19.6 \pm 0.5 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ have been used to measure the difference in mass between the top quark and antiquark. The measured value is

$$\Delta m_t = -0.15 \pm 0.19 (\text{stat}) \pm 0.09 (\text{syst}) \text{ GeV}.$$

This result improves in precision upon previously reported measurements [9–12] by more than a factor of two. It is in agreement with the expectations from CPT invariance, requiring equal particle and antiparticle masses.

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 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 and the CMS detector provided by the following funding agencies: BMWFW and FWF (Austria); FNRS and FWO (Belgium); CNPq, CAPES, FAPERJ, and FAPESP (Brazil); MES (Bulgaria); CERN; CAS, MoST, and NSFC (China); COLCIENCIAS (Colombia); MSES and CSF (Croatia); RPF (Cyprus); SENESCYT (Ecuador); MoER, ERC IUT, and ERDF (Estonia); Academy of Finland, MEC, and HIP (Finland); CEA and CNRS/IN2P3 (France); BMBF, DFG, and HGF (Germany); GSRT (Greece); OTKA and NIH (Hungary); DAE and DST (India); IPM (Iran); SFI (Ireland); INFN (Italy); MSIP and NRF (Republic of Korea); LAS (Lithuania); MOE and UM (Malaysia); BUAP, CINVESTAV, CONACYT, LNS, SEP, and UASLP-FAI (Mexico); MBIE (New Zealand); PAEC (Pakistan); MSHE and NSC (Poland); FCT (Portugal); JINR (Dubna); MON, RosAtom, RAS, and RFBR (Russia); MESTD (Serbia); SEIDI and CPAN (Spain); Swiss Funding Agencies (Switzerland); MST (Taipei); ThEPCenter, IPST, STAR, and NSTDA (Thailand); TUBITAK and TAEK (Turkey); NASU and SFFR (Ukraine); STFC (United Kingdom); DOE and NSF (USA).

Individuals have received support from the Marie-Curie programme and the European Research Council and EPLANET (European Union); the Leventis Foundation; the A. P. Sloan Foundation; the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation; the Belgian Federal Science Policy Office; the Fonds pour la Formation à la Recherche dans l'Industrie et dans l'Agriculture (FRIA-Belgium); the Agentschap voor Innovatie door Wetenschap en Technologie (IWT-Belgium); the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (MEYS) of the Czech Republic; the Council of Science and Industrial Research, India; the HOMING PLUS programme of the Foundation for Polish Science, cofinanced from European Union, Regional Development Fund, the Mobility Plus programme of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education, the National Science Center (Poland), contracts Harmonia 2014/14/M/ST2/00428, Opus 2013/11/B/ST2/04202, 2014/13/B/ST2/02543 and 2014/15/B/ST2/03998, Sonata-bis 2012/07/E/ST2/01406; the Thalís and Aristeia programmes cofinanced by EU-ESF and the Greek NSRF; the National Priorities Research Program by Qatar National Research Fund; the Programa Clarín-COFUND del Principado de Asturias; the Rachadapisek Sompot Fund for Postdoctoral Fellowship, Chulalongkorn University and the Chulalongkorn Academic into Its 2nd Century Project Advancement Project (Thailand); and the Welch Foundation, contract C-1845.

References

- [1] S. Glashow, "Partial-symmetries of weak interactions", *Nucl. Phys.* **22** (1961) 579, doi:10.1016/0029-5582(61)90469-2.
- [2] S. Weinberg, "A model of leptons", *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **19** (1967) 1264, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.19.1264.
- [3] A. Salam, "Weak and electromagnetic interactions", *Conf. Proc. C* **680519** (1968) 367.
- [4] Particle Data Group, C. Patrignani et al., "Review of particle physics", *Chin. Phys. C* **40** (2016) 100001, doi:10.1088/1674-1137/40/10/100001.
- [5] "CPT violation and the standard mode",.
- [6] G. Barenboim and J. Lykken, "A model of CPT violation for neutrinos", *Phys. Lett. B* **554** (2003) 73, doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(02)03262-8.
- [7] R. S. Raghavan, "A new model of solar neutrinos in manifest violation of CPT invariance", *JCAP* **0308** (2003) 002, doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2003/08/002.
- [8] V. A. Kostelecký and R. Potting, "CPT and strings", *Nucl. Phys. B* **359** (1991) 545, doi:10.1016/0550-3213(91)90071-5.
- [9] CDF Collaboration, "Measurement of the mass difference between top and anti-top quarks at CDF", *Phys. Rev. D* **106** (2013) 152001, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.106.152001, arXiv:1103.2782.
- [10] D0 Collaboration, "Direct measurement of the mass difference between top and antitop quarks", *Phys. Rev. D* **84** (2011) 052005, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.84.052005, arXiv:1106.2063.
- [11] CMS Collaboration, "Measurement of the mass difference between top and antitop quarks", *JHEP* **06** (2012) 109, doi:10.1007/JHEP06(2012)109, arXiv:1204.2807.
- [12] ATLAS Collaboration, "Measurement of the mass difference between top and anti-top quarks in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV using the ATLAS detector", *Phys. Lett. B* **728** (2013) 363, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2013.12.010, arXiv:1310.6527.
- [13] CMS Collaboration, "The CMS experiment at the CERN LHC", *JINST* **3** (2008) S08004, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08004.
- [14] DELPHI Collaboration, "Measurement of the mass and width of the W boson in e^+e^- collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 161$ -209 GeV", *Eur. Phys. J. D* **55** (2008) 1, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-008-0585-7, arXiv:0803.2534.
- [15] CMS Collaboration, "Performance of CMS muon reconstruction in pp collision events at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV", *JINST* **7** (2012) P10002, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/7/10/P10002, arXiv:1206.4071.
- [16] CMS Collaboration, "Energy calibration and resolution of the CMS electromagnetic calorimeter in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV", *JINST* **8** (2013) P09009, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/8/09/P09009, arXiv:1306.2016.

- [17] CMS Collaboration, “Performance of electron reconstruction and selection with the CMS detector in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV”, *JINST* **10** (2015) P06005, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/10/06/P06005, arXiv:1502.02701.
- [18] CMS Collaboration, “CMS luminosity based on pixel cluster counting—Summer 2013 update”, CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-LUM-13-001, 2013.
- [19] J. Alwall et al., “MadGraph 5: going beyond”, *JHEP* **06** (2011) 128, doi:10.1007/JHEP06(2011)128, arXiv:1106.0522.
- [20] T. Sjöstrand, S. Mrenna, and P. Skands, “PYTHIA 6.4 physics and manual”, *JHEP* **05** (2006) 026, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2006/05/026, arXiv:hep-ph/0603175.
- [21] 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.
- [22] 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.
- [23] S. Alioli, P. Nason, C. Oleari, and E. Re, “NLO single-top production matched with shower in POWHEG: s - and t -channel contributions”, *JHEP* **09** (2009) 111, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2009/09/111, arXiv:0907.4076. [Erratum: doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2010)011].
- [24] E. Re, “Single-top Wt -channel production matched with parton showers using the POWHEG method”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **71** (2011) 1547, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-011-1547-z, arXiv:1009.2450.
- [25] S. Frixione and B. R. Webber, “The MC@NLO 3.4 event generator”, (2008). arXiv:0812.0770.
- [26] G. Corcella et al., “HERWIG 6: an event generator for hadron emission reactions with interfering gluons (including supersymmetric processes)”, *JHEP* **01** (2001) 010, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2001/01/010, arXiv:hep-ph/0011363.
- [27] GEANT4 Collaboration, “GEANT4—a simulation toolkit”, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **506** (2003) 250, doi:10.1016/S0168-9002(03)01368-8.
- [28] K. Melnikov and F. Petriello, “Electroweak gauge boson production at hadron colliders through $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^2)$ ”, *Phys. Rev. D* **74** (2006) 114017, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.74.114017, arXiv:hep-ph/0609070.
- [29] M. Czakon, P. Fiedler, and A. Mitov, “The total top quark pair production cross-section at hadron colliders through $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^4)$ ”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110** (2013) 252004, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.110.252004, arXiv:1303.6254.
- [30] N. Kidonakis, “NNLL threshold resummation for top-pair and single-top production”, (2012). arXiv:1210.7813.
- [31] 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.

- [32] 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.
- [33] CMS Collaboration, “Determination of jet energy calibration and transverse momentum resolution in CMS”, *JINST* **6** (2011) 11002, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/6/11/P11002, arXiv:1107.4277.
- [34] CMS Collaboration, “Missing transverse energy performance of the CMS detector”, *JINST* **6** (2011) 09001, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/6/09/P09001, arXiv:1106.5048.
- [35] CMS Collaboration, “Measurement of the $t\bar{t}$ production cross section in the $e\mu$ channel in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ and 8 TeV”, (2016). arXiv:1603.02303. Submitted to JHEP.
- [36] CMS Collaboration, “Identification of b-quark jets with the CMS experiment”, *JINST* **8** (2013) 04013, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/8/04/P04013, arXiv:1211.4462.
- [37] CMS Collaboration, “Measurement of differential top-quark pair production cross sections in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **73** (2013) 2339, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-013-2339-4, arXiv:1211.2220.
- [38] CMS Collaboration, “Measurement of the differential cross section for top quark pair production in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **75** (2015) 542, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-015-3709-x, arXiv:1505.04480.
- [39] CMS Collaboration, “Measurement of the $t\bar{t}$ production cross section in the all-jets final state in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76** (2016) 128, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-3956-5, arXiv:1509.06076.
- [40] CMS Collaboration, “Measurement of the top quark mass using proton-proton data at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV and 8 TeV”, *Phys. Rev. D* **93** (2016) 072044, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.072044, arXiv:1509.04044.
- [41] P. Van Mulders, “Calibration of the jet energy scale using top quark events at the LHC”. PhD thesis, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, 2010. <https://cdsweb.cern.ch/record/1308729>.
- [42] J. D’Hondt et al., “Fitting of event topologies with external kinematic constraints in CMS”, CMS Note 2006/023, 2006.
- [43] S. Blyweert, “Measurement of the top-quark mass and the mass difference between top and anti-top quarks at the LHC”. PhD thesis, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, 2014.
- [44] The ATLAS, CDF, CMS and D0 Collaborations, “First combination of Tevatron and LHC measurements of the top-quark mass”, (2014). arXiv:1403.4427.
- [45] R. G. Miller, “The jackknife—a review”, *Biometrika* **61** (1974) 1, doi:10.1093/biomet/61.1.1.
- [46] CMS Collaboration, “Measurements of the $t\bar{t}$ production cross section in lepton+jets final states in pp collisions at 8 TeV and ratio of 8 to 7 TeV cross sections”, (2016). arXiv:1602.09024.
- [47] CMS Collaboration, “Measurement of the lepton charge asymmetry in inclusive W production in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV”, *JHEP* **04** (2011) 050, doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2011)050, arXiv:1103.3470.

-
- [48] CMS Collaboration, “Measurement of inclusive W and Z boson production cross sections in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8 \text{ TeV}$ ”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112** (2014) 191802, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.112.191802, arXiv:1402.0923.
- [49] CMS Collaboration, “Measurement of the t -channel single-top-quark production cross section and of the $|V_{tb}|$ CKM matrix element in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8 \text{ TeV}$ ”, *JHEP* **06** (2014) 090, doi:10.1007/JHEP06(2014)090, arXiv:1403.7366.
- [50] P. M. Nadolsky et al., “Implications of CTEQ global analysis for collider observables”, *Phys. Rev. D* **78** (2008) 013004, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.78.013004, arXiv:0802.0007.

A The CMS Collaboration

Yerevan Physics Institute, Yerevan, Armenia

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

Institut für Hochenergiephysik, Wien, Austria

W. Adam, T. Bergauer, M. Dragicevic, J. Erö, C. Fabjan¹, M. Friedl, R. Frühwirth¹, V.M. Ghete, C. Hartl, N. Hörmann, J. Hrubec, M. Jeitler¹, W. Kiesenhofer, V. Knünz, M. Krammer¹, I. Krätschmer, D. Liko, I. Mikulec, D. Rabady², B. Rahbaran, H. Rohringer, R. Schöfbeck, J. Strauss, A. Taurok, W. Treberer-Treberspurg, W. Waltenberger, C.-E. Wulz¹

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

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

Universiteit Antwerpen, Antwerpen, Belgium

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

Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussel, Belgium

F. Blekman, S. Blyweert, J. D'Hondt, N. Heracleous, A. Kalogeropoulos, J. Keaveney, T.J. Kim, S. Lowette, M. Maes, A. Olbrechts, D. Strom, S. Tavernier, W. Van Doninck, P. Van Mulders, G.P. Van Onsem, I. Vilella

Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium

C. Caillol, B. Clerboux, G. De Lentdecker, L. Favart, A.P.R. Gay, T. Hreus, A. Léonard, P.E. Marage, A. Mohammadi, L. Perniè, T. Reis, T. Seva, L. Thomas, C. Vander Velde, P. Vanlaer, J. Wang

Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

V. Adler, K. Beernaert, L. Benucci, A. Cimmino, S. Costantini, S. Dildick, G. Garcia, B. Klein, J. Lellouch, J. McCartin, A.A. Ocampo Rios, D. Ryckbosch, M. Sigamani, N. Strobbe, F. Thyssen, M. Tytgat, S. Walsh, E. Yazgan, N. Zaganidis

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

S. Basegmez, C. Beluffi³, G. Bruno, R. Castello, A. Caudron, L. Ceard, G.G. Da Silveira, C. Delaere, T. du Pree, D. Favart, L. Forthomme, A. Giammanco⁴, J. Hollar, P. Jez, M. Komm, V. Lemaître, J. Liao, O. Militaru, C. Nuttens, D. Pagano, A. Pin, K. Piotrkowski, A. Popov⁵, L. Quertenmont, M. Selvaggi, M. Vidal Marono, J.M. Vizan Garcia

Université de Mons, Mons, Belgium

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

Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Físicas, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

G.A. Alves, M. Correa Martins Junior, T. Dos Reis 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, J. Chinellato⁶, A. Custódio, E.M. Da Costa, D. De Jesus Damiao, C. De Oliveira Martins, S. Fonseca De Souza, H. Malbouisson, M. Malek, D. Matos Figueiredo, L. Mundim, H. Nogima, W.L. Prado Da Silva, J. Santaolalla, A. Santoro, A. Sznajder, E.J. Tonelli Manganote⁶, A. Vilela Pereira

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

C.A. Bernardes^b, F.A. Dias^{a,7}, T.R. Fernandez Perez Tomei^a, E.M. Gregores^b, C. Lagana^a, P.G. Mercadante^b, S.F. Novaes^a, Sandra S. Padula^a

Institute for Nuclear Research and Nuclear Energy, Sofia, Bulgaria

V. Genchev², P. Iaydjiev², A. Marinov, S. Piperov, M. Rodozov, G. Sultanov, M. Vutova

University of Sofia, Sofia, Bulgaria

A. Dimitrov, I. Glushkov, 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, M. Chen, R. Du, C.H. Jiang, D. Liang, S. Liang, X. Meng, R. Plestina⁸, J. Tao, X. Wang, Z. Wang

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

C. Asawatrangkuldee, Y. Ban, Y. Guo, Q. Li, W. Li, S. Liu, Y. Mao, S.J. Qian, D. Wang, L. Zhang, W. Zou

Universidad de Los Andes, Bogota, Colombia

C. Avila, C.A. Carrillo Montoya, L.F. Chaparro Sierra, C. Florez, J.P. Gomez, B. Gomez Moreno, J.C. Sanabria

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

N. Godinovic, D. Lelas, D. Polic, I. Puljak

University of Split, Faculty of Science, Split, Croatia

Z. Antunovic, M. Kovac

Institute Rudjer Boskovic, Zagreb, Croatia

V. Brigljevic, K. Kadija, J. Luetic, D. Mekterovic, S. Morovic, L. Sudic

University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus

A. Attikis, 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

E. El-khateeb⁹, T. Elkafrawy⁹, M.A. Mahmoud¹⁰, A. Mohamed¹¹, A. Radi^{12,9}, E. Salama^{9,12}

National Institute of Chemical Physics and Biophysics, Tallinn, Estonia

M. Kadastik, M. Müntel, M. Murumaa, 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, 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, L. Wendland

Lappeenranta University of Technology, Lappeenranta, Finland

T. Tuuva

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

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

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

S. Baffioni, F. Beaudette, P. Busson, C. Charlot, N. Daci, T. Dahms, M. Dalchenko, L. Dobrzynski, A. Florent, 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, Y. Yilmaz, A. Zabi

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

J.-L. Agram¹³, J. Andrea, D. Bloch, J.-M. Brom, E.C. Chabert, C. Collard, E. Conte¹³, F. Drouhin¹³, J.-C. Fontaine¹³, D. Gelé, U. Goerlach, C. Goetzmann, 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

S. Gadrat

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

S. Beauceron, N. Beaupere, G. Boudoul, S. Brochet, J. Chasserat, R. Chierici, D. Contardo, P. Depasse, H. El Mamouni, J. Fan, J. Fay, S. Gascon, M. Gouzevitch, B. Ille, T. Kurca, M. Lethuillier, L. Mirabito, S. Perries, J.D. Ruiz Alvarez, L. Sgandurra, V. Sordini, M. Vander Donckt, P. Verdier, S. Viret, H. Xiao

Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia

Z. Tsamalaidze¹⁴

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

C. Autermann, S. Beranek, M. Bontenackels, B. Calpas, M. Edelhoff, L. Feld, O. Hindrichs, K. Klein, A. Ostapchuk, A. Perieanu, F. Raupach, J. Sammet, S. Schael, D. Sprenger, H. Weber, B. Wittmer, V. Zhukov⁵

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, S. Knutzen, P. Kreuzer, M. Merschmeyer, A. Meyer, M. Olschewski, K. Padeken, P. Papacz, H. Reithler, S.A. Schmitz, L. Sonnenschein, D. Teyssier, S. Thüer, M. Weber

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

V. Cherepanov, Y. Erdogan, G. Flügge, H. Geenen, M. Geisler, W. Haj Ahmad, F. Hoehle, B. Kargoll, T. Kress, Y. Kuessel, J. Lingemann², A. Nowack, I.M. Nugent, L. Perchalla, O. Pooth, A. Stahl

Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Hamburg, Germany

I. Asin, N. Bartosik, J. Behr, W. Behrenhoff, U. Behrens, A.J. Bell, M. Bergholz¹⁵, A. Bethani, K. Borras, A. Burgmeier, A. Cakir, L. Calligaris, A. Campbell, S. Choudhury, F. Costanza, C. Diez Pardos, S. Dooling, T. Dorland, G. Eckerlin, D. Eckstein, T. Eichhorn, G. Flucke, A. Geiser, A. Grebenyuk, P. Gunnellini, S. Habib, J. Hauk, M. Hempel, D. Horton, H. Jung, M. Kasemann, P. Katsas, C. Kleinwort, M. Krämer, D. Krücker, W. Lange, J. Leonard, K. Lipka, W. Lohmann¹⁵, B. Lutz, R. Mankel, I. Marfin, I.-A. Melzer-Pellmann, A.B. Meyer, G. Mittag, J. Mnich, A. Mussgiller, S. Naumann-Emme, O. Novgorodova, F. Nowak, H. Perrey, A. Petrukhin, D. Pitzl, R. Placakyte, A. Raspereza, P.M. Ribeiro Cipriano, C. Riedl, E. Ron, M.Ö. Sahin, J. Salfeld-Nebgen, R. Schmidt¹⁵, T. Schoerner-Sadenius, M. Schröder, M. Stein, A.D.R. Vargas Trevino, R. Walsh, C. Wissing

University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany

M. Aldaya Martin, V. Blobel, H. Enderle, J. Erfle, E. Garutti, K. Goebel, M. Görner, M. Gosselink, J. Haller, R.S. Höing, H. Kirschenmann, R. Klanner, R. Kogler, J. Lange, I. Marchesini, J. Ott, T. Peiffer, N. Pietsch, J. Poehlsen¹⁶, D. Rathjens, C. Sander, H. Schettler, P. Schleper, E. Schlieckau, A. Schmidt, M. Seidel, V. Sola, H. Stadie, G. Steinbrück, D. Troendle, E. Usai, L. Vanelderen

Institut für Experimentelle Kernphysik, Karlsruhe, Germany

C. Barth, C. Baus, J. Berger, C. Böser, E. Butz, T. Chwalek, W. De Boer, A. Descroix, A. Dierlamm, M. Feindt, M. Guthoff², F. Hartmann², T. Hauth², H. Held, K.H. Hoffmann, U. Husemann, I. Katkov⁵, A. Kornmayer², E. Kuznetsova, P. Lobelle Pardo, D. Martschei, M.U. Mozer, Th. Müller, M. Niegel, A. Nürnberg, O. Oberst, G. Quast, K. Rabbertz, F. Ratnikov, S. Röcker, F.-P. Schilling, G. Schott, H.J. Simonis, F.M. Stober, R. Ulrich, J. Wagner-Kuhr, S. Wayand, T. Weiler, R. Wolf, M. Zeise

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

G. Anagnostou, G. Daskalakis, T. Geralis, S. Kesisoglou, A. Kyriakis, D. Loukas, A. Markou, C. Markou, E. Ntomari, I. Topsis-Giotis

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece

A. Agapitos, L. Gouskos, A. Panagiotou, N. Saoulidou, E. Stiliaris

University of Ioánnina, Ioánnina, Greece

X. Aslanoglou, I. Evangelou, G. Flouris, C. Foudas, P. Kokkas, N. Manthos, I. Papadopoulos, E. Paradas

Wigner Research Centre for Physics, Budapest, Hungary

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

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

National Institute of Science Education and Research, Bhubaneswar, India

S.K. Swain¹⁹

Panjab University, Chandigarh, India

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

University of Delhi, Delhi, India

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

Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, Kolkata, India

S. Banerjee, S. Bhattacharya, K. Chatterjee, S. Dutta, B. Gomber, Sa. Jain, Sh. Jain, R. Khurana, A. Modak, S. Mukherjee, D. Roy, S. Sarkar, M. Sharan, A.P. Singh

Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, Mumbai, India

A. Abdulsalam, D. Dutta, S. Kailas, V. Kumar, A.K. Mohanty², L.M. Pant, P. Shukla, A. Topkar

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

H. Arfaei, H. Bakhshiansohi, H. Behnamian, S.M. Etesami²⁰, A. Fahim²¹, A. Jafari, M. Khakzad, M. Mohammadi Najafabadi, M. Naseri, S. Paktinat Mehdiabadi, B. Safarzadeh²², M. Zeinali

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}, L. Barbone^{a,b}, C. Calabria^{a,b}, S.S. Chhibra^{a,b}, A. Colaleo^a, D. Creanza^{a,c}, N. De Filippis^{a,c}, M. De Palma^{a,b}, L. Fiore^a, G. Iaselli^{a,c}, G. Maggi^{a,c}, M. Maggi^a, B. Marangelli^{a,b}, S. My^{a,c}, S. Nuzzo^{a,b}, N. Pacifico^a, A. Pompili^{a,b}, G. Pugliese^{a,c}, R. Radogna^{a,b}, G. Selvaggi^{a,b}, L. Silvestris^a, G. Singh^{a,b}, R. Venditti^{a,b}, P. Verwilligen^a, 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}, R. Campanini^{a,b}, P. Capiluppi^{a,b}, A. Castro^{a,b}, F.R. Cavallo^a, G. Codispoti^{a,b}, M. Cuffiani^{a,b}, G.M. Dallavalle^a, F. Fabbri^a, A. Fanfani^{a,b}, D. Fasanella^{a,b}, P. Giacomelli^a, C. Grandi^a, L. Guiducci^{a,b}, S. Marcellini^a, G. Masetti^a, M. Meneghelli^{a,b}, 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}, N. Tosi^{a,b}, R. Travaglini^{a,b}

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

S. Albergo^{a,b}, G. Cappello^a, M. Chiorboli^{a,b}, S. Costa^{a,b}, F. Giordano^{a,b,2}, 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}, E. Gallo^a, S. Gozzi^{a,b}, V. Gori^{a,b}, P. Lenzi^{a,b}, M. Meschini^a, S. Paoletti^a, G. Sguazzoni^a, A. Tropiano^{a,b}

INFN Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, Frascati, Italy

L. Benussi, S. Bianco, F. Fabbri, D. Piccolo

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

P. Fabbriatore^a, R. Ferretti^{a,b}, F. Ferro^a, M. Lo Vetere^{a,b}, R. Musenich^a, E. Robutti^a, S. Tosi^{a,b}

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

A. Benaglia^a, M.E. Dinardo^{a,b}, S. Fiorendi^{a,b,2}, S. Gennai^a, A. Ghezzi^{a,b}, P. Govoni^{a,b}, M.T. Lucchini^{a,b,2}, S. Malvezzi^a, R.A. Manzoni^{a,b,2}, A. Martelli^{a,b,2}, D. Menasce^a, L. Moroni^a, M. Paganoni^{a,b}, D. Pedrini^a, S. Ragazzi^{a,b}, N. Redaelli^a, T. Tabarelli de Fatis^{a,b}

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

S. Buontempo^a, N. Cavallo^{a,c}, F. Fabozzi^{a,c}, A.O.M. Iorio^{a,b}, L. Lista^a, S. Meola^{a,d,2}, M. Merola^a, P. Paolucci^{a,2}

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

P. Azzi^a, N. Bacchetta^a, D. Bisello^{a,b}, A. Branca^{a,b}, R. Carlin^{a,b}, P. Checchia^a, T. Dorigo^a, M. Galanti^{a,b,2}, F. Gasparini^{a,b}, U. Gasparini^{a,b}, P. Giubilato^{a,b}, F. Gonella^a, A. Gozzelino^a, K. Kanishchev^{a,c}, S. Lacaprara^a, I. Lazzizzera^{a,c}, M. Margoni^{a,b}, A.T. Meneguzzo^{a,b}, F. Montecassiano^a, M. Passaseo^a, J. Pazzini^{a,b}, N. Pozzobon^{a,b}, P. Ronchese^{a,b}, F. Simonetto^{a,b}, E. Torassa^a, M. Tosi^{a,b}, S. Vanini^{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

M. Gabusi^{a,b}, S.P. Ratti^{a,b}, C. Riccardi^{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}, 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}

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

K. Androsov^{a,23}, P. Azzurri^a, G. Bagliesi^a, J. Bernardini^a, T. Boccali^a, G. Broccolo^{a,c}, R. Castaldi^a, M.A. Ciocci^{a,23}, R. Dell'Orso^a, F. Fiori^{a,c}, L. Foà^{a,c}, A. Giassi^a, M.T. Grippo^{a,23}, A. Kraan^a, F. Ligabue^{a,c}, T. Lomtadze^a, L. Martini^{a,b}, A. Messineo^{a,b}, C.S. Moon^{a,24}, F. Palla^a, A. Rizzi^{a,b}, A. Savoy-Navarro^{a,25}, A.T. Serban^a, P. Spagnolo^a, P. Squillacioti^{a,23}, R. Tenchini^a, G. Tonelli^{a,b}, A. Venturi^a, P.G. Verdini^a, C. Vernieri^{a,c}

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

L. Barone^{a,b}, F. Cavallari^a, D. Del Re^{a,b}, M. Diemoz^a, M. Grassi^{a,b}, C. Jorda^a, E. Longo^{a,b}, F. Margaroli^{a,b}, P. Meridiani^a, F. Micheli^{a,b}, S. Nourbakhsh^{a,b}, G. Organtini^{a,b}, R. Paramatti^a, S. Rahatlou^{a,b}, C. Rovelli^a, L. Soffi^{a,b}, P. Traczyk^{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}, R. Bellan^{a,b}, C. Biino^a, N. Cartiglia^a, S. Casasso^{a,b}, M. Costa^{a,b}, P. De Remigis^a, A. Degano^{a,b}, N. Demaria^a, C. Mariotti^a, S. Maselli^a, E. Migliore^{a,b}, V. Monaco^{a,b}, M. Musich^a, M.M. Obertino^{a,c}, G. Ortona^{a,b}, L. Pacher^{a,b}, N. Pastrone^a, M. Pelliccioni^{a,2}, A. Potenza^{a,b}, A. Romero^{a,b}, M. Ruspa^{a,c}, R. Sacchi^{a,b}, A. Solano^{a,b}, A. Staiano^a

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

S. Belforte^a, V. Candelise^{a,b}, M. Casarsa^a, F. Cossutti^{a,2}, G. Della Ricca^{a,b}, B. Gobbo^a, C. La Licata^{a,b}, M. Marone^{a,b}, D. Montanino^{a,b}, A. Penzo^a, A. Schizzi^{a,b}, T. Umer^{a,b}, A. Zanetti^a

Kangwon National University, Chunchon, Korea

S. Chang, T.Y. Kim, S.K. Nam

Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea

D.H. Kim, G.N. Kim, J.E. Kim, D.J. Kong, S. Lee, Y.D. Oh, H. Park, D.C. Son

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

J.Y. Kim, Zero J. Kim, S. Song

Korea University, Seoul, Korea

S. Choi, D. Gyun, B. Hong, M. Jo, H. Kim, Y. Kim, K.S. Lee, S.K. Park, Y. Roh

University of Seoul, Seoul, Korea

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

Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon, Korea

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

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 Cruz²⁶, R. Lopez-Fernandez, J. Martínez-Ortega, A. Sanchez-Hernandez, L.M. Villasenor-Cendejas

Universidad Iberoamericana, Mexico City, Mexico

S. Carrillo Moreno, F. Vazquez Valencia

Benemerita Universidad Autonoma de Puebla, Puebla, Mexico

H.A. Salazar Ibarguen

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

E. Casimiro Linares, A. Morelos Pineda

University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

D. Krofcheck

University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand

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

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

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

National Centre for Nuclear Research, Swierk, Poland

H. Bialkowska, M. Bluj, B. Boimska, T. Frueboes, 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, M. Misiura, W. Wolszczak

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

P. Bargassa, C. Beirão Da Cruz E Silva, P. Faccioli, P.G. Ferreira Parracho, M. Gallinaro, F. Nguyen, J. Rodrigues Antunes, J. Seixas², J. Varela, P. Vischia

Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia

I. Golutvin, V. Karjavin, V. Konoplyanikov, V. Korenkov, G. Kozlov, A. Lanev, A. Malakhov, V. Matveev, V.V. Mitsyn, P. Moisenz, V. Palichik, V. Perelygin, S. Shmatov, S. Shulha, N. Skatchkov, V. Smirnov, E. Tikhonenko, A. Zarubin

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

V. Golovtsov, Y. Ivanov, V. Kim²⁷, 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, A. Pashenkov, D. Tlisov, A. Toropin

Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia

V. Epshteyn, V. Gavrilov, N. Lychkovskaya, V. Popov, G. Safronov, S. Semenov, A. Spiridonov, V. Stolin, E. Vlasov, A. Zhokin

P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia

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

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

A. Belyaev, E. Boos, V. Bunichev, M. Dubinin⁷, L. Dudko, A. Ershov, A. Gribushin, V. Klyukhin, N. Korneeva, I. Lokhtin, A. Markina, S. Obraztsov, M. Perfilov, V. Savrin

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

I. Azhgirey, I. Bayshev, S. Bitioukov, V. Kachanov, A. Kalinin, D. Konstantinov, 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. Adzic²⁸, M. Dordevic, M. Ekmedzic, J. Milosevic

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

M. Aguilar-Benitez, J. Alcaraz Maestre, C. Battilana, E. Calvo, M. Cerrada, M. Chamizo Llatas², 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, E. Navarro De Martino, J. Puerta Pelayo, A. Quintario Olmeda, I. Redondo, L. Romero, M.S. Soares, C. Willmott

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain

C. Albajar, J.F. de Trocóniz

Universidad de Oviedo, Oviedo, Spain

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

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. Fernandez, G. Gomez, J. Gonzalez Sanchez, A. Graziano, A. Lopez Virto, J. Marco, R. Marco, C. Martinez Rivero, F. Matorras, F.J. Munoz Sanchez, J. Piedra Gomez, T. Rodrigo, A.Y. Rodríguez-Marrero, A. Ruiz-Jimeno, L. Scodellaro, I. Vila, R. Vilar Cortabitarte

CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland

D. Abbaneo, E. Auffray, G. Auzinger, M. Bachtis, P. Baillon, A.H. Ball, D. Barney, J. Bendavid, L. Benhabib, J.F. Benitez, C. Bernet⁸, G. Bianchi, P. Bloch, A. Bocci, A. Bonato, O. Bondu, C. Botta, H. Breuker, T. Camporesi, G. Cerminara, T. Christiansen, J.A. Coarasa Perez, S. Colafranceschi²⁹, M. D'Alfonso, D. d'Enterria, A. Dabrowski, A. David, F. De Guio, A. De Roeck, S. De Visscher, S. Di Guida, M. Dobson, N. Dupont, A. Elliott-Peisert, J. Eugster, G. Franzoni, W. Funk, M. Giffels, D. Gigi, K. Gill, D. Giordano, M. Girone, M. Giunta, F. Glege, R. Gomez-Reino Garrido, S. Gowdy, R. Guida, J. Hammer, M. Hansen, P. Harris, A. Hinzmann, V. Innocente, P. Janot, E. Karavakis, K. Kousouris, K. Krajczar, P. Lecoq, C. Lourenço, N. Magini, L. Malgeri, M. Mannelli, L. Masetti, F. Meijers, S. Mersi, E. Meschi, F. Moortgat, M. Mulders, P. Musella, L. Orsini, E. Palencia Cortezon, E. Perez, L. Perrozzi, A. Petrilli, G. Petrucciani, A. Pfeiffer, M. Pierini, M. Pimiä, D. Piparo, M. Plagge, A. Racz, W. Reece, G. Rolandi³⁰, M. Rovere, H. Sakulin, F. Santanastasio, C. Schäfer, C. Schwick, S. Sekmen, A. Sharma, P. Siegrist, P. Silva, M. Simon, P. Sphicas³¹, D. Spiga, J. Steggemann, B. Stieger, M. Stoye, A. Tsiros, G.I. Veres¹⁸, J.R. Vlimant, H.K. Wöhri, 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, D. Renker, T. Rohe

Institute for Particle Physics, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

F. Bachmair, L. Bäni, L. Bianchini, P. Bortignon, M.A. Buchmann, B. Casal, N. Chanon, A. Deisher, G. Dissertori, M. Dittmar, M. Donegà, M. Dünser, P. Eller, C. Grab, D. Hits,

W. Lustermann, B. Mangano, A.C. Marini, P. Martinez Ruiz del Arbol, D. Meister, N. Mohr, C. Nägeli³², P. Nef, F. Nessi-Tedaldi, F. Pandolfi, L. Pape, F. Pauss, M. Peruzzi, M. Quitnat, F.J. Ronga, M. Rossini, A. Starodumov³³, M. Takahashi, L. Tauscher[†], K. Theofilatos, D. Treille, R. Wallny, H.A. Weber

Universität Zürich, Zurich, Switzerland

C. Amsler³⁴, V. Chiochia, A. De Cosa, C. Favaro, M. Ivova Paneva, B. Kilminster, B. Millan Mejias, J. Ngadiuba, P. Robmann, H. Snoek, S. Taroni, M. Verzetti, Y. Yang

National Central University, Chung-Li, Taiwan

M. Cardaci, K.H. Chen, C. Ferro, C.M. Kuo, S.W. Li, W. Lin, Y.J. Lu, R. Volpe, S.S. Yu

National Taiwan University (NTU), Taipei, Taiwan

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

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

B. Asavapibhop, N. Suwonjandee

Cukurova University, Adana, Turkey

A. Adiguzel, M.N. Bakirci³⁵, S. Cerci³⁶, C. Dozen, I. Dumanoglu, E. Eskut, S. Girgis, G. Gokbulut, E. Gurpinar, I. Hos, E.E. Kangal, A. Kayis Topaksu, G. Onengut³⁷, K. Ozdemir, S. Ozturk³⁵, A. Polatoz, K. Sogut³⁸, D. Sunar Cerci³⁶, B. Tali³⁶, H. Topakli³⁵, 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, G. Karapinar³⁹, K. Ocalan, A. Ozpineci, M. Serin, R. Sever, U.E. Surat, M. Yalvac, M. Zeyrek

Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey

E. Gülmez, B. Isildak⁴⁰, M. Kaya⁴¹, O. Kaya⁴¹, S. Ozkorucuklu⁴², N. Sonmez⁴³

Istanbul Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey

H. Bahtiyar⁴⁴, E. Barlas, K. Cankocak, Y.O. Günaydin⁴⁵, F.I. Vardarli, M. Yücel

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

L. Levchuk, P. Sorokin

University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom

J.J. Brooke, E. Clement, D. Cussans, H. Flacher, R. Frazier, J. Goldstein, M. Grimes, G.P. Heath, H.F. Heath, J. Jacob, L. Kreczko, C. Lucas, Z. Meng, D.M. Newbold⁴⁶, S. Paramesvaran, A. Poll, S. Senkin, V.J. Smith, T. Williams

Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom

K.W. Bell, A. Belyaev⁴⁷, C. Brew, R.M. Brown, D.J.A. Cockerill, J.A. Coughlan, K. Harder, S. Harper, J. Ilic, E. Olaiya, D. Petyt, C.H. Shepherd-Themistocleous, A. Thea, I.R. Tomalin, W.J. Womersley, S.D. Worm

Imperial College, London, United Kingdom

M. Baber, R. Bainbridge, O. Buchmuller, D. Burton, 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, M. Kenzie, R. Lane, R. Lucas⁴⁶, L. Lyons, A.-M. Magnan, J. Marrouche, B. Mathias, R. Nandi, J. Nash, A. Nikitenko³³, J. Pela, M. Pesaresi, K. Petridis, M. Pioppi⁴⁸, D.M. Raymond, S. Rogerson,

A. Rose, C. Seez, P. Sharp[†], A. Sparrow, A. Tapper, M. Vazquez Acosta, T. Virdee, S. Wakefield, N. Wardle

Brunel University, Uxbridge, United Kingdom

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

J. Dittmann, K. Hatakeyama, A. Kasmi, H. Liu, T. Scarborough

The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, USA

O. Charaf, S.I. Cooper, C. Henderson, P. Rumerio

Boston University, Boston, USA

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

Brown University, Providence, USA

J. Alimena, S. Bhattacharya, G. Christopher, D. Cutts, Z. Demiragli, A. Ferapontov, A. Garabedian, U. Heintz, S. Jabeen, G. Kukartsev, E. Laird, G. Landsberg, M. Luk, M. Narain, M. Segala, T. Sinthuprasith, T. Speer, J. Swanson

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, R. Erbacher, M. Gardner, W. Ko, A. Kopecky, R. Lander, T. Miceli, D. Pellett, J. Pilot, F. Ricci-Tam, B. Rutherford, M. Searle, S. Shalhout, J. Smith, M. Squires, M. Tripathi, S. Wilbur, R. Yohay

University of California, Los Angeles, USA

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

University of California, Riverside, Riverside, USA

J. Babb, R. Clare, J. Ellison, J.W. Gary, G. Hanson, J. Heilman, P. Jandir, F. Lacroix, H. Liu, O.R. Long, A. Luthra, M. Malberti, H. Nguyen, A. Shrinivas, J. Sturdy, S. Sumowidagdo, S. Wimpenny

University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, USA

W. Andrews, J.G. Branson, G.B. Cerati, S. Cittolin, R.T. D'Agnolo, D. Evans, A. Holzner, R. Kelley, D. Kovalskyi, M. Lebourgeois, J. Letts, I. Macneill, S. Padhi, C. Palmer, M. Pieri, M. Sani, V. Sharma, S. Simon, E. Sudano, M. Tadel, Y. Tu, A. Vartak, S. Wasserbaech⁴⁹, F. Würthwein, A. Yagil, J. Yoo

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

D. Barge, C. Campagnari, T. Danielson, K. Flowers, P. Geffert, C. George, F. Golf, J. Incandela, C. Justus, R. Magaña Villalba, N. Mccoll, V. Pavlunin, J. Richman, R. Rossin, D. Stuart, W. To, C. West

California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA

A. Apresyan, A. Bornheim, J. Bunn, Y. Chen, E. Di Marco, J. Duarte, D. Kcira, A. Mott, H.B. Newman, C. Pena, C. Rogan, M. Spiropulu, V. Timciuc, R. Wilkinson, S. Xie, R.Y. Zhu

Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, USA

V. Azzolini, A. Calamba, R. Carroll, T. Ferguson, Y. Iiyama, D.W. Jang, M. Paulini, J. Russ, H. Vogel, I. Vorobiev

University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, USA

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

Cornell University, Ithaca, USA

J. Alexander, A. Chatterjee, N. Eggert, L.K. Gibbons, W. Hopkins, 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, Y. Weng, L. Winstrom, P. Wittich

Fairfield University, Fairfield, USA

D. Winn

Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, USA

S. Abdullin, M. Albrow, J. Anderson, G. Apollinari, L.A.T. Bauerdick, A. Beretvas, J. Berryhill, P.C. Bhat, K. Burkett, J.N. Butler, V. Chetluru, H.W.K. Cheung, F. Chlebana, S. Cihangir, V.D. Elvira, I. Fisk, J. Freeman, Y. Gao, E. Gottschalk, L. Gray, D. Green, O. Gutsche, D. Hare, R.M. Harris, J. Hirschauer, B. Hooberman, S. Jindariani, M. Johnson, U. Joshi, K. Kaadze, B. Klima, S. Kwan, J. Linacre, D. Lincoln, R. Lipton, J. Lykken, K. Maeshima, J.M. Marraffino, V.I. Martinez Outschoorn, S. Maruyama, D. Mason, P. McBride, K. Mishra, S. Mrenna, Y. Musienko⁵⁰, S. Nahn, C. Newman-Holmes, V. O'Dell, O. Prokofyev, N. Ratnikova, E. Sexton-Kennedy, S. Sharma, W.J. Spalding, L. Spiegel, L. Taylor, S. Tkaczyk, N.V. Tran, L. Uplegger, E.W. Vaandering, R. Vidal, J. Whitmore, W. Wu, F. Yang, J.C. Yun

University of Florida, Gainesville, USA

D. Acosta, P. Avery, D. Bourilkov, T. Cheng, S. Das, M. De Gruttola, G.P. Di Giovanni, D. Dobur, R.D. Field, M. Fisher, Y. Fu, I.K. Furic, J. Hugon, B. Kim, J. Konigsberg, A. Korytov, A. Kropivnitskaya, T. Kypreos, J.F. Low, K. Matchev, P. Milenov⁵¹, G. Mitselmakher, L. Muniz, A. Rinkevicius, L. Shchutska, N. Skhirtladze, M. Snowball, J. Yelton, M. Zakaria

Florida International University, Miami, USA

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

Florida State University, Tallahassee, USA

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

Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, USA

M.M. Baarmand, B. Dorney, M. Hohmann, H. Kalakhety, F. Yumiceva

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

M.R. Adams, L. Apanasevich, V.E. Bazterra, R.R. Betts, I. Bucinskaite, R. Cavanaugh, O. Evdokimov, L. Gauthier, C.E. Gerber, D.J. Hofman, S. Khalatyan, P. Kurt, D.H. Moon, C. O'Brien, C. Silkworth, P. Turner, N. Varelas

The University of Iowa, Iowa City, USA

U. Akgun, E.A. Albayrak⁴⁴, B. Bilki⁵², W. Clarida, K. Dilsiz, F. Duru, J.-P. Merlo, H. Mermerkaya⁵³, A. Mestvirishvili, A. Moeller, J. Nachtman, H. Ogul, Y. Onel, F. Ozok⁴⁴, S. Sen, P. Tan, E. Tiras, J. Wetzel, T. Yetkin⁵⁴, K. Yi

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA

B.A. Barnett, B. Blumenfeld, S. Bolognesi, D. Fehling, A.V. Gritsan, P. Maksimovic, C. Martin, M. Swartz, A. Whitbeck

The University of Kansas, Lawrence, USA

P. Baringer, A. Bean, G. Benelli, R.P. Kenny III, M. Murray, D. Noonan, S. Sanders, J. Sekaric, R. Stringer, Q. Wang, J.S. Wood

Kansas State University, Manhattan, USA

A.F. Barfuss, I. Chakaberia, A. Ivanov, S. Khalil, M. Makouski, Y. Maravin, L.K. Saini, S. Shrestha, I. Svintradze

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, USA

J. Gronberg, D. Lange, F. Rebassoo, D. Wright

University of Maryland, College Park, USA

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

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, USA

A. Apyan, R. Barbieri, G. Bauer, W. Busza, I.A. Cali, M. Chan, L. Di Matteo, V. Dutta, G. Gomez Ceballos, M. Goncharov, D. Gulhan, M. Klute, Y.S. Lai, Y.-J. Lee, A. Levin, P.D. Luckey, T. Ma, C. Paus, D. Ralph, C. Roland, G. Roland, G.S.F. Stephans, F. Stöckli, K. Sumorok, D. Velicanu, J. Veverka, B. Wyslouch, M. Yang, A.S. Yoon, M. Zanetti, V. Zhukova

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, USA

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

University of Mississippi, Oxford, USA

J.G. Acosta, L.M. Cremaldi, R. Kroeger, S. Oliveros, L. Perera, R. Rahmat, D.A. Sanders, D. Summers

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, USA

E. Avdeeva, K. Bloom, S. Bose, D.R. Claes, A. Dominguez, R. Gonzalez Suarez, J. Keller, I. Kravchenko, J. Lazo-Flores, S. Malik, F. Meier, G.R. Snow

State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, USA

J. Dolen, A. Godshalk, I. Iashvili, S. Jain, A. Kharchilava, A. Kumar, S. Rappoccio, Z. Wan

Northeastern University, Boston, USA

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

Northwestern University, Evanston, USA

A. Anastassov, K.A. Hahn, A. Kubik, L. Lusito, N. Mucia, N. Odell, B. Pollack, A. Pozdnyakov, M. Schmitt, S. Stoynev, K. Sung, M. Velasco, S. Won

University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, USA

D. Berry, A. Brinkerhoff, K.M. Chan, A. Drozdetskiy, 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

L. Antonelli, B. Bylsma, L.S. Durkin, S. Flowers, C. Hill, R. Hughes, K. Kotov, T.Y. Ling, D. Puigh, M. Rodenburg, G. Smith, C. Vuosalo, B.L. Winer, H. Wolfe, H.W. Wulsin

Princeton University, Princeton, USA

E. Berry, P. Elmer, V. Halyo, P. Hebda, J. Hegeman, A. Hunt, P. Jindal, S.A. Koay, P. Lujan,

D. Marlow, T. Medvedeva, M. Mooney, J. Olsen, P. Piroué, X. Quan, A. Raval, H. Saka, D. Stickland, C. Tully, J.S. Werner, S.C. Zenz, A. Zuranski

University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez, USA

E. Brownson, A. Lopez, H. Mendez, J.E. Ramirez Vargas

Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA

E. Alagoz, D. Benedetti, G. Bolla, D. Bortoletto, M. De Mattia, A. Everett, Z. Hu, M. Jones, K. Jung, M. Kress, N. Leonardo, D. Lopes Pegna, V. Maroussov, P. Merkel, D.H. Miller, N. Neumeister, B.C. Radburn-Smith, I. Shipsey, D. Silvers, A. Svyatkovskiy, F. Wang, W. Xie, L. Xu, H.D. Yoo, J. Zablocki, Y. Zheng

Purdue University Calumet, Hammond, USA

N. Parashar

Rice University, Houston, USA

A. Adair, B. Akgun, K.M. Ecklund, F.J.M. Geurts, W. Li, B. Michlin, B.P. Padley, R. Redjimi, J. Roberts, J. Zabel

University of Rochester, Rochester, USA

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

The Rockefeller University, New York, USA

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

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

S. Arora, 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, S. Salur, S. Schnetzer, C. Seitz, S. Somalwar, R. Stone, S. Thomas, P. Thomassen, M. Walker

University of Tennessee, Knoxville, USA

K. Rose, S. Spanier, Z.C. Yang, A. York

Texas A&M University, College Station, USA

O. Bouhali⁵⁵, R. Eusebi, W. Flanagan, J. Gilmore, T. Kamon⁵⁶, V. Khotilovich, V. Krutelyov, R. Montalvo, I. Osipenkov, Y. Pakhotin, A. Perloff, J. Roe, A. Safonov, T. Sakuma, I. Suarez, A. Tatarinov, D. Toback

Texas Tech University, Lubbock, USA

N. Akchurin, C. Cowden, J. Damgov, C. Dragoiu, P.R. Duderu, K. Kovitangoon, S. Kunori, S.W. Lee, T. Libeiro, I. Volobouev

Vanderbilt University, Nashville, USA

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

University of Virginia, Charlottesville, USA

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

Wayne State University, Detroit, USA

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

University of Wisconsin - Madison, Madison, WI, USA

D.A. Belknap, L. Borrello, D. Carlsmith, M. Cepeda, S. Dasu, S. Duric, E. Friis, M. Grothe, R. Hall-Wilton, M. Herndon, A. Hervé, P. Klabbers, J. Klukas, A. Lanaro, R. Loveless, A. Mohapatra, I. Ojalvo, T. Perry, G.A. Pierro, G. Polese, I. Ross, T. Sarangi, A. Savin, W.H. Smith

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Mumbai, ZZ

T. Aziz, S. Banerjee, R.M. Chatterjee, S. Dugad, S. Ganguly, S. Ghosh, M. Guchait, A. Gurtu⁵⁷, G. Kole, S. Kumar, M. Maity⁵⁸, G. Majumder, K. Mazumdar, G.B. Mohanty, B. Parida, K. Sudhakar, N. Wickramage⁵⁹

†: Deceased

- 1: Also at Vienna University of Technology, Vienna, Austria
- 2: Also at CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland
- 3: Also at Institut Pluridisciplinaire Hubert Curien, Université de Strasbourg, Université de Haute Alsace Mulhouse, CNRS/IN2P3, Strasbourg, France
- 4: Also at National Institute of Chemical Physics and Biophysics, Tallinn, Estonia
- 5: Also at Skobeltsyn Institute of Nuclear Physics, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia
- 6: Also at Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, Brazil
- 7: Also at California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA
- 8: Also at Laboratoire Leprince-Ringuet, Ecole Polytechnique, IN2P3-CNRS, Palaiseau, France
- 9: Now at Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt
- 10: Also at Fayoum University, El-Fayoum, Egypt
- 11: Also at Zewail City of Science and Technology, Zewail, Egypt
- 12: Also at British University in Egypt, Cairo, Egypt
- 13: Also at Université de Haute Alsace, Mulhouse, France
- 14: Also at Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia
- 15: Also at Brandenburg University of Technology, Cottbus, Germany
- 16: Also at The University of Kansas, Lawrence, USA
- 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, Mumbai, ZZ
- 20: Also at Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, Iran
- 21: Also at Sharif University of Technology, Tehran, Iran
- 22: Also at Plasma Physics Research Center, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
- 23: Also at Università degli Studi di Siena, Siena, Italy
- 24: Also at Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS) - IN2P3, Paris, France
- 25: Also at Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA
- 26: Also at Universidad Michoacana de San Nicolas de Hidalgo, Morelia, Mexico
- 27: Also at St. Petersburg State Polytechnical University, St. Petersburg, Russia
- 28: Also at Faculty of Physics, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia
- 29: Also at Facoltà Ingegneria, Università di Roma, Roma, Italy
- 30: Also at Scuola Normale e Sezione dell'INFN, Pisa, Italy
- 31: Also at National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece
- 32: Also at Paul Scherrer Institut, Villigen, Switzerland
- 33: Also at Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia
- 34: Also at Albert Einstein Center for Fundamental Physics, Bern, Switzerland
- 35: Also at Gaziosmanpasa University, Tokat, Turkey
- 36: Also at Adiyaman University, Adiyaman, Turkey

-
- 37: Also at Cag University, Mersin, Turkey
38: Also at Mersin University, Mersin, Turkey
39: Also at Izmir Institute of Technology, Izmir, Turkey
40: Also at Ozyegin University, Istanbul, Turkey
41: Also at Kafkas University, Kars, Turkey
42: Also at Suleyman Demirel University, Isparta, Turkey
43: Also at Ege University, Izmir, Turkey
44: Also at Mimar Sinan University, Istanbul, Istanbul, Turkey
45: Also at Kahramanmaras Sütcü Imam University, Kahramanmaras, Turkey
46: Also at Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom
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 Utah Valley University, Orem, USA
50: Also at Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia
51: Also at University of Belgrade, Faculty of Physics and Vinca Institute of Nuclear Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia
52: Also at Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, USA
53: Also at Erzincan University, Erzincan, Turkey
54: Also at Yildiz Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey
55: Also at Texas A&M University at Qatar, Doha, Qatar
56: Also at Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea
57: Now at King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
58: Also at University of Visva-Bharati, Santiniketan, India
59: Also at University of Ruhuna, Matara, Sri Lanka