Phys. Lett. B 857 (2024) 138979

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Physics Letters B

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/physletb

Letter

Searches for violation of Lorentz invariance in top quark pair production using dilepton events in 13 TeV proton-proton collisions

The CMS Collaboration *

CERN, Geneva, Switzerland

ARTICLE INFO

Editor: M. Doser

Keywords:
CMS
Top quark
Beyond standard model
Lorentz symmetry

ABSTRACT

A search for violation of Lorentz invariance in the production of top quark pairs ($t\bar{t}$) is presented. The measured normalized differential $t\bar{t}$ production cross section, as a function of the sidereal time, is examined for potential modulations induced by Lorentz-invariance breaking operators in an effective field theory extension of the standard model (SM). The cross section is measured from collision events collected by the CMS detector at a center-of-mass-energy of 13 TeV, corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 77.8 fb^{-1}, and containing one electron and one muon. The results are found to be compatible with zero, in agreement with the SM, and are used to place upper limits at 68% confidence level on the magnitude of the Lorentz-violating couplings ranging from $1–8 \times 10^{-3}$. This is the first precision test of the isotropy in special relativity with top quarks at the LHC, restricting further the bounds on such couplings by up to two orders of magnitude with respect to previous searches conducted at the Tevatron.

1. Introduction

Lorentz invariance is a key ingredient of the relativistic description of our world, on the scale of elementary particles as well as on large scales in the Universe. The standard model (SM) of particle physics is a relativistic quantum field theory, and as such it must contain a Lorentz-invariant action. General relativity preserves Lorentz invariance locally. The Lorentz group contains rotations and boosts in Minkowski spacetime. Models of quantum gravity, e.g., string theory [1] and loop quantum gravity [2], can, however, predict breaking of Lorentz invariance at a high mass scale. A quantum theory including gravity may be governed by an energy scale lower than the Planck mass, possibly at the TeV scale [3]. Thus, induced deviations from Lorentz invariance may be measurable at the LHC.

The standard model extension (SME) [4,5] is an effective field theory in which all operators violating Lorentz invariance are added to the SM Lagrangian. Its coefficients, controlling the size of Lorentz invariance breaking, are different for each particle. While coefficients related to photons, neutrons, protons, and neutrinos have been measured precisely [6], the quark sector remains constrained at a relatively lower precision. The ZEUS Collaboration at the DESY HERA recently searched for violation of Lorentz invariance arising from light quarks in deep inelastic scattering data [7]. Searches for Lorentz invariance violation were performed in neutral meson mixing at KLOE [8], KTeV [9], FOCUS [10], BaBar [11], D0 [12], and LHCb [13]. Violation of Lorentz invariance was searched for with top quark pairs ($t\bar{t}$) by the D0 experiment [14] at the Fermilab Tevatron, showing compatibility with Lorentz invariance with an absolute uncertainty of about 10% on the tested SME coefficients. The proton-proton (pp) collisions at the CERN LHC at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV produce $t\bar{t}$ events with a cross section approximately 100 times higher than that of the Tevatron. Studies showed that the measurements at the LHC have a large potential to significantly improve upon existing results [15].

In this Letter, the first search for Lorentz invariance violation with top quarks at the LHC is presented, within the context of the SME. Signatures for violation of Lorentz invariance involving top quarks are parameterized with the SME Lagrangian [16]:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{SME}} = \frac{1}{2} i\bar{\psi}(\gamma^{\nu} + c^{\mu\nu}\gamma_{\mu} + d^{\mu\nu}\gamma_5\gamma_{\mu})\overleftrightarrow{\partial_{\nu}}\psi - m_{\mathrm{t}}\bar{\psi}\psi, \quad (1)$$

where ψ and $\bar{\psi}$ are the Dirac fields for top quarks and antiquarks, m_{t} is the top quark mass, and $c^{\mu\nu}$ and $d^{\mu\nu}$ are the unitless SME coefficients. Unlike the SM fields, $c^{\mu\nu}$ and $d^{\mu\nu}$ are not modified under Lorentz transformations of the particle system: they are constant 4×4 matrices, thereby breaking Lorentz invariance of the Lagrangian. They indicate a preferential direction in spacetime as seen by top quarks, violating the isotropy of special relativity. Boosts associated with the Earth's rotation and with the revolution around the sun are negligible relative to

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

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2024.138979
Received 23 May 2024; Received in revised form 12 August 2024; Accepted 20 August 2024
Available online 23 August 2024
0370-2693/© 2024 CERN for the benefit of the CMS Collaboration. Published by Elsevier B.V. Funded by SCOAP³. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

top quark boosts. Lorentz invariance is preserved when $c^{\mu\nu}$ and $d^{\mu\nu}$ are zero.

Choosing a reference frame is needed to report measurements of Lorentz-violating coefficients, in analogy, for instance, with the measurement of particle energies, which are not invariant under Lorentz transformation. By convention, results are reported in the sun-centered frame (SCF) [6], with its origin at the center of the sun; the Z axis pointing north, parallel to the Earth's rotation axis; the X axis pointing to the intersection of the ecliptic and celestial equator on January 1st, 2000 (J2000); and the Y axis completing the direct basis. The SCF can be considered as inertial in the lifetime of a physics experiment. Hereafter, the coefficients $c^{\mu\nu}$ and $d^{\mu\nu}$ with space-time indices μ or $\nu = T, X, Y, Z$ are expressed in the SCF (to be distinguished from the space-time indices of the CMS frame). The relevant measure of time in this reference frame is called sidereal time. While one rotation period of the Earth is equal to approximately 23 h 56 min UTC (i.e., Universal Time Coordinated, where UTC seconds are defined from Cesium atomic hyperfine transitions), one rotation period is defined as being equal to 24 sidereal hours. The CMS detector moves around the Earth's rotation axis during a sidereal day, and so does the beam line direction at the interaction point, or the average direction of top quarks produced in the collisions. As a consequence, top quark couplings $c^{\mu\nu}$ and $d^{\mu\nu}$ depend on time, resulting in cross sections for top quark production modulating with sidereal time. Searching for such signatures is the goal of this Letter.

We report a search for violation of Lorentz invariance in $pp \to t\bar{t}$ production with the CMS experiment at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, using events with one muon and one electron of opposite charge in the final state, stemming from the decay $t\bar{t} \to b\bar{b}e\nu_e\mu\nu_\mu$ (where the particle or antiparticle nature of the leptons is implied). The $e\mu$ channel provides a high purity sample of $t\bar{t}$ events owing to the negligible contribution from Z + jets processes. A data sample recorded in 2016–2017 with the CMS experiment and corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 77.8 fb^{-1} is analyzed. Events are categorized based on the number of jets identified as originating from b quarks (b jets) to improve the separation between the $t\bar{t}$ signal and the background processes. The normalized $t\bar{t}$ cross section is measured differentially as a function of the sidereal time, in bins of hours within the sidereal day, by performing a profile maximum likelihood fit to the event yields in the b jet multiplicity. The measurement is used to constrain, for the first time at the LHC, the Lorentz-violating coefficients $c^{\mu\nu}$ and $d^{\mu\nu}$ impacting top quarks. Tabulated results are provided in the HEPData record for this analysis [17].

The Letter is organized as follows. A description of the CMS detector and event reconstruction is provided in Section 2. Section 3 gives details on simulation samples, and Section 4 describes the event selection. Event corrections and associated systematic uncertainties, as well as their treatment relative to sidereal time, are detailed in Section 5. The normalized differential cross section for $t\bar{t}$ production as a function of sidereal time is measured in Section 6, providing a model-independent result. Bounds on the coefficients $c^{\mu\nu}$ and $d^{\mu\nu}$ within the SME framework are extracted in Section 7. The Letter concludes with a Summary in Section 8.

2. Event reconstruction with the CMS detector

The CMS apparatus [18–20] is a multipurpose, nearly hermetic detector, designed to trigger on [21,22] and identify electrons, muons, photons, and hadrons [23–25]. A global "particle-flow" (PF) algorithm [26] aims to reconstruct all individual particles in an event, combining information provided by the all-silicon inner tracker and by the crystal electromagnetic (ECAL) and brass-scintillator hadron (HCAL) calorimeters, operating inside a 3.8 T superconducting solenoid, with data from the gas-ionization muon detectors embedded in the flux-return yoke outside the solenoid. The reconstructed particles are used to build τ leptons, jets, and missing transverse momentum [27–29]. 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 Refs. [18–20].

Events of interest are selected using a two-tiered trigger system. The first level (L1), composed of custom hardware processors, uses information from the calorimeters and muon detectors to select events at a rate of around 100 kHz within a fixed latency of about 4 μs [21]. During the 2016–2017 data taking, a gradual shift in the timing of the inputs of the ECAL L1 trigger in the region at $|\eta| > 2.0$, where η is the pseudorapidity, caused a specific trigger inefficiency. Correction factors, which are small, were computed from data and applied to the simulation. The second level, known as the high-level trigger (HLT), consists of a farm of processors running a version of the full event reconstruction software optimized for fast processing, and reduces the event rate to around 1 kHz before data storage [22]. Events are selected at the HLT by requiring the presence of one or two leptons, with transverse momentum (p_T) thresholds as follows: one electron with $p_T > 12$ GeV and one muon with $p_T > 23$ GeV; one electron with $p_T > 23$ GeV and one muon with $p_T > 8$ GeV; one electron with $p_T > 27$ (35) GeV in 2016 (2017); or one muon with $p_T > 24$ (27) GeV in 2016 (2017).

The electron momentum is estimated by combining the energy measurement in the ECAL with the momentum measurement in the tracker. Electron candidates are required to satisfy $p_T > 25$ and 20 GeV for the highest p_T (leading) and second-highest p_T (subleading) lepton. Furthermore, electrons must have $|\eta| < 2.4$, and their energy deposit in the ECAL must lie outside of the transition region between the barrel and endcap sections ($1.44 < |\eta| < 1.56$). Electron candidates must satisfy tight identification criteria and are required to be isolated in the detector to reject jets misidentified as electrons. Identification criteria comprise selections on a shower shape variable in the ECAL, on the matching of the track with the ECAL energy deposit, on the ratio of HCAL over ECAL energy deposits around the candidate, the hits in the inner tracker, and on criteria to reject electrons arising from photon conversions [23]. An isolation variable is computed with the PF algorithm as the scalar p_T sum of photons, charged and neutral hadrons in a cone around the electron direction. The cone is defined by $\Delta R = \sqrt{(\Delta\eta)^2 + (\Delta\phi)^2} < 0.3$, where $\Delta\eta$ and $\Delta\phi$ are the η and azimuthal angle differences between the PF particles and the electron, respectively. Contributions to the isolation sum from other inelastic pp interactions in the same or nearby bunch crossing (pileup) are corrected using the FastJet estimator [30]. The relative isolation, calculated as the isolation sum divided by the electron p_T, is used. Differences in reconstruction and identification efficiencies between data and simulation are corrected using $Z \to e^+e^-$ events with a "tag-and-probe" method [31].

Muons are measured in the range $|\eta| < 2.4$, with detection planes made using three technologies: drift tubes, cathode strip chambers, and resistive-plate chambers. Muon candidates are reconstructed with the PF algorithm. They are required to satisfy $p_T > 25$ (20) GeV for the leading (subleading) lepton. Muon candidates are required to satisfy tight identification and isolation criteria, to suppress contributions from jets misidentified as muons. Identification criteria include selections on the number of matched muon detector planes, hits in the pixel and tracker, the χ^2 of the trajectory fit including tracking layers and muon detector planes, and the transverse impact parameter of the track [24]. A relative isolation variable is calculated with the PF algorithm similar to electrons but with a cone size $\Delta R < 0.4$. Differences in identification and isolation efficiencies between data and simulation are corrected using $Z \to \mu^+\mu^-$ events with the tag-and-probe method.

Jets are reconstructed from PF candidates, using the anti-k_T algorithm with a distance parameter of 0.4 [30,32]. Jet momentum is determined as the vectorial sum of all particle momenta in the jet, and is found from simulation to be, on average, within 5–10% of the true momentum over the entire p_T spectrum and detector acceptance. To mitigate pileup contributions, tracks identified to be originating from pileup vertices are discarded, and an offset correction is applied to correct for the remaining contributions. Jet energy corrections are derived from simulation studies so that the average measured energy of jets be-

comes identical to that of particle level jets. In situ measurements of the momentum balance in dijet, photon+jet, Z+jet, and multijet events are used to determine any residual differences between the jet energy scale in data and simulation, and appropriate corrections are made [28]. Additional selection criteria are applied to each jet to remove jets potentially dominated by instrumental effects or reconstruction failures. Jets are selected if they satisfy $p_T > 30$ GeV and $|\eta| < 2.4$. Jets are not considered if their distance ΔR from selected leptons is less than 0.4.

For the identification of b jets, a loose selection on the score of the DEEPCSV algorithm, a deep-learning discriminant using secondary vertex and lifetime information [33,34], is used. The identification efficiency of b quark jets is about 84% with a probability of misidentifying light-quark and gluon jets of 10%, estimated for b jet candidates with $p_T > 20$ GeV in simulated $t\bar{t}$ events. Corrections for the difference in identification efficiency of b jets and light jets between data and simulation are computed as a function of the jet p_T and η and applied to all jets in the event.

3. Simulation samples

Monte Carlo (MC) samples for $t\bar{t}$ production are generated at next-to-leading order (NLO) in perturbative quantum chromodynamics (pQCD) with the POWHEG v2 [35] generator, interfaced with PYTHIA 8 [36] for simulating parton shower, hadronization, and the underlying event. Revision 3453 is used for all the MC samples generated with POWHEG, while all of the simulation samples use PYTHIA 8.226 (8.230) in 2016 (2017). The $t\bar{t}$ cross section is computed with the TOP++ v2.0 program [37] at next-to-NLO (NNLO) and next-to-next-to-leading logarithmic accuracy. It has been observed that the top quark p_T spectrum in data is softer than the spectrum predicted in simulation [38–40]. Simulated events for $t\bar{t}$ production are therefore corrected for the ratio of unfolded $t\bar{t}$ data over POWHEG predictions as a function of the top quark and antiquark p_T at parton level.

Since this analysis targets the $t\bar{t}$ final state with two charged leptons of different flavors and at least one b jet, single top quark production in association with a W boson (tW) constitutes the main background, with one lepton each arising from the top quark and associated W boson decay. Simulated samples of tW and t-channel single top quark production are generated at NLO in pQCD with POWHEG v2. The cross section for the tW channel is computed at approximate NNLO [41]. Other backgrounds involving top quarks include s-channel single top quark production and $t\bar{t}$ production in association with a vector boson ($t\bar{t}W$ and $t\bar{t}Z$, grouped together and denoted as $t\bar{t}V$). Simulated samples for these processes are generated at NLO with MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO [42] (version 2.4.2 in 2016 and 2.6.0 in 2017 in all samples using MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO) with additional jets using FxFx merging [43]. The cross sections for single top t- and s-channel production are computed with the HATHOR v2.1 program [44] at NLO accuracy. The cross sections for $t\bar{t}W$ and $t\bar{t}Z$ processes are computed at NLO with MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO generation [42]. In the simulated samples, a fixed value of $m_t = 172.5$ GeV is used. Diboson production samples (WW, WZ, ZZ) are generated with PYTHIA 8. The cross section for the WW process is computed at NNLO [45], while the WZ and ZZ cross sections are computed at NLO with MCFM [46] version 6.6. The W+jets and Z+jets processes (grouped together and denoted as V+jets) are generated using MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO, at leading order (LO) matched with additional jets using the MLM algorithm [47] or at NLO with additional jets using FxFx merging. Cross sections for Z+jets and W+jets processes are computed with FEWZ [48] version 3.1 at NNLO.

The underlying event is modeled with the CP5 tune [49] for all of the simulated samples with 2017 detector conditions, and for the simulation of $t\bar{t}$ and tW processes with 2016 detector conditions. The samples simulated with 2016 detector conditions are using the CUETP8M1 tune [50] for all other background processes. The parton distribution functions (PDFs) used are the NNPDF3.1 NNLO set [51] for samples using the CP5 tune, and NNPDF3.0 NNLO for samples using the CUETP8M1 tune.

Table 1
Event yields in data and MC simulation in 2016–2017, after selection. The uncertainties include statistical and systematic sources, with correlations.

Process	2016	2017
$t\bar{t}$ SM	$169\,500 \pm 6100$	$196\,000 \pm 7300$
$t\bar{t}V$	460 ± 60	540 ± 70
Single top quark	$8\,500 \pm 1600$	$9\,900 \pm 2000$
Diboson	700 ± 150	650 ± 130
V+jets	$2\,100 \pm 500$	$2\,300 \pm 600$
Total background	$11\,700 \pm 1700$	$13\,404 \pm 2000$
Total MC	$181\,000 \pm 6700$	$209\,000 \pm 8100$
Data	168 282	203 584

The CMS detector response is simulated with the GEANT4 toolkit [52]. Data and simulation events are passed through the same CMS software reconstruction chain. Pileup interactions generated with PYTHIA 8 are added to the simulations, and the distribution in the number of pileup interactions is corrected for each MC sample to reproduce the numbers observed in data.

4. Event selection

Events with exactly one electron and one muon are selected. Events are rejected if there are additional electrons or muons with $p_T > 20$ GeV. In addition, the invariant mass of the dilepton pair is required to satisfy $m_{e\mu} > 20$ GeV, to reduce contributions from low-mass resonances and Drell–Yan τ pair production. Events with at least two jets are selected, among which at least one must be identified as a b jet.

The distribution in the number of b jets is compared between data and simulation in Fig. 1. The MC simulation of signal and backgrounds provides a description of the data distribution in the number of b jets agreeing within uncertainties. Inclusively, the event yields are 7.1% (2016) and 2.7% (2017) lower in data than in simulation, as shown in Table 1.

The distribution in the number of b jets is used as discriminant for the signal extraction in Sections 6 and 7, since it provides clear separation between the $t\bar{t}$ signal and the single top quark background, with the latter having only one top quark decaying to bW, compared to two for the signal process.

5. Treatment of the sidereal time dependence in corrections and systematic uncertainties

The CMS data is recorded in UNIX time, whose seconds having the same duration as UTC seconds. The UNIX timestamp of the events is translated to sidereal time with the following formula:

$$\Omega_{\text{sidereal}}\, t_{\text{sidereal}} = \Omega_{\text{UTC}}\, t_{\text{UNIX}} + \phi_{\text{UNIX}} + \phi_{\text{longitude}}, \tag{2}$$

where $\Omega_{\text{sidereal}} = 2\pi/86\,400\,\text{s}^{-1}$ (sidereal) is the angular velocity of Earth's rotation around its axis in sidereal time, $\Omega_{\text{UTC}} = 2\pi/86\,164\,\text{s}^{-1}$ (UTC) is the angular velocity of Earth's rotation around its axis in UTC time, and t_{UNIX} represents the event timestamp recorded at CMS in UNIX time since January 1st, 1970 (UNIX epoch). The azimuthal angle ϕ_{UNIX} encodes the phase between the UNIX epoch and J2000, which is the origin of the sidereal time count, and $\phi_{\text{longitude}}$ is the effective longitude, defined as the angle between the LHC beam at the CMS interaction point and the Greenwich meridian in rad.

Data events are classified in 24 bins, corresponding to the 24 sidereal hours within a sidereal day. In the MC simulation, event timestamps are not included; instead, a time-integrated distribution is built and scaled by 1/24 to define the expected prediction in each sidereal hour bin. This prediction and its associated systematic uncertainties need to be corrected for effects that would potentially depend on sidereal time.



Fig. 1. Distribution of the number of b jets in data and simulation, after the event selection, (upper) in 2016 and (lower) in 2017 samples. The hatched band includes statistical and systematic uncertainties in the predictions. The vertical bars associated with the data points represent their statistical uncertainty. The lower panels show the ratio of the observed data event yields to those expected from simulation.

According to the definition of sidereal time, events recorded every day within a year at the same UTC time would populate the bins uniformly.

The instantaneous luminosity delivered by the LHC, and thus the distribution of the number of pileup interactions per bunch crossing evolves over the year. To allow for differences in the instantaneous luminosity profile between sidereal time bins, the distribution in the number of pileup interactions in simulation is corrected to agree with data, as a function of the sidereal hour within a day. The associated uncertainty arises from our imprecise knowledge of the total inelastic cross section, and is computed by varying this cross section by its uncertainty (4.6%) simultaneously in each sidereal time bin.

The recorded integrated luminosity per sidereal time bin varies by up to 25% within a sidereal day, reflecting the time structure of the LHC operations. The simulated events are corrected to match the integrated luminosity in each sidereal time bin. The uncertainty in the integrated luminosity measurement originates from various sources in the normalization (related to the van der Meer calibration procedure [53–55]) and the integration of the luminosity measurement performed with several independent subdetectors (referred to as luminometers). The normalization, as well as detector-specific normalization uncertainties are not expected to depend on sidereal time and are treated as uniform. The uncertainties in the time stability and the linearity with respect to pileup, however, are estimated from cross-detector comparisons, i.e., by comparing the agreement between different luminometers, and their dependence on sidereal time can be evaluated explicitly. In 2016, the three main luminometers and methods used for the luminosity measurement [55] are the cluster counting in the pixel tracker, an occupancy-based algorithm using the HCAL measurement, and an LHC radiation monitoring system. In 2017, the three main luminometers and methods [56] are a method based on the sum of transverse energy in HCAL towers, pixel detector cluster counting, and the pixel luminosity telescope [57]. The main luminometers used for the luminosity measurement are not the same at all times, since the individual luminosity detectors can be affected by various operational issues. A small dependence of the stability and linearity estimates on the sidereal time is found:

- The cross-detector stability is evaluated separately in each sidereal time bin by taking the maximum difference among the integrated luminosities estimated with the three main luminometers. The relative uncertainty is found to be 0.1–0.3 (0.2–0.4)% in 2016 (2017), consistent with the time-integrated uncertainties evaluated in Refs. [55,56].
- The time dependence of the linearity of the luminometer response is evaluated in each sidereal time bin by computing the average single-bunch instantaneous luminosity (SBIL), as measured with the different luminometers, and weighting the largest difference with the corresponding cross-detector linearity slopes from Refs. [56,55]. The slopes are obtained from a fit of the ratios of SBIL estimates for pairs of luminometers, as a function of SBIL. The relative uncertainty is found to be at most 0.3 (0.5)% in 2016 (2017), depending on the sidereal time bin. The 2016 result is in agreement with the time-integrated uncertainty evaluated in Ref. [55], but the 2017 result is smaller than the uncertainty from Ref. [56] due to the usage of the less-conservative approach from Ref. [55] for the evaluation of the 2017 luminosity.

Cross-detector stability and linearity uncertainties are included in the analysis with explicit dependence on sidereal time. The LHC-related uncertainties (normalization uncertainties related to the van der Meer scan procedure) are evaluated to be 0.6 (0.9)% in 2016 (2017), and other luminosity uncertainties related to the detector are evaluated to be 0.9 (1.4)% in 2016 (2017).

The trigger efficiency, potentially changing slightly over the course of the year with the instantaneous luminosity profile, might also depend on sidereal time. Simulated events are therefore corrected for the difference in the trigger efficiency between data and simulation as a function of sidereal time. The trigger efficiencies are measured with the same method as in Ref. [58], using events triggered with requirements on the missing transverse momentum $p_{\mathrm{T}}^{\mathrm{miss}}$, which is the magnitude of the $\vec{p}_{\mathrm{T}}^{\mathrm{miss}}$ vector, defined as the projection onto the plane perpendicular to the beam axis of the negative vector sum of the momenta of all PF objects in the event, corrected for pileup effects. Events triggered with $p_{\mathrm{T}}^{\mathrm{miss}}$ requirements are correlated at less than 1% with those passing single-lepton and dilepton triggers. Events must satisfy a requirement on reconstructed $p_{\mathrm{T}}^{\mathrm{miss}} > 100$ GeV. At least one jet identified as b jet is required. For each sidereal time bin, a statistical uncertainty is computed, and two systematic uncertainties are evaluated by repeating the measurement in subpartitions of the data: an uncertainty for the dependence of the trigger efficiency on the number of jets and on the period of data taking. The ratio of trigger efficiencies in data and simulation is found to be in a range 97–99%, with uncertainties at the level of 1%, depending on the sidereal time bin.

For other experimental corrections and uncertainties, the dependence on sidereal time is unknown. As a consequence, an individual

nuisance parameter per sidereal time bin is conservatively attributed to most of the other experimental uncertainties, whose size is evaluated from an estimate not depending on time, allowing the fit to accommodate possible time dependence. These experimental uncertainties include the following sources: ratios of efficiencies between data and simulation for electron and muon reconstruction, identification, and isolation that arise from tag-and-probe measurements with $Z \to \ell^+\ell^-$ events [23,24] (where $\ell = e$ or μ; uncertainties associated with the jet energy corrections (including jet energy resolution) [28]; uncertainties arising from the identification of b jets [33]; and uncertainties associated with the gradual shift in the timing of the inputs of the ECAL L1 trigger. All of these uncertainties are treated as impacting the shape of the number of b jets distribution, as well as its normalization, and are treated as uncorrelated across sidereal time. Where relevant, each uncertainty source is split into systematic uncertainties correlated year-to-year, and a year-to-year uncorrelated component essentially of statistical nature. Two additional sources of theoretical origin impact experimental quantities and are treated as correlated as functions of sidereal time and years: the uncertainty in the jet energy scale arising from the parton flavors, obtained by comparing HERWIG and PYTHIA simulation; and the uncertainty in lepton isolation arising from the phase space extrapolation of efficiencies, from $Z \to \ell^+\ell^-$ to $t\bar{t}$ events. The uncertainties inducing the largest impact on the distribution of the number of b jets for the $t\bar{t}$ process are the electron identification (1.2% in 2016 and 2.1% in 2017) and b jet identification uncertainty (2% at low number of jets to 5% at high number of jets).

Contributions from background processes are estimated from simulation. After the selection, the event yield for background processes is about 8% of the total number of expected events (Table 1), dominated by single top quark processes. The normalization of single top quark processes, whose contribution is dominated by the tW process, is assigned an uncertainty of 30%, accounting for the interference with the $t\bar{t}$ process in the selected phase space. Diboson and V+jets processes are attributed an uncertainty of 30% as well estimated for the predictions in the selected phase-space. All these uncertainties are estimated following the prescription from Ref. [59]. An uncertainty of 20% is associated with $t\bar{t}V$ processes [60]. A normalization uncertainty of 4% is assigned to the SM $t\bar{t}$ process [59] in the SME fit (Section 7).

The uncertainty corresponding to the correction of the top quark p_T in the $t\bar{t}$ process is estimated by the difference with respect to not applying the correction (signatures for violation of Lorentz invariance searched for in this Letter cannot induce a modification of the top quark and antiquark p_T, once integrated over time). Other theoretical uncertainties are arising from the top quark mass (obtained by varying m_t by 1 GeV up and down around its nominal value); from the parameter h_{damp} controlling the matching between matrix element and parton shower in the POWHEG generator (varied around its nominal value as $1.379^{+0.926}_{-0.505}$ times m_t); uncertainties associated with the CP5 underlying event tune (estimated during the tuning process [49]); and color reconnection uncertainties in the parton shower. Uncertainties in the parton shower modeling, related to initial- and final-state radiation, are included for $t\bar{t}$ and single top quark processes by varying the renormalization scale for initial- and final-state QCD emission in the parton shower by a factor 2 up and down. Uncertainties arising from our missing knowledge of higher-order corrections in pQCD are included separately for $t\bar{t}$, single top quark, $t\bar{t}V$, and V+jets processes by constructing an envelope of maximum variation computed from renormalization and factorization scale varied by a factor 1/2 to 2, excluding anticorrelated variations. Uncertainties in the PDFs and the strong coupling constant α_S are evaluated with the Hessian set of NNPDF3.1 (102 replicas) and added in quadrature, with a single nuisance parameter for $t\bar{t}$, single top quark, $t\bar{t}V$, and V+jets processes. The h_{damp}, CP5 tune, and color reconnection sources modify the normalization of the distribution in the number of b jets, while all the other theoretical uncertainties modify the shape of the distribution. Theoretical uncertainties related to SM predictions are uniform across sidereal time.

A theoretical uncertainty corresponding to single top quark time modulation in the SME is included in the SME fit (described in Section 7), and treated as correlated across sidereal time.

The same MC samples are used to predict the event yields in each sidereal time bin, separately for 2016 and 2017. Statistical uncertainties in the MC samples are included as log-normal uncertainties independently for each bin of the b jet multiplicity distribution, treated as correlated across sidereal time bins.

The assumed correlations of the uncertainties between years of data taking and sidereal time bins are detailed in Table 2.

6. Measurement of the normalized $t\bar{t}$ differential cross section with sidereal time

The normalized differential cross section for $t\bar{t}$ production is measured by employing a profile likelihood template fit of the predictions from simulation to the data including all sidereal time bins, based on the LHC test statistic [61–63]. Since the SM predictions for the $t\bar{t}$ cross section are identical in each particle-level bin i, and because unfolding for detector effects is not needed (particle- and reconstructed-level sidereal time are identical), the normalized differential cross section σ_i/σ_{avg} in bin i (where σ_{avg} is the averaged cross section over all sidereal time bins) reduces to μ_i/μ_{avg}, where μ_i is the ratio of the observed $t\bar{t}$ yield to the $t\bar{t}$ yield predicted in the SM, and $\mu_{avg} = \sum_k \mu_k/24$. The fractions $f_i = \mu_i/\mu_{avg}$ for 23 sidereal time bins are directly fitted as parameters of interest together with μ_{avg}; the remaining fraction and its uncertainty is computed via error propagation using the covariance matrix of the fit.

In performing the measurement of the $t\bar{t}$ normalized differential cross section as a function of sidereal time, the distributions in the number of b jets in each sidereal time bin are used as discriminant observables between $t\bar{t}$ and background processes. Uncertainties described in Section 5 are considered either as nuisance parameters with log-normal distribution attributed to the normalization of the distribution in the number of b jets, or as nuisance parameters distorting the shape of the distribution in the number of b jets. Uncertainties follow the correlation scheme highlighted in Table 2: when the dependency with sidereal time is known, the uncertainties are treated as correlated across sidereal time bin (including uniform theory and background normalization uncertainties); and when the dependency is not known, the uncertainties are treated as uncorrelated across sidereal time bin. Prefit and postfit distributions are illustrated in Fig. 2. The prefit distribution corresponds to the expected SM event yields and their uncertainties before the fit is performed. After the model is fitted to the data, the final values of the parameters and their uncertainties are obtained, corresponding to the postfit distribution. The predicted distributions of the number of b jets are not the same in each time bin, because corrections for integrated luminosity, pileup, and trigger efficiencies are applied as a function of sidereal time.

The normalized differential cross section is shown in Fig. 3. A goodness-of-fit test including constraints from the nuisance parameters [64] results in a p-value [65] of 0.92 for the adequacy of the MC model to describe data.

Fig. 4 shows a breakdown of the uncertainties associated with the measurement of $t\bar{t}$ normalized differential cross section, according to the treatment of their dependences on sidereal time. The measurement is dominated by systematic uncertainties. The experimental uncertainties that are treated as uncorrelated in sidereal time have the largest impact on the normalized differential cross section, and they arise mainly from sources related to electrons, jet energy scale, and b tagging. The uncertainties featuring explicit dependence on sidereal time have an impact that is smaller than the statistical uncertainty, and are dominated by trigger uncertainties. Uncertainties that are uniform in sidereal time (flat luminosity component, background normalization, theory uncertainties) contribute to a lesser extent.

Table 2
Summary of the systematic uncertainties and their correlation scheme between 2016 and 2017 data sets, and between sidereal time bins. Sources marked with an asterisk are only included in the SME fits. Sources marked with a dagger are uniform and correlated in sidereal time.

Systematic uncertainty source	Correlation 2016–2017	Correlation time bins	Magnitude
Flat luminosity, year-to-year correlated part	100%	100%	0.6–0.9%
Flat luminosity, year-to-year uncorrelated part	0%	100%	0.9–1.4%
Time-dependent luminosity stability	0%	100%	0.2–0.4%
Time-dependent luminosity linearity	0%	100%	0.2–0.4%
Time-dependent pileup reweighting	100%	100%	0.3–5%
Time-dependent trigger efficiency, syst. component	0%	100%	0.5–1%
Time-dependent trigger efficiency, stat. component	0%	0%	0.5%
L1 ECAL timing shift	100%	0%	0.5%
Electron reconstruction	100%	0%	0.4%
Electron identification	100%	0%	1.2–2.2%
Muon identification, syst. component	100%	0%	0.3%
Muon identification, stat. component	0%	0%	0.5%
Muon isolation, syst. component	100%	0%	<0.1%
Muon isolation, stat. component	0%	0%	0.2%
Phase-space extrapolation of lepton isolation	100%	100%	0.5–1%
Jet energy scale, year-to-year correlated part	100%	0%	0.8%
Jet energy scale, year-to-year uncorrelated part	0%	0%	1.4%
Parton flavor impact on jet energy scale	100%	100%	1.1%
b tagging	0%	0%	2–4%
Matrix element scale †	100%	100%	0.3–6%
PDF+α_S †	100%	100%	0.1–0.4%
Initial- & final-state radiation scale †	100%	100%	1–5%
Top quark p_T †	100%	100%	0.5–2.5%
Matrix element to parton shower matching †	100%	100%	0.7%
Underlying event tune †	100%	100%	0.2%
Color reconnection †	100%	100%	0.3%
Top quark mass †	100%	100%	0.5–3%
Single top quark cross section †	100%	100%	30%
$t\bar{t}V$ cross section †	100%	100%	20%
Diboson cross section †	100%	100%	30%
V+jets cross section †	100%	100%	30%
$t\bar{t}$ cross section *†	100%	100%	4%
Single top quark time modulation *	100%	100%	2%
MC statistical uncertainty	0%	100%	0.1–1%

7. Testing Lorentz invariance with the SME

Corrections to the matrix element of $t\bar{t}$ production and decay arising from Lorentz-violating terms in the SME are known at LO in pQCD [16], and are linear in the SME coefficients, stemming from the interference between SME and SM predictions. Within the CMS reference frame, the variation of the $t\bar{t}$ cross section with sidereal time t is quantified with the function [14] $f(t) = \sigma_{\mathrm{SME}}(t)/\sigma_{\mathrm{SM}} - 1$, where σ_{SME} (σ_{SM}) are the values predicted in the SME (SM):

$$f(t) = (c_{L,\mu\nu} + c_{R,\mu\nu}) R^{\mu}_{\alpha}(t) R^{\nu}_{\beta}(t) \left(\frac{\delta P}{P} \right)^{\alpha\beta} + c_{L,\mu\nu} R^{\mu}_{\alpha}(t) R^{\nu}_{\beta}(t) \left(\frac{\delta F}{F} + \frac{\delta \bar{F}}{\bar{F}} \right)^{\alpha\beta}, \quad (3)$$

with $c_{L,\mu\nu} = c^{\mu\nu} + d^{\mu\nu}$ and $c_{R,\mu\nu} = c^{\mu\nu} - d^{\mu\nu}$; where α and β represent summation over space-time indices in the CMS detector frame; P, F, and $\bar{F}$ are the squared LO matrix elements of the SM $t\bar{t}$ production (either quark-antiquark annihilation or gluon fusion), and top quark and antiquark decays; and δP, δF, $\delta \bar{F}$ are their corrections predicted in the SME. Rotation matrices $R(t)$ represent transformations of observer coordinates from the SCF to the CMS reference frame, depending on the Earth's rotation around its axis with angular velocity $\Omega_{\mathrm{sidereal}}$. The coordinates of the CMS interaction point are specified [66] by the azimuth on the LHC ring ($\phi = 101.28°$), the latitude ($\lambda = 46.31°$ N), and the longitude ($\ell = 6.08°$ E). Furthermore, the LHC plane, and thus the CMS cavern, has an angle of $\gamma = 0.705°$ relative to the surface.

A $t\bar{t}$ production sample, generated with MadGraph5_aMC@NLO at LO in pQCD with parton shower, underlying event, and hadronization simulated with Pythia 8, followed by full detector simulation, is used to evaluate the signal $f(t)$ functions. The $f(t)$ functions are computed for each number of reconstructed b jets separately for each year and sidereal time bin. Events containing exactly 1, 2, 3, or ≥4 b jets at the reconstructed level are used to evaluate the matrix elements P, F, $\bar{F}$ and their SME corrections, using exact LO kinematics before showering.

The SME coefficients are classified into four families extracted separately, corresponding to $c_{L,\mu\nu}$ (assuming $c_{R,\mu\nu} = 0$), $c_{R,\mu\nu}$ (assuming $c_{L,\mu\nu} = 0$), $c^{\mu\nu}$ (assuming $d^{\mu\nu} = 0$), and $d^{\mu\nu}$ (assuming $c^{\mu\nu} = 0$). Within the chosen basis of coefficients adopted in the SME, these matrices are defined as symmetric and traceless. Coefficients with indices $\mu\nu = TT$ induce a shift in the $t\bar{t}$ cross section and are not considered. Since the Z-axis is defined as the Earth's rotation axis, and because modulation of the $t\bar{t}$ cross section with sidereal time is induced by rotation around this axis, there is by definition no sensitivity in the coefficients with indices $\mu\nu = ZZ$. For similar reasons, coefficients with indices $\mu\nu = ZT$ are not considered. Coefficients with $\mu\nu = XT$ or YT are found to induce very small SME corrections and are also not considered. Remaining coefficients correspond to the combinations $c_{XX} = -c_{YY}$, $c_{XZ} = c_{ZX}$, $c_{YZ} = c_{ZY}$, and $c_{XY} = c_{YX}$ (and similar expressions for the three other scenarios). A total of 16 sets of coefficients is determined. An illustration of their impact on the $t\bar{t}$ cross section is shown in Fig. 5.



Fig. 2. Prefit (upper) and postfit (lower) distributions of the number of b jets in sidereal hour bins, in 2016 and 2017 data. The gray band reflects the statistical and systematic uncertainty predicted in each bin, including correlations across bins. The vertical bars associated with the data points represent their statistical uncertainty. The lower panels show the ratio of the observed data event yields to those expected from simulation.



Fig. 3. The normalized differential cross section for $t\bar{t}$ as a function of sidereal time, using combined 2016–2017 data. The error bars show statistical, as well as statistical and systematic uncertainties, including correlations across bins.

The Lagrangian defined in Eq. (1) impacts all processes involving top quarks, including single top quark and $t\bar{t}V$ processes. The latter processes have a small yield and their variation with sidereal time can be neglected, contrary to the former processes. Expressions for the matrix elements of single top quark production in the SME are not available, to our knowledge. Among the single top quark processes, tW production has the largest contribution in the selected dileptonic event sample. Therefore, uncertainties corresponding to single top quark time modulation in the SME are attributed to single top quark processes, and computed from matrix elements predicted in the SME for top quark and antiquark decay only, in an MC sample of tW processes generated at LO. These uncertainties correspond to a value of the SME coefficients of $\pm 3 \times 10^{-3}$ in XX and XY directions, and $\pm 10 \times 10^{-3}$ in XZ and YZ directions, at the same order of magnitude as the expected sensitivity in the worst case among c_L, c_R, c, and d sets of coefficients. In the case of $c_{R,\mu\nu}$ coefficients, which do not affect the top quark or antiquark in the decay (as highlighted in Eq. (3)), the uncertainty model for $c_{L,\mu\nu}$ is used. In measuring individually the SME coefficients, the SME uncertainty for single top quark processes in a given direction has been

Table 3
Expected and observed 68% confidence level interval measured for the SME fits of single coefficients while the others are fixed to their SM value, and while coefficients for the three other directions are floating. The expected intervals represent the results obtained using simulation only, assuming null values of the coefficients in the data. Reported intervals are to be multiplied by 10^{-3}.

SME coefficient	Others fixed to SM		Others floating	
(10^{-3} unit)	Expected	Observed	Expected	Observed
$c_{L,XX} = -c_{L,YY}$	[−0.96; 0.96]	[−0.9; 1.03]	[−0.96; 0.96]	[−0.9; 1.03]
$c_{L,XY} = c_{L,YX}$	[−0.97; 0.97]	[−1.92; 0.0]	[−0.97; 0.97]	[−1.94; −0.02]
$c_{L,XZ} = c_{L,ZX}$	[−3.23; 3.23]	[−0.97; 5.49]	[−3.23; 3.23]	[−0.92; 5.54]
$c_{L,YZ} = c_{L,ZY}$	[−3.24; 3.24]	[−4.61; 1.85]	[−3.24; 3.24]	[−4.64; 1.82]
$c_{R,XX} = -c_{R,YY}$	[−1.7; 1.7]	[−1.65; 1.77]	[−1.7; 1.7]	[−1.66; 1.76]
$c_{R,XY} = c_{R,YX}$	[−1.71; 1.71]	[0.09; 3.5]	[−1.71; 1.71]	[0.12; 3.52]
$c_{R,XZ} = c_{R,ZX}$	[−5.78; 5.78]	[−9.36; 2.2]	[−5.78; 5.78]	[−9.45; 2.11]
$c_{R,YZ} = c_{R,ZY}$	[−5.8; 5.8]	[−3.82; 7.76]	[−5.8; 5.8]	[−3.77; 7.82]
$c_{XX} = -c_{YY}$	[−2.17; 2.17]	[−1.76; 2.62]	[−2.17; 2.17]	[−1.83; 2.55]
$c_{XY} = c_{YX}$	[−2.18; 2.18]	[−4.23; 0.17]	[−2.18; 2.18]	[−4.31; 0.09]
$c_{XZ} = c_{ZX}$	[−7.21; 7.21]	[−1.49; 13.07]	[−7.21; 7.21]	[−1.29; 13.27]
$c_{YZ} = c_{ZY}$	[−7.24; 7.24]	[−11.05; 3.38]	[−7.24; 7.24]	[−11.21; 3.28]
$d_{XX} = -d_{YY}$	[−0.61; 0.61]	[−0.6; 0.63]	[−0.61; 0.61]	[−0.59; 0.64]
$d_{XY} = d_{YX}$	[−0.62; 0.62]	[−1.24; −0.01]	[−0.62; 0.62]	[−1.25; −0.02]
$d_{XZ} = d_{ZX}$	[−2.07; 2.07]	[−0.68; 3.46]	[−2.08; 2.07]	[−0.65; 3.49]
$d_{YZ} = d_{ZY}$	[−2.08; 2.08]	[−2.9; 1.25]	[−2.08; 2.08]	[−2.92; 1.23]



Fig. 4. Comparison of systematic and statistical uncertainties, where the former are grouped according to the treatment of time dependence: uniform (flat luminosity component, background normalization, theory), correlated (trigger, luminosity stability and linearity, pileup, and MC statistical uncertainty), or uncorrelated (other experimental uncertainties) across sidereal time bins.

verified to impact only the coefficients related to the same direction, with an uncertainty corresponding to approximately 15% of the total uncertainty on the coefficient.

The discriminant observable used to extract the SME coefficients is the same as in the differential measurement (Section 6), with event corrections and systematic uncertainties described in Section 5. The likelihood fit is performed in two scenarios: 1) independently for each set of coefficients as a single parameter of interest, with all other parameters being set to zero; 2) independently for each set of coefficients as a single parameter of interest, with the parameters corresponding to the three other directions (among XX, XY, XZ, YZ directions) floating in the fit, for the four families of coefficients c_L, c_R, c, and d separately. The measured values of the SME sets of coefficients in the latter scenario is shown in Fig. 6, while Table 3 compares the values for the two scenarios. Scenarios 1 and 2 yield expected uncertainties identical up to the second digit, because the correlation between the four sets of coefficients in a family is found to be 0–4%. A p-value of 0.98 is obtained for the measurements of the coefficients in a given direction while the coefficients corresponding to the three other directions are floating in the fit. All of the measured values for the SME coefficients are compatible with zero, in agreement with the SM within one standard deviation or less, indicating no sign of deviation from Lorentz invariance. The precision achieved on the values of the coefficients of the c_L and c_R families on the one hand, and on the values of the coefficients of the d family on the other hand, is improved respectively by a factor 20–50 and up to 100 over the previous constraints [14]. The coefficients of the c family are measured for the first time.

The impact of the uncertainties in the SME coefficients is shown in Fig. 7 in the case of the fit of individual sets of coefficients, while the coefficients corresponding to the three other directions are left floating. Systematic uncertainties uncorrelated between sidereal time bins are dominating the precision, at a level of approximately three times higher than the statistical uncertainties. The systematic uncertainties that are nonuniform and correlated across sidereal time impact the precision at about half the impact of the statistical uncertainties. The uncertainties that are uniform in sidereal time have a smaller impact.

8. Summary

A search for violation of Lorentz invariance has been performed using top quark pairs ($t\bar{t}$), requiring the presence of one muon and one electron in the events. Data collected in 2016–2017 with the CMS detector corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 77.8 fb^{-1} are used. A measurement of the $t\bar{t}$ normalized differential cross section as a function of sidereal time is performed. The Lorentz invariance assumption is tested by measuring 16 sets of coefficients within the standard model extension, an effective field theory predicting a modulation of the $t\bar{t}$ cross section with sidereal time. Measurements of the Lorentz-violating couplings are found to be compatible with the standard model hypothesis. The precision of the results ranges from less than 1×10^{-3} to 8×10^{-3} for the measured coefficients. This constitutes the most precise test of the isotropy in special relativity using top quarks at a hadron collider.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.



Fig. 5. Number of $t\bar{t}$ events reconstructed in the SME hypothesis divided by the number of events in the SM hypothesis, as a function of the number of b jets and sidereal time, for the four directions of the c_L coefficients. The uncertainty band represents the MC statistical uncertainty in the sample used to compute the SME hypothesis. The sinusoidal variation is arising from the $f(t)$ dependence on sidereal time, while smaller structures reflect the number of b jets in each sidereal time bin.



Fig. 6. Fitted SME coefficients and their 68 and 95% CL, measured in fits of single coefficients while the coefficients corresponding to the three other directions are left floating, within the c_L, c_R, c, and d families. The error bar includes statistical and systematic uncertainties. Fitting a single coefficient, with the others fixed to the SM value, leads to negligible changes in the results.

Data availability

Release and preservation of data used by the CMS Collaboration as the basis for publications is guided by the CMS data preservation, re-use and open access policy.

Acknowledgements

We congratulate our colleagues in the CERN accelerator departments for the excellent performance of the LHC and thank the technical and administrative staffs at CERN and at other CMS institutes for their contributions to the success of the CMS effort. In addition, we gratefully acknowledge the computing centers and personnel of the Worldwide LHC Computing Grid and other centers for delivering so effectively the computing infrastructure essential to our analyses. Finally, we acknowledge the enduring support for the construction and operation of the LHC, the CMS detector, and the supporting computing infrastructure provided by the following funding agencies: SC (Armenia), BMBWF and FWF (Austria); FNRS and FWO (Belgium); CNPq, CAPES, FAPERJ, FAPERGS, and FAPESP (Brazil); MES and BNSF (Bulgaria); CERN; CAS, MoST, and NSFC (China); MINCIENCIAS (Colombia); MSES and CSF (Croatia); RIF (Cyprus); SENESCYT (Ecuador); ERC PRG, RVTT3 and MoER TK202 (Estonia); Academy of Finland, MEC, and HIP (Finland); CEA and CNRS/IN2P3 (France); SRNSF (Georgia); BMBF, DFG, and HGF (Germany); GSRI (Greece); NKFIH (Hungary); DAE and DST (India); IPM (Iran); SFI (Ireland); INFN (Italy); MSIP and NRF (Republic of Korea); MES (Latvia); LMTLT (Lithuania); MOE and UM (Malaysia); BUAP, CINVESTAV, CONACYT, LNS, SEP, and UASLP-FAI



Fig. 7. Uncertainty breakdown for SME fits of single coefficients while the coefficients corresponding to the three other directions are left floating, by splitting according to the treatment of time dependence: flat across sidereal time (flat luminosity component, background normalization, theory), correlated in sidereal time bins (trigger, luminosity stability and linearity, pileup, MC statistical uncertainty, single top quark decay in the SME), systematics uncorrelated in sidereal time bins (other experimental uncertainties), and statistical uncertainty.

(Mexico); MOS (Montenegro); MBIE (New Zealand); PAEC (Pakistan); MES and NSC (Poland); FCT (Portugal); MESTD (Serbia); MCIN/AEI and PCTI (Spain); MOSTR (Sri Lanka); Swiss Funding Agencies (Switzerland); MST (Taipei); MHESI and NSTDA (Thailand); TUBITAK and TENMAK (Turkey); NASU (Ukraine); STFC (United Kingdom); DOE and NSF (USA).

Individuals have received support from the Marie-Curie program and the European Research Council and Horizon 2020 Grant, contract Nos. 675440, 724704, 752730, 758316, 765710, 824093, 101115353, 101002207, and COST Action CA16108 (European Union); the Leventis Foundation; The Alfred P. Sloan Foundation; the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation; the Science Committee, project no. 22rl-037 (Armenia); the Belgian Federal Science Policy Office; the Fonds pour la Formation à la Recherche dans l'Industrie et dans l'Agriculture (FRIA-Belgium); the Agentschap voor Innovatie door Wetenschap en Technologie (IWT-Belgium); the F.R.S.-FNRS and FWO (Belgium) under the "Excellence of Science – EOS" – be.h project n. 30820817; the Beijing Municipal Science & Technology Commission, No. Z191100007219010 and Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (China); the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (MEYS) of the Czech Republic; the Shota Rustaveli National Science Foundation, grant FR-22-985 (Georgia); the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG), under Germany's Excellence Strategy – EXC 2121 "Quantum Universe" – 390833306, and under project number 400140256 - GRK2497; the Hellenic Foundation for Research and Innovation (HFRI), Project Number 2288 (Greece); the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, the New National Excellence Program - ÚNKP, the NKFIH research grants K 131991, K 133046, K 138136, K 143460, K 143477, K 146913, K 146914, K 147048, 2020-2.2.1-ED-2021-00181, and TKP2021-NKTA-64 (Hungary); the Council of Science and Industrial Research, India; ICSC – National Research Center for High Performance Computing, Big Data and Quantum Computing and FAIR – Future Artificial Intelligence Research, funded by the NextGenerationEU program (Italy); the Latvian Council of Science; the Ministry of Education and Science, project no. 2022/WK/14, and the National Science Center, contracts Opus 2021/41/B/ST2/01369 and 2021/43/B/ST2/01552 (Poland); the Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, grant CEECIND/01334/2018 (Portugal); the National Priorities Research Program by Qatar National Research Fund; MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033, ERDF "a way of making Europe", and the Programa Estatal de Fomento de la Investigación Científica y Técnica de Excelencia María de Maeztu, grant MDM-2017-0765 and Programa Severo Ochoa del Principado de Asturias (Spain); the Chulalongkorn Academic into Its 2nd Century Project Advancement Project, and the National Science, Research and Innovation Fund via the Program Management Unit for Human Resources & Institutional Development, Research and Innovation, grant B37G660013 (Thailand); the Kavli Foundation; the Nvidia Corporation; the Super-Micro Corporation; the Welch Foundation, contract C-1845; and the Weston Havens Foundation (USA).

References

[1] V.A. Kostelecký, S. Samuel, Spontaneous breaking of Lorentz symmetry in string theory, Phys. Rev. D 39 (1989) 683, https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.39.683.
[2] R. Gambini, J. Pullin, Nonstandard optics from quantum space-time, Phys. Rev. D 59 (1999) 124021, https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.59.124021, arXiv:gr-qc/9809038.
[3] M. Pospelov, C. Tamarit, Lifshitz-sector mediated SUSY breaking, J. High Energy Phys. 01 (2014) 048, https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP01(2014)048, arXiv:1309.5569.
[4] D. Colladay, V.A. Kostelecký, CPT violation and the standard model, Phys. Rev. D 55 (1997) 6760, https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.55.6760, arXiv:hep-ph/9703464.
[5] D. Colladay, V.A. Kostelecký, Lorentz-violating extension of the standard model, Phys. Rev. D 58 (1998) 116002, https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.58.116002, arXiv:hep-ph/9809521.
[6] V.A. Kostelecký, N. Russell, Data tables for Lorentz and CPT violation, Rev. Mod. Phys. 83 (2011) 11, https://doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.83.11, arXiv:0801.0287.
[7] I. Abt, et al., ZEUS, Search for effective Lorentz and CPT violation using ZEUS data, Phys. Rev. D 107 (2023) 092008, https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.107.092008, arXiv:2212.12750.
[8] D. Babusci, et al., KLOE-2, Test of CPT and Lorentz symmetry in entangled neutral kaons with the KLOE experiment, Phys. Lett. B 730 (2014) 89, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2014.01.026, arXiv:1312.6818.
[9] H. Nguyen, CPT results from KTeV, in: Proc. 2nd Meeting on CPT and Lorentz Symmetry, Bloomington IN, USA, August 15–18, 2001, 2002, arXiv:hep-ex/0112046.
[10] J.M. Link, et al., FOCUS, Charm system tests of CPT and Lorentz invariance with FOCUS, Phys. Lett. B 556 (2003) 7, https://doi.org/10.1016/S0370-2693(03)00103-5, arXiv:hep-ex/0208034.
[11] B. Aubert, et al., BaBar, Search for CPT and Lorentz violation in B^0–$\overline{B}^0$ oscillations with dilepton events, Phys. Rev. Lett. 100 (2008) 131802, https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.100.131802, arXiv:0711.2713.
[12] V.M. Abazov, et al., D0, Search for violation of CPT and Lorentz invariance in B_s^0 meson oscillations, Phys. Rev. Lett. 115 (2015) 161601, https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.161601, arXiv:1506.04123.
[13] LHCb Collaboration, Search for violations of Lorentz invariance and CPT symmetry in $B^0_{(s)}$ mixing, Phys. Rev. Lett. 116 (2016) 241601, https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.241601, arXiv:1603.04804.
[14] V.M. Abazov, et al., D0, Search for violation of Lorentz invariance in top quark pair production and decay, Phys. Rev. Lett. 108 (2012) 261603, https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.108.261603, arXiv:1203.6106.
[15] A. Carle, N. Chanon, S. Perries, Prospects for Lorentz invariance violation searches with top pair production at the LHC and future hadron colliders, Eur. Phys. J. C 80 (2020) 128, https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-020-7715-2, arXiv:1908.11256.
[16] M.S. Berger, V.A. Kostelecký, Z. Liu, Lorentz and CPT violation in top-quark production and decay, Phys. Rev. D 93 (2016) 036005, https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.93.036005, arXiv:1509.08929.
[17] HEPData record for this analysis, https://doi.org/10.17182/hepdata.138418, 2024.
[18] CMS Collaboration, The CMS experiment at the CERN LHC, J. Instrum. 3 (2008) S08004, https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08004.
[19] W. Adam, et al., CMS Tracker Group, The CMS Phase-1 pixel detector upgrade, J. Instrum. 16 (2021) P02027, https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/16/02/P02027, arXiv:2012.14304.
[20] CMS Collaboration, Development of the CMS detector for the CERN LHC Run 3, J. Instrum. 19 (2024) P05064, https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/19/05/P05064, arXiv:2309.05466.
[21] CMS Collaboration, Performance of the CMS Level-1 trigger in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, J. Instrum. 15 (2020) P10017, https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/15/10/P10017, arXiv:2006.10165.
[22] CMS Collaboration, The CMS trigger system, J. Instrum. 12 (2017) P01020, https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/12/01/P01020, arXiv:1609.02366.
[23] CMS Collaboration, Electron and photon reconstruction and identification with the CMS experiment at the CERN LHC, J. Instrum. 16 (2021) P05014, https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/16/05/P05014, arXiv:2012.06888.
[24] CMS Collaboration, Performance of the CMS muon detector and muon reconstruction with proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, J. Instrum. 13 (2018) P06015, https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/13/06/P06015, arXiv:1804.04528.

[25] CMS Collaboration, Description and performance of track and primary-vertex reconstruction with the CMS tracker, J. Instrum. 9 (2014) P10009, https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/9/10/P10009, arXiv:1405.6569.

[26] CMS Collaboration, Particle-flow reconstruction and global event description with the CMS detector, J. Instrum. 12 (2017) P10003, https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/12/10/P10003, arXiv:1706.04965.

[27] CMS Collaboration, Performance of reconstruction and identification of τ leptons decaying to hadrons and ν_τ in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, J. Instrum. 13 (2018) P10005, https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/13/10/P10005, arXiv:1809.02816.

[28] CMS Collaboration, Jet energy scale and resolution in the CMS experiment in pp collisions at 8 TeV, J. Instrum. 12 (2017) P02014, https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/12/02/P02014, arXiv:1607.03663.

[29] CMS Collaboration, Performance of missing transverse momentum reconstruction in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV using the CMS detector, J. Instrum. 14 (2019) P07004, https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/14/07/P07004, arXiv:1903.06078.

[30] M. Cacciari, G.P. Salam, G. Soyez, FastJet user manual, Eur. Phys. J. C 72 (2012) 1896, https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-012-1896-2, arXiv:1111.6097.

[31] CMS Collaboration, Measurements of inclusive W and Z cross sections in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV, J. High Energy Phys. 01 (2011) 080, https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP01(2011)080, arXiv:1012.2466.

[32] M. Cacciari, G.P. Salam, G. Soyez, The anti-k_T jet clustering algorithm, J. High Energy Phys. 04 (2008) 063, https://doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2008/04/063, arXiv:0802.1189.

[33] CMS Collaboration, Identification of heavy-flavour jets with the CMS detector in pp collisions at 13 TeV, J. Instrum. 13 (2018) P05011, https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/13/05/P05011, arXiv:1712.07158.

[34] CMS Collaboration, Performance summary of AK4 jet b tagging with data from proton-proton collisions at 13 TeV with the CMS detector, CMS Detector Performance Note CMS-DP-2023-005, https://cds.cern.ch/record/2854609, 2023.

[35] S. Alioli, P. Nason, C. Oleari, E. Re, A general framework for implementing NLO calculations in shower Monte Carlo programs: the POWHEG BOX, J. High Energy Phys. 06 (2010) 043, https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP06(2010)043, arXiv:1002.2581.

[36] T. Sjöstrand, S. Ask, J.R. Christiansen, R. Corke, N. Desai, P. Ilten, S. Mrenna, S. Prestel, C.O. Rasmussen, P.Z. Skands, An introduction to PYTHIA 8.2, Comput. Phys. Commun. 191 (2015) 159, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpc.2015.01.024, arXiv:1410.3012.

[37] M. Czakon, A. Mitov, TOP++: a program for the calculation of the top-pair cross-section at hadron colliders, Comput. Phys. Commun. 185 (2014) 2930, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpc.2014.06.021, arXiv:1112.5675.

[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, https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-015-3709-x, arXiv:1505.04480.

[39] CMS Collaboration, Measurement of differential cross sections for top quark pair production using the lepton+jets final state in proton-proton collisions at 13 TeV, Phys. Rev. D 95 (2017) 092001, https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.95.092001, arXiv:1610.04191.

[40] CMS Collaboration, Differential cross section measurements for the production of top quark pairs and of additional jets using dilepton events from pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, J. High Energy Phys. (2024), submitted for publication, arXiv:2402.08486.

[41] N. Kidonakis, N. Yamanaka, Higher-order corrections for tW production at high-energy hadron colliders, J. High Energy Phys. 05 (2021) 278, https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP05(2021)278, arXiv:2102.11300.

[42] J. Alwall, R. Frederix, S. Frixione, V. Hirschi, F. Maltoni, O. Mattelaer, H.-S. Shao, T. Stelzer, P. Torrielli, M. Zaro, The automated computation of tree-level and next-to-leading order differential cross sections, and their matching to parton shower simulations, J. High Energy Phys. 07 (2014) 079, https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07(2014)079, arXiv:1405.0301.

[43] R. Frederix, S. Frixione, Merging meets matching in MC@NLO, J. High Energy Phys. 12 (2012) 061, https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP12(2012)061, arXiv:1209.6215.

[44] P. Kant, O.M. Kind, T. Kintscher, T. Lohse, T. Martini, S. Mölbitz, P. Rieck, P. Uwer, HATHOR for single top-quark production: updated predictions and uncertainty estimates for single top-quark production in hadronic collisions, Comput. Phys. Commun. 191 (2015) 74, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpc.2015.02.001, arXiv:1406.4403.

[45] T. Gehrmann, M. Grazzini, S. Kallweit, P. Maierhöfer, A. von Manteuffel, S. Pozzorini, D. Rathlev, L. Tancredi, W^+W^- production at hadron colliders in next to next to leading order QCD, Phys. Rev. Lett. 113 (2014) 212001, https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.113.212001, arXiv:1408.5243.

[46] J.M. Campbell, R.K. Ellis, C. Williams, Vector boson pair production at the LHC, J. High Energy Phys. 07 (2011) 018, https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07(2011)018, arXiv:1105.0020.

[47] J. Alwall, S. de Visscher, F. Maltoni, QCD radiation in the production of heavy colored particles at the LHC, J. High Energy Phys. 02 (2009) 017, https://doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2009/02/017, arXiv:0810.5350.

[48] R. Gavin, Y. Li, F. Petriello, S. Quackenbush, FEWZ 2.0: a code for hadronic Z production at next-to-next-to-leading order, Comput. Phys. Commun. 182 (2011) 2388, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpc.2011.06.008, arXiv:1011.3540.

[49] CMS Collaboration, Extraction and validation of a new set of CMS PYTHIA 8 tunes from underlying-event measurements, Eur. Phys. J. C 80 (2020) 4, https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-019-7499-4, arXiv:1903.12179.

[50] CMS Collaboration, Event generator tunes obtained from underlying event and multiparton scattering measurements, Eur. Phys. J. C 76 (2016) 155, https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-3988-x, arXiv:1512.00815.

[51] R.D. Ball, V. Bertone, S. Carrazza, L. Del Debbio, S. Forte, P. Groth-Merrild, A. Guffanti, N.P. Hartland, Z. Kassabov, J.I. Latorre, E.R. Nocera, J. Rojo, L. Rottoli, E. Slade, M. Ubiali, NNPDF, Parton distributions from high-precision collider data, Eur. Phys. J. C 77 (2017) 663, https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-5199-5, arXiv:1706.00428.

[52] S. Agostinelli, et al., GEANT4, [Geant4]—a simulation toolkit, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A 506 (2003) 250, https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9002(03)01368-8.

[53] S. van der Meer, Calibration of the effective beam height in the ISR, ISR Report CERN-ISR-PO-68-31, 1968, https://cds.cern.ch/record/296752.

[54] P. Grafström, W. Kozanecki, Luminosity determination at proton colliders, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. 81 (2015) 97, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ppnp.2014.11.002.

[55] CMS Collaboration, Precision luminosity measurement in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV in 2015 and 2016 at CMS, Eur. Phys. J. C 81 (2021) 800, https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-021-09538-2, arXiv:2104.01927.

[56] CMS Collaboration, CMS luminosity measurement for the 2017 data-taking period at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-LUM-17-004, 2018, https://cds.cern.ch/record/2621960.

[57] E. Ayala, et al., CMS BRIL, The Pixel Luminosity Telescope: a detector for luminosity measurement at CMS using silicon pixel sensors, Eur. Phys. J. C 83 (2023) 673, https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-023-11713-6, arXiv:2206.08870.

[58] CMS Collaboration, Search for charged-lepton flavor violation in top quark production and decay in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, J. High Energy Phys. 06 (2022) 082, https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP06(2022)082, arXiv:2201.07859.

[59] CMS Collaboration, Measurement of the $t\bar{t}$ production cross section, the top quark mass, and the strong coupling constant using dilepton events in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, Eur. Phys. J. C 79 (2019) 368, https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-019-6863-8, arXiv:1812.10505.

[60] CMS Collaboration, Measurement of the cross section for top quark pair production in association with a W or Z boson in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, J. High Energy Phys. 08 (2018) 011, https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP08(2018)011, arXiv:1711.02547.

[61] ATLAS CMS Collaborations, LHC Higgs Combination Group, Combination Group, Procedure for the LHC Higgs boson search combination in Summer 2011, Technical Report CMS-NOTE-2011-005, ATL-PHYS-PUB-2011-11, 2011, https://cds.cern.ch/record/1379837.

[62] G. Cowan, K. Cranmer, E. Gross, O. Vitells, Asymptotic formulae for likelihood-based tests of new physics, Eur. Phys. J. C 71 (2011) 1554, https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-011-1554-0, arXiv:1007.1727, Erratum: https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-013-2501-z.

[63] CMS Collaboration, The CMS statistical analysis and combination tool: COMBINE, Comput. Softw. Big Sci. (2024), https://doi.org/10.1007/s41781-024-00121-4, arXiv:2404.06614, in press.

[64] S. Baker, R.D. Cousins, Clarification of the use of chi-square and likelihood functions in fits to histograms, Nucl. Instrum. Methods 221 (1984) 437, https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-5087(84)90016-4.

[65] L. Demortier, *p* values and nuisance parameters, in: Proc. LHC Workshop on Statistical Issues for LHC Physics (PHYSTAT-LHC), Geneva, Switzerland, June 27–29, 2007, 2007, p. 23, https://doi.org/10.5170/CERN-2008-001.23.

[66] M. Jones, Computation of WGS84 geodetic coordinates and azimuths at the LHC interaction points, CERN TS/SU-ACG Activity Report, 2005, https://edms.cern.ch/document/322747, eDMS Document 322747.

The CMS collaboration

A. Hayrapetyan, A. Tumasyan [1]

Yerevan Physics Institute, Yerevan, Armenia

W. Adam, J.W. Andrejkovic, T. Bergauer, S. Chatterjee, K. Damanakis, M. Dragicevic, P.S. Hussain, M. Jeitler[2], N. Krammer, A. Li, D. Liko, I. Mikulec, J. Schieck[2], R. Schöfbeck, D. Schwarz, M. Sonawane, S. Templ, W. Waltenberger, C.-E. Wulz[2]

Institut für Hochenergiephysik, Vienna, Austria

M.R. Darwish[3], T. Janssen, P. Van Mechelen

Universiteit Antwerpen, Antwerpen, Belgium

E.S. Bols, J. D'Hondt, S. Dansana, A. De Moor, M. Delcourt, H. El Faham, S. Lowette, I. Makarenko, D. Müller, A.R. Sahasransu, S. Tavernier, M. Tytgat[4], G.P. Van Onsem, S. Van Putte, D. Vannerom

Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussel, Belgium

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

Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium

M. De Coen, D. Dobur, Y. Hong, J. Knolle, L. Lambrecht, G. Mestdach, K. Mota Amarilo, C. Rendón, A. Samalan, K. Skovpen, N. Van Den Bossche, J. van der Linden, L. Wezenbeek

Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

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

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

G.A. Alves, E. Coelho, C. Hensel, T. Menezes De Oliveira, A. Moraes, P. Rebello Teles, M. Soeiro

Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Fisicas, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

W.L. Aldá Júnior, M. Alves Gallo Pereira, M. Barroso Ferreira Filho, H. Brandao Malbouisson, W. Carvalho, J. Chinellato[5], E.M. Da Costa, G.G. Da Silveira[6], D. De Jesus Damiao, S. Fonseca De Souza, R. Gomes De Souza, J. Martins[7], C. Mora Herrera, L. Mundim, H. Nogima, J.P. Pinheiro, A. Santoro, A. Sznajder, M. Thiel, A. Vilela Pereira

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

C.A. Bernardes[6], L. Calligaris, T.R. Fernandez Perez Tomei, E.M. Gregores, P.G. Mercadante, S.F. Novaes, B. Orzari, Sandra S. Padula

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

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

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

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

University of Sofia, Sofia, Bulgaria

S. Keshri, S. Thakur

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

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

Beihang University, Beijing, China

Z. Hu, J. Liu, K. Yi[8,9]

Department of Physics, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China

G.M. Chen [10], H.S. Chen [10], M. Chen [10], F. Iemmi, C.H. Jiang, A. Kapoor [11], H. Liao, Z.-A. Liu [12], R. Sharma [13], J.N. Song [12], J. Tao, C. Wang [10], J. Wang, Z. Wang [10], H. Zhang

Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing, China

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

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

Z. You

Sun Yat-Sen University, Guangzhou, China

N. Lu

University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, China

G. Bauer [14]

Nanjing Normal University, Nanjing, China

X. Gao [15], D. Leggat, H. Okawa

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

Z. Lin, C. Lu, M. Xiao

Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, Zhejiang, China

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

Universidad de Los Andes, Bogota, Colombia

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

Universidad de Antioquia, Medellin, Colombia

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

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

M. Kovac, T. Sculac

University of Split, Faculty of Science, Split, Croatia

P. Bargassa, V. Brigljevic, B.K. Chitroda, D. Ferencek, S. Mishra, A. Starodumov [16], T. Susa

Institute Rudjer Boskovic, Zagreb, Croatia

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

University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus

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

Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

E. Ayala

Escuela Politecnica Nacional, Quito, Ecuador

E. Carrera Jarrin

Universidad San Francisco de Quito, Quito, Ecuador

H. Abdalla [17], Y. Assran [18,19]

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

A. Lotfy, M.A. Mahmoud

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

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

National Institute of Chemical Physics and Biophysics, Tallinn, Estonia

H. Kirschenmann, K. Osterberg, M. Voutilainen

Department of Physics, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

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

Helsinki Institute of Physics, Helsinki, Finland

P. Luukka, H. Petrow

Lappeenranta-Lahti University of Technology, Lappeenranta, Finland

M. Besancon, F. Couderc, M. Dejardin, D. Denegri, J.L. Faure, F. Ferri, S. Ganjour, P. Gras, G. Hamel de Monchenault, V. Lohezic, J. Malcles, J. Rander, A. Rosowsky, M.Ö. Sahin, A. Savoy-Navarro[20], P. Simkina, M. Titov, M. Tornago

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

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

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

J.-L. Agram[21], J. Andrea, D. Apparu, D. Bloch, J.-M. Brom, E.C. Chabert, C. Collard, S. Falke, U. Goerlach, C. Grimault, R. Haeberle, A.-C. Le Bihan, M. Meena, G. Saha, M.A. Sessini, P. Van Hove

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

S. Beauceron, B. Blancon, G. Boudoul, A. Carle, N. Chanon, J. Choi, D. Contardo, P. Depasse, C. Dozen[22], H. El Mamouni, J. Fay, S. Gascon, M. Gouzevitch, C. Greenberg, G. Grenier, B. Ille, I.B. Laktineh, M. Lethuillier, L. Mirabito, S. Perries, A. Purohit, M. Vander Donckt, P. Verdier, J. Xiao

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

I. Lomidze, T. Toriashvili[23], Z. Tsamalaidze[16]

Georgian Technical University, Tbilisi, Georgia

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

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

S. Diekmann, A. Dodonova, N. Eich, D. Eliseev, F. Engelke, J. Erdmann, M. Erdmann, P. Fackeldey, B. Fischer, T. Hebbeker, K. Hoepfner, F. Ivone, A. Jung, M.y. Lee, L. Mastrolorenzo, F. Mausolf, M. Merschmeyer, A. Meyer, S. Mukherjee, D. Noll, A. Novak, F. Nowotny, A. Pozdnyakov, Y. Rath, W. Redjeb, F. Rehm, H. Reithler, U. Sarkar, V. Sarkisovi, A. Schmidt, A. Sharma, J.L. Spah, A. Stein, F. Torres Da Silva De Araujo[24], L. Vigilante, S. Wiedenbeck, S. Zaleski

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

C. Dziwok, G. Flügge, W. Haj Ahmad [25], T. Kress, A. Nowack, O. Pooth, A. Stahl, T. Ziemons, A. Zotz

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

H. Aarup Petersen, M. Aldaya Martin, J. Alimena, S. Amoroso, Y. An, S. Baxter, M. Bayatmakou, H. Becerril Gonzalez, O. Behnke, A. Belvedere, S. Bhattacharya, F. Blekman [26], K. Borras [27], A. Campbell, A. Cardini, C. Cheng, F. Colombina, S. Consuegra Rodríguez, G. Correia Silva, M. De Silva, G. Eckerlin, D. Eckstein, L.I. Estevez Banos, O. Filatov, E. Gallo [26], A. Geiser, A. Giraldi, G. Greau, V. Guglielmi, M. Guthoff, A. Hinzmann, A. Jafari [28], L. Jeppe, N.Z. Jomhari, B. Kaech, M. Kasemann, C. Kleinwort, R. Kogler, M. Komm, D. Krücker, W. Lange, D. Leyva Pernia, K. Lipka [29], W. Lohmann [30], R. Mankel, I.-A. Melzer-Pellmann, M. Mendizabal Morentin, A.B. Meyer, G. Milella, A. Mussgiller, L.P. Nair, A. Nürnberg, Y. Otarid, J. Park, D. Pérez Adán, E. Ranken, A. Raspereza, B. Ribeiro Lopes, J. Rübenach, A. Saggio, M. Scham [31,27], S. Schnake [27], P. Schütze, C. Schwanenberger [26], D. Selivanova, K. Sharko, M. Shchedrolosiev, R.E. Sosa Ricardo, D. Stafford, F. Vazzoler, A. Ventura Barroso, R. Walsh, Q. Wang, Y. Wen, K. Wichmann, L. Wiens [27], C. Wissing, Y. Yang, A. Zimermmane Castro Santos

Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Hamburg, Germany

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

University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany

S. Brommer, M. Burkart, E. Butz, T. Chwalek, A. Dierlamm, A. Droll, N. Faltermann, M. Giffels, A. Gottmann, F. Hartmann [32], R. Hofsaess, M. Horzela, U. Husemann, J. Kieseler, M. Klute, R. Koppenhöfer, J.M. Lawhorn, M. Link, A. Lintuluoto, S. Maier, S. Mitra, M. Mormile, Th. Müller, M. Neukum, M. Oh, M. Presilla, G. Quast, K. Rabbertz, B. Regnery, N. Shadskiy, I. Shvetsov, H.J. Simonis, M. Toms, N. Trevisani, R. Ulrich, R.F. Von Cube, M. Wassmer, S. Wieland, F. Wittig, R. Wolf, X. Zuo

Karlsruher Institut fuer Technologie, Karlsruhe, Germany

G. Anagnostou, G. Daskalakis, A. Kyriakis, A. Papadopoulos [32], A. Stakia

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

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

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece

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

National Technical University of Athens, Athens, Greece

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

University of Ioánnina, Ioánnina, Greece

M. Bartók[33], C. Hajdu, D. Horvath[34,35], F. Sikler, V. Veszpremi

HUN-REN Wigner Research Centre for Physics, Budapest, Hungary

M. Csanád, K. Farkas, M.M.A. Gadallah[36], Á. Kadlecsik, P. Major, K. Mandal, G. Pásztor, A.J. Rádl[37], G.I. Veres

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

P. Raics, B. Ujvari, G. Zilizi

Faculty of Informatics, University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary

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

Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary

T. Csorgo[37], F. Nemes[37], T. Novak

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

J. Babbar, S. Bansal, S.B. Beri, V. Bhatnagar, G. Chaudhary, S. Chauhan, N. Dhingra[38], A. Kaur, A. Kaur, H. Kaur, M. Kaur, S. Kumar, K. Sandeep, T. Sheokand, J.B. Singh, A. Singla

Panjab University, Chandigarh, India

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

University of Delhi, Delhi, India

S. Baradia, S. Barman[39], S. Bhattacharya, S. Dutta, S. Dutta, S. Sarkar

Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, HBNI, Kolkata, India

M.M. Ameen, P.K. Behera, S.C. Behera, S. Chatterjee, P. Jana, P. Kalbhor, J.R. Komaragiri[40], D. Kumar[40], L. Panwar[40], P.R. Pujahari, N.R. Saha, A. Sharma, A.K. Sikdar, S. Verma

Indian Institute of Technology Madras, Madras, India

S. Dugad, M. Kumar, G.B. Mohanty, P. Suryadevara

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-A, Mumbai, India

A. Bala, S. Banerjee, R.M. Chatterjee, R.K. Dewanjee[41], M. Guchait, Sh. Jain, S. Karmakar, S. Kumar, G. Majumder, K. Mazumdar, S. Parolia, A. Thachayath

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-B, Mumbai, India

S. Bahinipati[42], C. Kar, D. Maity[43], P. Mal, T. Mishra, V.K. Muraleedharan Nair Bindhu[43], K. Naskar[43], A. Nayak[43], P. Sadangi, P. Saha, S.K. Swain, S. Varghese[43], D. Vats[43]

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

S. Acharya[44], A. Alpana, S. Dube, B. Gomber[44], B. Kansal, A. Laha, B. Sahu[44], S. Sharma

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

H. Bakhshiansohi[45], E. Khazaie[46], M. Zeinali[47]

Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, Iran

S. Chenarani[48], S.M. Etesami, M. Khakzad, M. Mohammadi Najafabadi

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

M. Grunewald

University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland

M. Abbrescia [a,b], R. Aly [a,c,49], A. Colaleo [a,b], D. Creanza [a,c], B. D'Anzi [a,b], N. De Filippis [a,c], M. De Palma [a,b], A. Di Florio [a,c], W. Elmetenawee [a,b,49], L. Fiore [a], G. Iaselli [a,c], M. Louka [a,b], G. Maggi [a,c], M. Maggi [a], I. Margjeka [a,b], V. Mastrapasqua [a,b], S. My [a,b], S. Nuzzo [a,b], A. Pellecchia [a,b], A. Pompili [a,b], G. Pugliese [a,c], R. Radogna [a], G. Ramirez-Sanchez [a,c], D. Ramos [a], A. Ranieri [a], L. Silvestris [a], F.M. Simone [a,b], Ü. Sözbilir [a], A. Stamerra [a], R. Venditti [a], P. Verwilligen [a], A. Zaza [a,b]

[a] *INFN Sezione di Bari, Bari, Italy*
[b] *Università di Bari, Bari, Italy*
[c] *Politecnico di Bari, Bari, Italy*

G. Abbiendi [a], C. Battilana [a,b], D. Bonacorsi [a,b], L. Borgonovi [a], R. Campanini [a,b], P. Capiluppi [a,b], A. Castro [a,b], F.R. Cavallo [a], M. Cuffiani [a,b], G.M. Dallavalle [a], T. Diotalevi [a,b], F. Fabbri [a], A. Fanfani [a,b], D. Fasanella [a,b], P. Giacomelli [a], L. Giommi [a,b], C. Grandi [a], L. Guiducci [a,b], S. Lo Meo [a,50], L. Lunerti [a,b], S. Marcellini [a], G. Masetti [a], F.L. Navarria [a,b], F. Primavera [a,b], A.M. Rossi [a,b], T. Rovelli [a,b], G.P. Siroli [a,b]

[a] *INFN Sezione di Bologna, Bologna, Italy*
[b] *Università di Bologna, Bologna, Italy*

S. Costa [a,b,51], A. Di Mattia [a], R. Potenza [a,b], A. Tricomi [a,b,51], C. Tuve [a,b]

[a] *INFN Sezione di Catania, Catania, Italy*
[b] *Università di Catania, Catania, Italy*

P. Assiouras [a], G. Barbagli [a], G. Bardelli [a,b], B. Camaiani [a,b], A. Cassese [a], R. Ceccarelli [a], V. Ciulli [a,b], C. Civinini [a], R. D'Alessandro [a,b], E. Focardi [a,b], T. Kello [a], G. Latino [a,b], P. Lenzi [a,b], M. Lizzo [a], M. Meschini [a], S. Paoletti [a], A. Papanastassiou [a,b], G. Sguazzoni [a], L. Viliani [a]

[a] *INFN Sezione di Firenze, Firenze, Italy*
[b] *Università di Firenze, Firenze, Italy*

L. Benussi, S. Bianco, S. Meola [52], D. Piccolo

INFN Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, Frascati, Italy

P. Chatagnon [a], F. Ferro [a], E. Robutti [a], S. Tosi [a,b]

[a] *INFN Sezione di Genova, Genova, Italy*
[b] *Università di Genova, Genova, Italy*

A. Benaglia [a], G. Boldrini [a,b], F. Brivio [a], F. Cetorelli [a], F. De Guio [a,b], M.E. Dinardo [a,b], P. Dini [a], S. Gennai [a], R. Gerosa [a,b], A. Ghezzi [a,b], P. Govoni [a,b], L. Guzzi [a], M.T. Lucchini [a,b], M. Malberti [a], S. Malvezzi [a], A. Massironi [a], D. Menasce [a], L. Moroni [a], M. Paganoni [a,b], D. Pedrini [a], B.S. Pinolini [a], S. Ragazzi [a,b], T. Tabarelli de Fatis [a,b], D. Zuolo [a]

[a] *INFN Sezione di Milano-Bicocca, Milano, Italy*
[b] *Università di Milano-Bicocca, Milano, Italy*

S. Buontempo [a], A. Cagnotta [a,b], F. Carnevali [a,b], N. Cavallo [a,c], A. De Iorio [a,b], F. Fabozzi [a,c], A.O.M. Iorio [a,b], L. Lista [a,b,53], P. Paolucci [a,32], B. Rossi [a], C. Sciacca [a,b]

[a] *INFN Sezione di Napoli, Napoli, Italy*
[b] *Università di Napoli 'Federico II', Napoli, Italy*
[c] *Università della Basilicata, Potenza, Italy*
[d] *Scuola Superiore Meridionale (SSM), Napoli, Italy*

R. Ardino [a], P. Azzi [a], N. Bacchetta [a,54], M. Biasotto [a,55], P. Bortignon [a], A. Bragagnolo [a,b], R. Carlin [a,b], P. Checchia [a], T. Dorigo [a], F. Gasparini [a,b], U. Gasparini [a,b], E. Lusiani [a],

M. Margoni [a,b], F. Marini [a], A.T. Meneguzzo [a,b], M. Migliorini [a,b], J. Pazzini [a,b], P. Ronchese [a,b], R. Rossin [a,b], F. Simonetto [a,b], G. Strong [a], M. Tosi [a,b], A. Triossi [a,b], S. Ventura [a], H. Yarar [a,b], M. Zanetti [a,b], P. Zotto [a,b], A. Zucchetta [a,b], G. Zumerle [a,b]

[a] INFN Sezione di Padova, Padova, Italy
[b] Università di Padova, Padova, Italy
[c] Università di Trento, Trento, Italy

S. Abu Zeid [a,56], C. Aimè [a,b], A. Braghieri [a], S. Calzaferri [a], D. Fiorina [a], P. Montagna [a,b], V. Re [a], C. Riccardi [a,b], P. Salvini [a], I. Vai [a,b], P. Vitulo [a,b]

[a] INFN Sezione di Pavia, Pavia, Italy
[b] Università di Pavia, Pavia, Italy

S. Ajmal [a,b], G.M. Bilei [a], D. Ciangottini [a,b], L. Fanò [a,b], M. Magherini [a,b], G. Mantovani [a,b], V. Mariani [a,b], M. Menichelli [a], F. Moscatelli [a,57], A. Rossi [a,b], A. Santocchia [a,b], D. Spiga [a], T. Tedeschi [a,b]

[a] INFN Sezione di Perugia, Perugia, Italy
[b] Università di Perugia, Perugia, Italy

P. Asenov [a,b], P. Azzurri [a], G. Bagliesi [a], R. Bhattacharya [a], L. Bianchini [a,b], T. Boccali [a], E. Bossini [a], D. Bruschini [a,c], R. Castaldi [a], M.A. Ciocci [a,b], M. Cipriani [a,b], V. D'Amante [a,d], R. Dell'Orso [a], S. Donato [a], A. Giassi [a], F. Ligabue [a,c], D. Matos Figueiredo [a], A. Messineo [a,b], M. Musich [a,b], F. Palla [a], A. Rizzi [a,b], G. Rolandi [a,c], S. Roy Chowdhury [a], T. Sarkar [a], A. Scribano [a], P. Spagnolo [a], R. Tenchini [a], G. Tonelli [a,b], N. Turini [a,d], A. Venturi [a], P.G. Verdini [a]

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

P. Barria [a], M. Campana [a,b], F. Cavallari [a], L. Cunqueiro Mendez [a,b], D. Del Re [a,b], E. Di Marco [a], M. Diemoz [a], F. Errico [a,b], E. Longo [a,b], P. Meridiani [a], J. Mijuskovic [a,b], G. Organtini [a,b], F. Pandolfi [a], R. Paramatti [a,b], C. Quaranta [a,b], S. Rahatlou [a,b], C. Rovelli [a], F. Santanastasio [a,b], L. Soffi [a]

[a] INFN Sezione di Roma, Roma, Italy
[b] Sapienza Università di Roma, Roma, Italy

N. Amapane [a,b], R. Arcidiacono [a,c], S. Argiro [a,b], M. Arneodo [a,c], N. Bartosik [a], R. Bellan [a,b], A. Bellora [a,b], C. Biino [a], C. Borca [a,b], N. Cartiglia [a], M. Costa [a,b], R. Covarelli [a,b], N. Demaria [a], L. Finco [a], M. Grippo [a,b], B. Kiani [a,b], F. Legger [a], F. Luongo [a,b], C. Mariotti [a], L. Markovic [a,b], S. Maselli [a], A. Mecca [a,b], E. Migliore [a,b], M. Monteno [a], R. Mulargia [a], M.M. Obertino [a,b], G. Ortona [a], L. Pacher [a,b], N. Pastrone [a], M. Pelliccioni [a], M. Ruspa [a,c], F. Siviero [a,b], V. Sola [a,b], A. Solano [a,b], A. Staiano [a], C. Tarricone [a,b], D. Trocino [a], G. Umoret [a,b], E. Vlasov [a,b]

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

S. Belforte [a], V. Candelise [a,b], M. Casarsa [a], F. Cossutti [a], K. De Leo [a,b], G. Della Ricca [a,b]

[a] INFN Sezione di Trieste, Trieste, Italy
[b] Università di Trieste, Trieste, Italy

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

Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea

M.S. Kim

Department of Mathematics and Physics - GWNU, Gangneung, Korea

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

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

E. Asilar, D. Kim, T.J. Kim, J.A. Merlin

Hanyang University, Seoul, Korea

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

Korea University, Seoul, Korea

J. Goh, S. Yang

Kyung Hee University, Department of Physics, Seoul, Korea

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

Sejong University, Seoul, Korea

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

Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea

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

University of Seoul, Seoul, Korea

S. Ha, H.D. Yoo

Yonsei University, Department of Physics, Seoul, Korea

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

Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon, Korea

T. Beyrouthy, Y. Maghrbi

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

K. Dreimanis, A. Gaile, G. Pikurs, A. Potrebko, M. Seidel, V. Veckalns[58]

Riga Technical University, Riga, Latvia

N.R. Strautnieks

University of Latvia (LU), Riga, Latvia

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

Vilnius University, Vilnius, Lithuania

N. Bin Norjoharuddeen, I. Yusuff[59], Z. Zolkapli

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

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

Universidad de Sonora (UNISON), Hermosillo, Mexico

G. Ayala, H. Castilla-Valdez, E. De La Cruz-Burelo, I. Heredia-De La Cruz[60], R. Lopez-Fernandez, C.A. Mondragon Herrera, A. Sánchez Hernández

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

C. Oropeza Barrera, M. Ramírez García

Universidad Iberoamericana, Mexico City, Mexico

I. Bautista, I. Pedraza, H.A. Salazar Ibarguen, C. Uribe Estrada

Benemerita Universidad Autonoma de Puebla, Puebla, Mexico

I. Bubanja, N. Raicevic

University of Montenegro, Podgorica, Montenegro

P.H. Butler

University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand

A. Ahmad, M.I. Asghar, A. Awais, M.I.M. Awan, H.R. Hoorani, W.A. Khan

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

V. Avati, L. Grzanka, M. Malawski

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

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

National Centre for Nuclear Research, Swierk, Poland

K. Bunkowski, K. Doroba, A. Kalinowski, M. Konecki, J. Krolikowski, A. Muhammad

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

K. Pozniak, W. Zabolotny

Warsaw University of Technology, Warsaw, Poland

M. Araujo, D. Bastos, C. Beirão Da Cruz E Silva, A. Boletti, M. Bozzo, T. Camporesi, G. Da Molin, P. Faccioli, M. Gallinaro, J. Hollar, N. Leonardo, T. Niknejad, A. Petrilli, M. Pisano, J. Seixas, J. Varela, J.W. Wulff

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

P. Adzic, P. Milenovic

Faculty of Physics, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia

M. Dordevic, J. Milosevic, V. Rekovic

VINCA Institute of Nuclear Sciences, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia

M. Aguilar-Benitez, J. Alcaraz Maestre, Cristina F. Bedoya, M. Cepeda, M. Cerrada, N. Colino, B. De La Cruz, A. Delgado Peris, A. Escalante Del Valle, D. Fernández Del Val, J.P. Fernández Ramos, J. Flix, M.C. Fouz, O. Gonzalez Lopez, S. Goy Lopez, J.M. Hernandez, M.I. Josa, D. Moran, C.M. Morcillo Perez, Á. Navarro Tobar, C. Perez Dengra, A. Pérez-Calero Yzquierdo, J. Puerta Pelayo, I. Redondo, D.D. Redondo Ferrero, L. Romero, S. Sánchez Navas, L. Urda Gómez, J. Vazquez Escobar, C. Willmott

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

J.F. de Trocóniz

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain

B. Alvarez Gonzalez, J. Cuevas, J. Fernandez Menendez, S. Folgueras, I. Gonzalez Caballero, J.R. González Fernández, E. Palencia Cortezon, C. Ramón Álvarez, V. Rodríguez Bouza, A. Soto Rodríguez, A. Trapote, C. Vico Villalba, P. Vischia

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

S. Bhowmik, S. Blanco Fernández, J.A. Brochero Cifuentes, I.J. Cabrillo, A. Calderon, J. Duarte Campderros, M. Fernandez, G. Gomez, C. Lasaosa García, C. Martinez Rivero, P. Martinez Ruiz del Arbol, F. Matorras, P. Matorras Cuevas, E. Navarrete Ramos, J. Piedra Gomez, L. Scodellaro, I. Vila, J.M. Vizan Garcia

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

M.K. Jayananda, B. Kailasapathy [61], D.U.J. Sonnadara, D.D.C. Wickramarathna

University of Colombo, Colombo, Sri Lanka

W.G.D. Dharmaratna [62], K. Liyanage, N. Perera, N. Wickramage

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

D. Abbaneo, C. Amendola, E. Auffray, G. Auzinger, J. Baechler, D. Barney, A. Bermúdez Martínez, M. Bianco, B. Bilin, A.A. Bin Anuar, A. Bocci, C. Botta, E. Brondolin, C. Caillol, G. Cerminara, N. Chernyavskaya, D. d'Enterria, A. Dabrowski, A. David, A. De Roeck, M.M. Defranchis, M. Deile, M. Dobson, L. Forthomme, G. Franzoni, W. Funk, S. Giani, D. Gigi, K. Gill, F. Glege, L. Gouskos, M. Haranko, J. Hegeman, B. Huber, V. Innocente, T. James, P. Janot, S. Laurila, P. Lecoq, E. Leutgeb, C. Lourenço, B. Maier, L. Malgeri, M. Mannelli, A.C. Marini, M. Matthewman, F. Meijers, S. Mersi, E. Meschi, V. Milosevic, F. Monti, F. Moortgat, M. Mulders, I. Neutelings, S. Orfanelli, F. Pantaleo, G. Petrucciani, A. Pfeiffer, M. Pierini, D. Piparo, H. Qu, D. Rabady, G. Reales Gutiérrez, M. Rovere, H. Sakulin, S. Scarfi, C. Schwick, M. Selvaggi, A. Sharma, K. Shchelina, P. Silva, P. Sphicas [63], A.G. Stahl Leiton, A. Steen, S. Summers, D. Treille, P. Tropea, A. Tsirou, D. Walter, J. Wanczyk [64], J. Wang, S. Wuchterl, P. Zehetner, P. Zejdl, W.D. Zeuner

CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland

T. Bevilacqua [65], L. Caminada [65], A. Ebrahimi, W. Erdmann, R. Horisberger, Q. Ingram, H.C. Kaestli, D. Kotlinski, C. Lange, M. Missiroli [65], L. Noehte [65], T. Rohe

Paul Scherrer Institut, Villigen, Switzerland

T.K. Aarrestad, K. Androsov [64], M. Backhaus, A. Calandri, C. Cazzaniga, K. Datta, A. De Cosa, G. Dissertori, M. Dittmar, M. Donegà, F. Eble, M. Galli, K. Gedia, F. Glessgen, C. Grab, D. Hits, W. Lustermann, A.-M. Lyon, R.A. Manzoni, M. Marchegiani, L. Marchese, C. Martin Perez, A. Mascellani [64], F. Nessi-Tedaldi, F. Pauss, V. Perovic, S. Pigazzini, C. Reissel, T. Reitenspiess, B. Ristic, F. Riti, D. Ruini, R. Seidita, J. Steggemann [64], D. Valsecchi, R. Wallny

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

C. Amsler [66], P. Bärtschi, D. Brzhechko, M.F. Canelli, K. Cormier, J.K. Heikkilä, M. Huwiler, W. Jin, A. Jofrehei, B. Kilminster, S. Leontsinis, S.P. Liechti, A. Macchiolo, P. Meiring, U. Molinatti, A. Reimers, P. Robmann, S. Sanchez Cruz, M. Senger, Y. Takahashi, R. Tramontano

Universität Zürich, Zurich, Switzerland

C. Adloff [67], D. Bhowmik, C.M. Kuo, W. Lin, P.K. Rout, P.C. Tiwari [40], S.S. Yu

National Central University, Chung-Li, Taiwan

L. Ceard, Y. Chao, K.F. Chen, P.s. Chen, Z.g. Chen, W.-S. Hou, T.h. Hsu, Y.w. Kao, R. Khurana, G. Kole, Y.y. Li, R.-S. Lu, E. Paganis, X.f. Su, J. Thomas-Wilsker, L.s. Tsai, H.y. Wu, E. Yazgan

National Taiwan University (NTU), Taipei, Taiwan

C. Asawatangtrakuldee, N. Srimanobhas, V. Wachirapusitanand

High Energy Physics Research Unit, Department of Physics, Faculty of Science, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand

D. Agyel, F. Boran, Z.S. Demiroglu, F. Dolek, I. Dumanoglu[68], E. Eskut, Y. Guler[69], E. Gurpinar Guler[69], C. Isik, O. Kara, A. Kayis Topaksu, U. Kiminsu, G. Onengut, K. Ozdemir[70], A. Polatoz, B. Tali[71], U.G. Tok, S. Turkcapar, E. Uslan, I.S. Zorbakir

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

M. Yalvac[72]

Middle East Technical University, Physics Department, Ankara, Turkey

B. Akgun, I.O. Atakisi, E. Gülmez, M. Kaya[73], O. Kaya[74], S. Tekten[75]

Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey

A. Cakir, K. Cankocak[68,76], Y. Komurcu, S. Sen[77]

Istanbul Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey

O. Aydilek, S. Cerci[71], V. Epshteyn, B. Hacisahinoglu, I. Hos[78], B. Kaynak, S. Ozkorucuklu, O. Potok, H. Sert, C. Simsek, C. Zorbilmez

Istanbul University, Istanbul, Turkey

B. Isildak[79], D. Sunar Cerci[71]

Yildiz Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey

A. Boyaryntsev, B. Grynyov

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

L. Levchuk

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

D. Anthony, J.J. Brooke, A. Bundock, F. Bury, E. Clement, D. Cussans, H. Flacher, M. Glowacki, J. Goldstein, H.F. Heath, L. Kreczko, S. Paramesvaran, S. Seif El Nasr-Storey, V.J. Smith, N. Stylianou[80], K. Walkingshaw Pass, R. White

University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom

A.H. Ball, K.W. Bell, A. Belyaev[81], C. Brew, R.M. Brown, D.J.A. Cockerill, C. Cooke, K.V. Ellis, K. Harder, S. Harper, M.-L. Holmberg[82], J. Linacre, K. Manolopoulos, D.M. Newbold, E. Olaiya, D. Petyt, T. Reis, G. Salvi, T. Schuh, C.H. Shepherd-Themistocleous, I.R. Tomalin, T. Williams

Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom

R. Bainbridge, P. Bloch, C.E. Brown, O. Buchmuller, V. Cacchio, C.A. Carrillo Montoya, G.S. Chahal[83], D. Colling, J.S. Dancu, I. Das, P. Dauncey, G. Davies, J. Davies, M. Della Negra, S. Fayer, G. Fedi, G. Hall, M.H. Hassanshahi, A. Howard, G. Iles, M. Knight, J. Langford, J. León Holgado, L. Lyons, A.-M. Magnan, S. Malik, M. Mieskolainen, J. Nash[84], M. Pesaresi, B.C. Radburn-Smith, A. Richards, A. Rose, K. Savva, C. Seez, R. Shukla, A. Tapper, K. Uchida, G.P. Uttley, L.H. Vage, T. Virdee[32], M. Vojinovic, N. Wardle, D. Winterbottom

Imperial College, London, United Kingdom

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

Brunel University, Uxbridge, United Kingdom

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

Baylor University, Waco, TX, USA

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

Catholic University of America, Washington, DC, USA

B. Bam, R. Chudasama, S.I. Cooper, S.V. Gleyzer, C.U. Perez, P. Rumerio[85], E. Usai, R. Yi

The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, AL, USA

A. Akpinar, D. Arcaro, C. Cosby, Z. Demiragli, C. Erice, C. Fangmeier, C. Fernandez Madrazo, E. Fontanesi, D. Gastler, F. Golf, S. Jeon, I. Reed, J. Rohlf, K. Salyer, D. Sperka, D. Spitzbart, I. Suarez, A. Tsatsos, S. Yuan, A.G. Zecchinelli

Boston University, Boston, MA, USA

G. Benelli, X. Coubez[27], D. Cutts, M. Hadley, U. Heintz, J.M. Hogan[86], T. Kwon, G. Landsberg, K.T. Lau, D. Li, J. Luo, S. Mondal, M. Narain[†], N. Pervan, S. Sagir[87], F. Simpson, M. Stamenkovic, W.Y. Wong, X. Yan, W. Zhang

Brown University, Providence, RI, USA

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

University of California, Davis, Davis, CA, USA

M. Bachtis, R. Cousins, A. Datta, G. Flores Avila, J. Hauser, M. Ignatenko, M.A. Iqbal, T. Lam, E. Manca, A. Nunez Del Prado, D. Saltzberg, V. Valuev

University of California, Los Angeles, CA, USA

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

University of California, Riverside, Riverside, CA, USA

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

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

A. Barzdukas, L. Brennan, C. Campagnari, A. Dorsett, J. Incandela, J. Kim, A.J. Li, P. Masterson, H. Mei, J. Richman, U. Sarica, R. Schmitz, F. Setti, J. Sheplock, D. Stuart, T.Á. Vámi, S. Wang

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

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

California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA, USA

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

Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA

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

University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, CO, USA

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

Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA

M. Albrow, M. Alyari, O. Amram, G. Apollinari, A. Apresyan, L.A.T. Bauerdick, D. Berry, J. Berryhill, P.C. Bhat, K. Burkett, J.N. Butler, A. Canepa, G.B. Cerati, H.W.K. Cheung, F. Chlebana, G. Cummings, J. Dickinson, I. Dutta, V.D. Elvira, Y. Feng, J. Freeman, A. Gandrakota, Z. Gecse, L. Gray, D. Green, A. Grummer, S. Grünendahl, D. Guerrero, O. Gutsche, R.M. Harris, R. Heller, T.C. Herwig, J. Hirschauer, L. Horyn, B. Jayatilaka, S. Jindariani, M. Johnson, U. Joshi, T. Klijnsma, B. Klima, K.H.M. Kwok, S. Lammel, D. Lincoln, R. Lipton, T. Liu, C. Madrid, K. Maeshima, C. Mantilla, D. Mason, P. McBride, P. Merkel, S. Mrenna, S. Nahn, J. Ngadiuba, D. Noonan, V. Papadimitriou, N. Pastika, K. Pedro, C. Pena [88], F. Ravera, A. Reinsvold Hall [89], L. Ristori, E. Sexton-Kennedy, N. Smith, A. Soha, L. Spiegel, S. Stoynev, J. Strait, L. Taylor, S. Tkaczyk, N.V. Tran, L. Uplegger, E.W. Vaandering, I. Zoi

Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, IL, USA

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

University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, USA

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

Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL, USA

B. Alsufyani, M.M. Baarmand, S. Butalla, T. Elkafrawy [56], M. Hohlmann, R. Kumar Verma, M. Rahmani, E. Yanes

Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, FL, USA

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

University of Illinois Chicago, Chicago, USA

M. Alhusseini, D. Blend, K. Dilsiz [90], L. Emediato, G. Karaman, O.K. Köseyan, J.-P. Merlo, A. Mestvirishvili [91], J. Nachtman, O. Neogi, H. Ogul [92], Y. Onel, A. Penzo, C. Snyder, E. Tiras [93]

The University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA, USA

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

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA

A. Abreu, L.F. Alcerro Alcerro, J. Anguiano, P. Baringer, A. Bean, Z. Flowers, D. Grove, J. King, G. Krintiras, M. Lazarovits, C. Le Mahieu, C. Lindsey, J. Marquez, N. Minafra,

M. Murray, M. Nickel, M. Pitt, S. Popescu[94], C. Rogan, C. Royon, R. Salvatico, S. Sanders, C. Smith, Q. Wang, G. Wilson

The University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS, USA

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

Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS, USA

F. Rebassoo, D. Wright

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA, USA

A. Baden, A. Belloni, Y.M. Chen, S.C. Eno, N.J. Hadley, S. Jabeen, R.G. Kellogg, T. Koeth, Y. Lai, S. Lascio, A.C. Mignerey, S. Nabili, C. Palmer, C. Papageorgakis, M.M. Paranjpe, L. Wang

University of Maryland, College Park, MD, USA

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

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA

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

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, USA

L.M. Cremaldi

University of Mississippi, Oxford, MS, USA

K. Bloom, D.R. Claes, G. Haza, J. Hossain, C. Joo, I. Kravchenko, J.E. Siado, W. Tabb, A. Vagnerini, A. Wightman, F. Yan, D. Yu

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, NE, USA

H. Bandyopadhyay, L. Hay, I. Iashvili, A. Kharchilava, M. Morris, D. Nguyen, S. Rappoccio, H. Rejeb Sfar, A. Williams

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

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

Northeastern University, Boston, MA, USA

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

Northwestern University, Evanston, IL, USA

G. Agarwal, R. Band, R. Bucci, S. Castells, A. Das, R. Goldouzian, M. Hildreth, K.W. Ho, K. Hurtado Anampa, T. Ivanov, C. Jessop, K. Lannon, J. Lawrence, N. Loukas, L. Lutton, J. Mariano, N. Marinelli, I. Mcalister, T. McCauley, C. Mcgrady, C. Moore, Y. Musienko[16], H. Nelson, M. Osherson, A. Piccinelli, R. Ruchti, A. Townsend, Y. Wan, M. Wayne, H. Yockey, M. Zarucki, L. Zygala

University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN, USA

A. Basnet, B. Bylsma, M. Carrigan, L.S. Durkin, C. Hill, M. Joyce, M. Nunez Ornelas, K. Wei, B.L. Winer, B.R. Yates

The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA

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

Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, USA

S. Malik

University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez, PR, USA

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

Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, USA

J. Dolen, N. Parashar, A. Pathak

Purdue University Northwest, Hammond, IN, USA

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

Rice University, Houston, TX, USA

A. Bodek, P. de Barbaro, R. Demina, J.L. Dulemba, A. Garcia-Bellido, O. Hindrichs, A. Khukhunaishvili, N. Parmar, P. Parygin[95], E. Popova[95], R. Taus

University of Rochester, Rochester, NY, USA

K. Goulianos

The Rockefeller University, New York, NY, USA

B. Chiarito, J.P. Chou, Y. Gershtein, E. Halkiadakis, A. Hart, M. Heindl, D. Jaroslawski, O. Karacheban[30], I. Laflotte, A. Lath, R. Montalvo, K. Nash, H. Routray, S. Salur, S. Schnetzer, S. Somalwar, R. Stone, S.A. Thayil, S. Thomas, J. Vora, H. Wang

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

H. Acharya, D. Ally, A.G. Delannoy, S. Fiorendi, S. Higginbotham, T. Holmes, A.R. Kanuganti, N. Karunarathna, L. Lee, E. Nibigira, S. Spanier

University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN, USA

D. Aebi, M. Ahmad, O. Bouhali[96], R. Eusebi, J. Gilmore, T. Huang, T. Kamon[97], H. Kim, S. Luo, R. Mueller, D. Overton, D. Rathjens, A. Safonov

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

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

Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX, USA

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

Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN, USA

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

University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA, USA

P.E. Karchin

Wayne State University, Detroit, MI, USA

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

University of Wisconsin - Madison, Madison, WI, USA

S. Afanasiev, V. Andreev, Yu. Andreev, T. Aushev, M. Azarkin, A. Babaev, A. Belyaev, V. Blinov[98], E. Boos, V. Borshch, D. Budkouski, V. Bunichev, V. Chekhovsky, R. Chistov[,98], M. Danilov[,98], A. Dermenev, T. Dimova[,98], D. Druzhkin[,99], M. Dubinin[,88], L. Dudko, A. Ershov, G. Gavrilov, V. Gavrilov, S. Gninenko, V. Golovtcov, N. Golubev, I. Golutvin, I. Gorbunov, A. Gribushin, Y. Ivanov, V. Kachanov, V. Karjavine, A. Karneyeu, V. Kim[,98], M. Kirakosyan, D. Kirpichnikov, M. Kirsanov, V. Klyukhin, V. Korenkov, A. Kozyrev[,98], N. Krasnikov, A. Lanev, P. Levchenko[,100], N. Lychkovskaya, V. Makarenko, A. Malakhov, V. Matveev[,98], V. Murzin, A. Nikitenko[,101,102], S. Obraztsov, V. Oreshkin, V. Palichik, V. Perelygin, M. Perfilov, S. Polikarpov[,98], V. Popov, O. Radchenko[,98], M. Savina, V. Savrin, V. Shalaev, S. Shmatov, S. Shulha, Y. Skovpen[,98], S. Slabospitskii, V. Smirnov, D. Sosnov, V. Sulimov, E. Tcherniaev, A. Terkulov, O. Teryaev, I. Tlisova, A. Toropin, L. Uvarov, A. Uzunian, P. Volkov, A. Vorobyev[†], G. Vorotnikov, N. Voytishin, B.S. Yuldashev[103], A. Zarubin, I. Zhizhin, A. Zhokin

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

[†] Deceased.
[1] Also at Yerevan State University, Yerevan, Armenia.
[2] Also at TU Wien, Vienna, Austria.
[3] Also at Institute of Basic and Applied Sciences, Faculty of Engineering, Arab Academy for Science, Technology and Maritime Transport, Alexandria, Egypt.
[4] Also at Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium.
[5] Also at Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, Brazil.
[6] Also at Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, Brazil.
[7] Also at UFMS, Nova Andradina, Brazil.
[8] Also at Nanjing Normal University, Nanjing, China.
[9] Now at The University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, USA.
[10] Also at University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China.
[11] Also at China Center of Advanced Science and Technology, Beijing, China.
[12] Also at University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China.
[13] Also at China Spallation Neutron Source, Guangdong, China.
[14] Now at Henan Normal University, Xinxiang, China.
[15] Also at Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium.
[16] Also at an institute or an international laboratory covered by a cooperation agreement with CERN.
[17] Also at Cairo University, Cairo, Egypt.
[18] Also at Suez University, Suez, Egypt.
[19] Now at British University in Egypt, Cairo, Egypt.
[20] Also at Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana, USA.
[21] Also at Université de Haute Alsace, Mulhouse, France.
[22] Also at Istinye University, Istanbul, Turkey.
[23] Also at Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia.
[24] Also at The University of the State of Amazonas, Manaus, Brazil.
[25] Also at Erzincan Binali Yildirim University, Erzincan, Turkey.
[26] Also at University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany.
[27] Also at RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut A, Aachen, Germany.
[28] Also at Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, Iran.
[29] Also at Bergische University Wuppertal (BUW), Wuppertal, Germany.
[30] Also at Brandenburg University of Technology, Cottbus, Germany.
[31] Also at Forschungszentrum Jülich, Juelich, Germany.
[32] Also at CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland.
[33] Also at Institute of Physics, University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary.
[34] Also at Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary.
[35] Now at Universitatea Babes-Bolyai - Facultatea de Fizica, Cluj-Napoca, Romania.

[36] Also at Physics Department, Faculty of Science, Assiut University, Assiut, Egypt.
[37] Also at HUN-REN Wigner Research Centre for Physics, Budapest, Hungary.
[38] Also at Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana, India.
[39] Also at University of Visva-Bharati, Santiniketan, India.
[40] Also at Indian Institute of Science (IISc), Bangalore, India.
[41] Also at Birla Institute of Technology, Mesra, Mesra, India.
[42] Also at IIT Bhubaneswar, Bhubaneswar, India.
[43] Also at Institute of Physics, Bhubaneswar, India.
[44] Also at University of Hyderabad, Hyderabad, India.
[45] Also at Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Hamburg, Germany.
[46] Also at Department of Physics, Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, Iran.
[47] Also at Sharif University of Technology, Tehran, Iran.
[48] Also at Department of Physics, University of Science and Technology of Mazandaran, Behshahr, Iran.
[49] Also at Helwan University, Cairo, Egypt.
[50] Also at Italian National Agency for New Technologies, Energy and Sustainable Economic Development, Bologna, Italy.
[51] Also at Centro Siciliano di Fisica Nucleare e di Struttura Della Materia, Catania, Italy.
[52] Also at Università degli Studi Guglielmo Marconi, Roma, Italy.
[53] Also at Scuola Superiore Meridionale, Università di Napoli 'Federico II', Napoli, Italy.
[54] Also at Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, Illinois, USA.
[55] Also at Laboratori Nazionali di Legnaro dell'INFN, Legnaro, Italy.
[56] Also at Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt.
[57] Also at Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche - Istituto Officina dei Materiali, Perugia, Italy.
[58] Also at Riga Technical University, Riga, Latvia.
[59] Also at Department of Applied Physics, Faculty of Science and Technology, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi, Malaysia.
[60] Also at Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología, Mexico City, Mexico.
[61] Also at Trincomalee Campus, Eastern University, Sri Lanka, Nilaveli, Sri Lanka.
[62] Also at Saegis Campus, Nugegoda, Sri Lanka.
[63] Also at National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece.
[64] Also at Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland.
[65] Also at Universität Zürich, Zurich, Switzerland.
[66] Also at Stefan Meyer Institute for Subatomic Physics, Vienna, Austria.
[67] Also at Laboratoire d'Annecy-le-Vieux de Physique des Particules, IN2P3-CNRS, Annecy-le-Vieux, France.
[68] Also at Near East University, Research Center of Experimental Health Science, Mersin, Turkey.
[69] Also at Konya Technical University, Konya, Turkey.
[70] Also at Izmir Bakircay University, Izmir, Turkey.
[71] Also at Adiyaman University, Adiyaman, Turkey.
[72] Also at Bozok Universitetesi Rektörlügü, Yozgat, Turkey.
[73] Also at Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey.
[74] Also at Milli Savunma University, Istanbul, Turkey.
[75] Also at Kafkas University, Kars, Turkey.
[76] Now at Istanbul Okan University, Istanbul, Turkey.
[77] Also at Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.
[78] Also at Istanbul University - Cerrahpasa, Faculty of Engineering, Istanbul, Turkey.
[79] Also at Yildiz Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey.
[80] Also at Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussel, Belgium.
[81] Also at School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southampton, Southampton, United Kingdom.
[82] Also at University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom.
[83] Also at IPPP Durham University, Durham, United Kingdom.
[84] Also at Monash University, Faculty of Science, Clayton, Australia.
[85] Also at Università di Torino, Torino, Italy.
[86] Also at Bethel University, St. Paul, Minnesota, USA.
[87] Also at Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University, Karaman, Turkey.
[88] Also at California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California, USA.
[89] Also at United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, USA.
[90] Also at Bingol University, Bingol, Turkey.
[91] Also at Georgian Technical University, Tbilisi, Georgia.
[92] Also at Sinop University, Sinop, Turkey.
[93] Also at Erciyes University, Kayseri, Turkey.
[94] Also at Horia Hulubei National Institute of Physics and Nuclear Engineering (IFIN-HH), Bucharest, Romania.
[95] Now at an institute or an international laboratory covered by a cooperation agreement with CERN.
[96] Also at Texas A&M University at Qatar, Doha, Qatar.
[97] Also at Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea.
[98] Also at another institute or international laboratory covered by a cooperation agreement with CERN.
[99] Also at Universiteit Antwerpen, Antwerpen, Belgium.
[100] Also at Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts, USA.
[101] Also at Imperial College, London, United Kingdom.
[102] Now at Yerevan Physics Institute, Yerevan, Armenia.
[103] Also at Institute of Nuclear Physics of the Uzbekistan Academy of Sciences, Tashkent, Uzbekistan.