



**University of
Zurich**^{UZH}

**Zurich Open Repository and
Archive**

University of Zurich
Main Library
Strickhofstrasse 39
CH-8057 Zurich
www.zora.uzh.ch

Year: 2013

Interpretation of searches for supersymmetry with simplified models

CMS Collaboration; Chatrchyan, S; Khachatryan, V; Sirunyan, A M; et al; Chiochia, V; Kilminster, B; Robmann, P

Abstract: The results of searches for supersymmetry by the CMS experiment are interpreted in the framework of simplified models. The results are based on data corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 4.73 to 4.98 fb⁻¹. The data were collected at the LHC in proton–proton collisions at a center-of-mass energy of 7 TeV. This paper describes the method of interpretation and provides upper limits on the product of the production cross section and branching fraction as a function of new particle masses for a number of simplified models. These limits and the corresponding experimental acceptance calculations can be used to constrain other theoretical models and to compare different supersymmetry-inspired analyses.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.88.052017>

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich


ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-92408>

Journal Article

Originally published at:

CMS Collaboration; Chatrchyan, S; Khachatryan, V; Sirunyan, A M; et al; Chiochia, V; Kilminster, B; Robmann, P (2013). Interpretation of searches for supersymmetry with simplified models. *Physical Review D (Particles, Fields, Gravitation and Cosmology)*, 88(5):052017.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.88.052017>



Interpretation of searches for supersymmetry with simplified models

The CMS Collaboration*

Abstract

The results of searches for supersymmetry by the CMS experiment are interpreted in the framework of simplified models. The results are based on data corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 4.73 to 4.98 fb⁻¹. The data were collected at the LHC in proton–proton collisions at a center-of-mass energy of 7 TeV. This paper describes the method of interpretation and provides upper limits on the product of the production cross section and branching fraction as a function of new particle masses for a number of simplified models. These limits and the corresponding experimental acceptance calculations can be used to constrain other theoretical models and to compare different supersymmetry-inspired analyses.

Published in Physical Review D as doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.88.052017.

1 Introduction

The results of searches for supersymmetry (SUSY) [1] at particle colliders are often used to test the validity of a few, specific, theoretical models. These models predict a large number of experimental observables at hadron colliders as a function of a few theoretical parameters. Most of the SUSY analyses performed by the Compact Muon Solenoid (CMS) experiment present their results as an exclusion of a range of parameters for the constrained minimal supersymmetric standard model (CMSSM) [2–4]. However, the results of the SUSY analyses can be used to test a wide range of alternative models, since many SUSY and non-SUSY models predict a similar phenomenology. These similarities inspired the formulation of the simplified model framework for presenting experimental results [5–9]. Specific applications of these ideas have appeared in Refs. [10, 11].

A simplified model is defined by a set of hypothetical particles and a sequence of their production and decay. For each simplified model, values for the product of the experimental acceptance and efficiency ($\mathcal{A} \times \epsilon$) are calculated to translate a number of signal events into a signal cross section. From this information, a 95% confidence level upper limit (UL) on the product of the cross section and branching fraction ($[\sigma \times \mathcal{B}]_{\text{UL}}$) is derived as a function of particle masses. The simplified model framework can quantify the dependence of an experimental limit on the particle spectrum or a particular sequence of particle production and decay in a manner that is more general than the CMSSM. Furthermore, the values of $[\sigma \times \mathcal{B}]_{\text{UL}}$ can be compared with theoretical predictions from a SUSY or non-SUSY model to determine whether the theory is compatible with data.

This paper collects and describes simplified model interpretations of a large number of SUSY-inspired analyses performed on data collected by the CMS collaboration in 2011 [12–26]. The simplified model framework was also applied by CMS to a limited number of analyses in 2010 [27]. The ATLAS collaboration has published similar interpretations [28–34].

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 provides a brief description of the CMS analyses considered here; Section 3 describes simplified models; Section 4 demonstrates the calculation of the product of the experimental acceptance and efficiency and the upper limits on cross sections; Section 5 contains comparisons of the results for different simplified models and analyses; Section 6 contains a summary.

2 The CMS detector and analyses

The CMS detector consists of a silicon tracker, an electromagnetic calorimeter, and a hadronic calorimeter, all located within the field volume of a central solenoid magnet, and a muon-detection system located outside the magnet [35]. Information from these components is combined to define objects such as electrons, muons, photons, jets, jets identified as b jets (b-tagged jets), and missing transverse energy (E_{T}). The exact definition of these objects depends on the specific analysis, and can be found in the analysis references. The data were collected by the CMS experiment at the Large Hadron Collider in proton-proton collisions at a center-of-mass energy of 7 TeV. Unless stated otherwise, the data corresponds to an integrated luminosity of $4.98 \pm 0.11 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ [36].

The descriptions of the analyses are categorized by the main features of the event selection. Detailed descriptions of these analyses can be found in the references [12–26]. The target of these analyses is a signal of the production of new, heavy particles that decay into standard model particles and stable, neutral particles that escape detection. The stable, neutral particles

can produce a signature of large \cancel{E}_T . The standard model also produces \cancel{E}_T in top quark, weak gauge boson, and heavy flavor production. Fluctuations in energy deposition in the detector can also produce significant \cancel{E}_T in quantum chromodynamics processes.

All-Hadronic Events contain two or more high transverse momentum (p_T) jets and significant \cancel{E}_T . Events with isolated leptons are rejected to reduce backgrounds from $t\bar{t}$, W , and Z boson production. A selection on kinematic discriminants is applied to reduce backgrounds containing \cancel{E}_T . The names of the discriminants label the analyses: α_T [12], \cancel{H}_T +jets [13] and M_{T2} [14]. The α_T [37] and M_{T2} [38, 39] variables are both motivated by the kinematics of new-particle pair production and decay into two visible systems of jets and a pair of invisible particles. The \cancel{H}_T +jets analysis, instead, uses a selection on the negative vector sum (\cancel{H}_T) and the scalar sum (H_T) of the transverse momentum of each jet. The M_{T2} analysis uses data corresponding to an integrated luminosity of $4.73 \pm 0.10 \text{ fb}^{-1}$

The α_T analysis mentioned above also categorizes events with one, two, or at least three jets that satisfy a b-tagging requirement. The M_{T2b} analysis modifies the M_{T2} selection mentioned above and requires at least one b-tagged jet. The $\cancel{E}_T + b$ analysis [15] follows a similar strategy as the \cancel{H}_T +jets analysis, but selects events with one, two, or at least three b-tagged jets.

Single Lepton + Jets Events are selected with one high- p_T , isolated lepton (electron or muon), jets, and significant \cancel{E}_T . Three analyses are considered in this paper [17]. The lepton spectrum (e/μ LS) and lepton projection (e/μ LP) methods exploit the expected correlation between the lepton p_T and \cancel{E}_T from W boson decays to separate a potential signal from the main backgrounds of $t\bar{t}$ and W +jets production. The artificial neural network (ANN) method applies an ANN that is based on event properties (jet multiplicity, H_T , transverse mass, and the azimuthal angular separation between the two highest- p_T jets) to separate backgrounds from the expectations of a CMSSM benchmark model.

Two other analyses [18] require also two or more b-tagged jets. In the first analysis ($e/\mu \geq 2b + \cancel{E}_T$), the W^+ , W^- , and $t\bar{t}$ background distributions from simulation are corrected to match the measured \cancel{E}_T spectrum at low H_T , and then the corrected prediction is extrapolated to high H_T and high \cancel{E}_T . A selection on \cancel{E}_T significance (Y_{MET}) and H_T is used in the second analysis ($e/\mu \geq 3b$, Y_{MET}). The Y_{MET} variable is defined as the ratio of \cancel{E}_T to $\sqrt{H_T}$.

Opposite-Sign Dileptons Events are selected with two leptons (electrons or muons) having electric charge of the opposite sign (OS), jets, and significant \cancel{E}_T . In one (OS $e/\mu + \cancel{E}_T$) analysis [21], a signal is defined as an excess of events at large values of \cancel{E}_T and H_T . In a second (OS e/μ edge) analysis [21], a search is performed for a characteristic kinematic edge in the dilepton mass distribution $m_{\ell^+\ell^-}$. In these two analyses events with an e^+e^- or $\mu^+\mu^-$ pair with invariant mass of the dilepton system between 76 GeV and 106 GeV or below 12 GeV are removed, in order to suppress Z/γ^* events, as well as low-mass dilepton resonances. A third analysis (OS e/μ ANN) [22] applies a selection on the output of an ANN that is based on seven kinematic variables constructed from leptons and jets, to discriminate the signal events from the background.

Two other analyses complementary focus directly on the two leptons from Z -boson decay by applying an invariant mass selection [25]. With this requirement, the main source of \cancel{E}_T arises from fluctuations in the measurement of jet energy. One analysis ($Z + \cancel{E}_T$) determines this background from a control sample that differs only in the presence of a Z boson. A second analysis (JZB) applies a kinematic variable denoted JZB, which is

defined as the difference between the sum of the vector elements of the p_T of the jets and the p_T of the boson candidate.

The last analysis in this group selects events consistent with a W boson decaying to jets produced in association with a Z boson decaying to leptons, and searches for an excess of events in the \cancel{E}_T distribution. This analysis is part of the combined lepton (comb. leptons) analysis [24] that targets a signal containing gauge boson pairs and \cancel{E}_T : $WZ, ZZ + \cancel{E}_T$.

Same-Sign Dileptons Events are selected with two leptons (electrons or muons) having electric charge of the same sign (SS), and significant \cancel{E}_T . One analysis (SS e/μ) uses several different selections on \cancel{E}_T and H_T to suppress backgrounds [19]. A second analysis (SS+b) requires at least one b-tagged jet [20]. A third analysis makes no requirements on jet activity. It limits backgrounds by applying more stringent lepton identification criteria. Results from this analysis are included in the combined lepton results [24].

Multileptons Events are selected containing at least three leptons. Selections are made on the values of several event variables, including \cancel{E}_T , H_T , and the invariant mass of lepton pairs [23, 24]. One analysis applies a veto on b-tagged jets to remove most of the $t\bar{t}$ background, and is included in the combined lepton results [24].

Photons Events are selected containing one photon, two jets, and \cancel{E}_T ($\gamma jj + \cancel{E}_T$), or two photons, one jet, and \cancel{E}_T ($\gamma\gamma j + \cancel{E}_T$) [26]. The requirement of a photon and \cancel{E}_T is sufficient to remove most backgrounds.

Inclusive The *razor* analysis integrates several event categories [16]. Events are required to contain jets and zero, one, or two leptons (electrons and muons) with a further classification based on the presence of a b-tagged jet. The razor variable [40] is a ratio of a jet system mass to a transverse mass. The distribution in the razor variable is highly correlated with the mass values of new particles for hypothesized signals but skewed to relatively smaller values for backgrounds. Values of the razor variable are chosen to reduce backgrounds while accepting signal events in a similar manner as for the a_T and M_{T2} analyses. The razor analysis uses data corresponding to an integrated luminosity of $4.73 \pm 0.10 \text{ fb}^{-1}$.

3 Simplified models

A simplified model is defined by a set of hypothetical particles and a sequence of their production and decay. In this paper, the selection of models is motivated by the particles and interactions of the CMSSM or models with generalized gauge mediation [41]. For convenience, the particle naming convention of the CMSSM is adopted, but none of the specific assumptions of the CMSSM are imposed. The CMSSM assumptions include relationships among the new particle masses, their production cross sections and distributions, and their decay modes and distributions. In the simplified models under consideration, only the production process for two primary particles is considered. Each primary particle can undergo a direct decay or a cascade decay through an intermediate new particle. Each particle decay chain ends with a neutral, undetected particle, denoted LSP (lightest supersymmetric particle) in text and $\tilde{\chi}_{\text{LSP}}$ in equations. $\tilde{\chi}_{\text{LSP}}$ can represent a neutralino or gravitino LSP. The masses of the primary particle and the LSP are free parameters. When the model includes the cascade decay of a mother particle (mother) to an intermediate particle (int), the mass of the intermediate particle depends on m_{mother} , m_{LSP} , and a parameter x , according to the equation $m_{\text{int}} = x m_{\text{mother}} + (1 - x) m_{\text{LSP}}$.

The value of x can be anywhere in the range from zero to one, but values of $x = \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{3}{4}$ are used here.

The simplified models with a T1-, T3-, and T5-prefix are all models of gluino pair production, with different assumptions about the gluino decay. Those with a T2- and T6-prefix are models of squark-antisquark production, with different assumptions on the type of squark or the pattern of squark decay. Those with a TChi-prefix are models of chargino and neutralino production and decay. In the simplified models under consideration, the W and Z bosons decay to any allowed final state. A detailed description of the specific models follows. Table 1 provides a summary.

T1, T1bbbb, T1tttt The T1 model is a simplified version of gluino pair production. Each gluino undergoes a three-body decay to a light-flavor quark-antiquark pair and the LSP ($\tilde{g} \rightarrow q\bar{q}\tilde{\chi}_{\text{LSP}}$). Ignoring the effects of additional radiation and jet reconstruction, this choice produces a final state of 4 jets+ \cancel{E}_T . The T1bbbb and T1tttt models are modifications of the T1 model in which the gluino decays exclusively into b or t quark-antiquark pairs. After accounting for the unobserved LSPs, the kinematic properties of events from the T1tttt model are indistinguishable by the analyses considered here to those from alternative simplified models, such as gluino decay to a top squark and an anti-top quark, followed by top squark decay to a top quark and the LSP ($\tilde{g} \rightarrow t\bar{t}^*, \tilde{t}^* \rightarrow \bar{t}\tilde{\chi}_{\text{LSP}}$) [20]. For simplicity, only the T1tttt model is considered.

T2, T2bb, T2tt, T6ttww The T2 model is a simplified version of squark-antisquark production. Each squark undergoes a two-body decay to a light-flavor quark and the LSP ($\tilde{q} \rightarrow q\tilde{\chi}_{\text{LSP}}$). Ignoring the effects of additional radiation and jet reconstruction, this choice produces a final state of 2 jets+ \cancel{E}_T . The T2bb and T2tt models are versions of bottom and top squark production, respectively, with the bottom (top) squark decaying to a bottom (top) quark and the LSP. The T6ttww model is a version of direct bottom squark production, with the bottom squark decaying to a top quark, a W boson, and the LSP.

T3w, T3lh The models with the T3-prefix are also based on gluino pair production. One gluino has a direct decay to a light-flavor quark-antiquark pair and the LSP, as in the T1 model. The other gluino has a cascade decay through an intermediate particle, denoted as $\tilde{\chi}_2^0$ or $\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$. In the T3w model, the cascade decay is a two-body decay of the chargino to a W boson and the LSP. For the T3lh model, the cascade decay is a three-body decay of a heavy neutralino to a lepton pair and the LSP ($\tilde{\chi}_2^0 \rightarrow \ell^+\ell^-\tilde{\chi}_{\text{LSP}}$). If a heavy neutralino $\tilde{\chi}_2^0$ decays to the LSP $\tilde{\chi}_{\text{LSP}}$ and a pair of leptons, the edge occurs at $m_{\ell^+\ell^-} = m_{\tilde{\chi}_2^0} - m_{\tilde{\chi}_{\text{LSP}}}$, corresponding to the region of kinematic phase space where $\tilde{\chi}_{\text{LSP}}$ is produced at rest in the $\tilde{\chi}_2^0$ rest frame.

T5lnu, T5zz The models with T5-prefix are also based on gluino pair production. Both gluinos undergo cascade decays. The T5lnu model has each gluino decay to a quark-antiquark pair and chargino that undergoes a three-body decay to a lepton, neutrino, and LSP. The decay can produce SS dileptons, due to the Majorana nature of the gluino. The T5zz model has each gluino decay to a quark-antiquark pair and an intermediate neutralino that undergoes a two-body decay to a Z boson and the LSP. When both Z bosons in an event decay to a quark-antiquark pair, and ignoring the effects of additional radiation and jet reconstruction, the T5zz model produces a final state of 8 jets+ \cancel{E}_T .

TChiSlepSlep, TChiwz, TChizz These models are simplified versions of the direct production and decay of charginos and neutralinos or neutralino pairs. The TChiSlepSlep and

TChiwz models are versions of chargino-neutralino production. The former has neutralino and chargino cascade decays through a charged slepton to three electrons, muons, and taus in equal rate, while the latter has direct decays to gauge bosons and LSPs. The TChiSlepSlep model does not include the decay $\tilde{\chi}_2^0 \rightarrow \tilde{\nu}\nu$, since this will not produce a multilepton signature. The TChizz model, instead, is a version of neutralino pair production and decay into Z bosons.

T5gg, T5wg The T5gg model is a version of gluino pair production in which each gluino decays to a quark-antiquark pair and an intermediate neutralino, which further decays to a photon and a massless LSP. The T5wg model, instead, has one gluino decaying to quark-antiquark pair and an intermediate neutralino that decays to a photon and the LSP, and the second gluino decaying to a quark-antiquark pair and a chargino that decays to a W boson and the LSP. The neutralino and chargino masses are set to a common value to allow an interpretation in models of gauge mediation. The intermediate neutralino is labeled as the next-to-LSP (NLSP).

The calculation of $\mathcal{A} \times \epsilon$ for each simplified model uses the PYTHIA [42] event generator with the SUSY differential cross sections for gluino, squark-antisquark, and neutralino and chargino pair production. The decays of non-Standard Model particles are performed with a constant amplitude, so that no spin correlations exist between the decay products. The primary particle masses are varied between 100 GeV and 1500 GeV. The theoretical prediction for the production cross section is not needed to calculate $[\sigma \times \mathcal{B}]_{\text{UL}}$. However, it is informative to compare the values of $[\sigma \times \mathcal{B}]_{\text{UL}}$ with the production cross section expected in a benchmark model. The selected benchmark is the CMSSM cross section prediction for gluino pair, squark antisquark, or neutralino and chargino pair production. The cross sections are determined at next-to-leading order (σ^{NLO}) accuracy for gaugino pair production, and at NLO with next-to-leading-logarithmic contributions ($\sigma^{\text{NLO+NLL}}$) for the other processes [43–48]. In both the calculation of particle production and the reference cross sections, extraneous SUSY particles are decoupled. For example, the contributions from squarks are effectively removed by setting the squark mass to a very large value when calculating the acceptance and cross section for gluino pair production. The cross sections are presented under the assumption of unit branching ratios, even for models such as T3w that consider two different decay modes of the gluino.

4 Limit setting procedure

The method used to set exclusion limits is common to all simplified models and analyses. In this section, the procedure is presented using the interpretation of two different OS dilepton analyses [21] as an example.

The reference simplified model is T3lh, which can yield pairs of OS leptons not arising from Z-boson decays. The mass of the intermediate neutralino produced in the gluino decay chain is set using $m_{\tilde{\chi}_2^0} = \frac{1}{2}(m_{\tilde{g}} + m_{\tilde{\chi}_{\text{LSP}}})$, corresponding to $x = \frac{1}{2}$. The parameter x influences the patterns of cascade decays. The mass splitting between the gluino and the intermediate particle, $(1-x)(m_{\tilde{g}} - m_{\tilde{\chi}_{\text{LSP}}})$, influences the observable hadronic energy, while the mass splitting between the intermediate particle and the LSP, $x(m_{\tilde{g}} - m_{\tilde{\chi}_{\text{LSP}}})$, influences the energy of the leptonic decay products or the \cancel{E}_T . For large x , the signal is expected to have lower H_T and higher \cancel{E}_T , and possibly higher- p_T leptons. Conversely, for small x , the signal should have higher H_T and lower \cancel{E}_T , and possibly lower- p_T leptons. Results are shown for a counting experiment based on H_T and \cancel{E}_T selections (OS $e/\mu + \cancel{E}_T$), and the edge reconstruction in the dilepton invariant mass ($m_{\ell^+\ell^-}$) distribution (OS e/μ edge).

Table 1: Summary of the simplified models used in the interpretation of results.

Model name	Production mode	Decay	Visibility	References
T1	$\tilde{g}\tilde{g}$	$\tilde{g} \rightarrow q\bar{q}\tilde{\chi}_{\text{LSP}}$	All-Hadronic	[12–14, 16]
T2	$\tilde{q}\tilde{q}^*$	$\tilde{q} \rightarrow q\tilde{\chi}_{\text{LSP}}$	All-Hadronic	[12, 13, 16]
T5zz	$\tilde{g}\tilde{g}$	$\tilde{g} \rightarrow q\bar{q}\tilde{\chi}_2^0, \tilde{\chi}_2^0 \rightarrow Z\tilde{\chi}_{\text{LSP}}$	All-Hadronic Opposite-Sign Dileptons Multileptons	[13, 14] [25] [23]
T3w	$\tilde{g}\tilde{g}$	$\tilde{g} \rightarrow q\bar{q}\tilde{\chi}_{\text{LSP}}$ $\tilde{g} \rightarrow q\bar{q}\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm, \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm \rightarrow W^\pm\tilde{\chi}_{\text{LSP}}$	Single Lepton + Jets	[17]
T5lnu	$\tilde{g}\tilde{g}$	$\tilde{g} \rightarrow q\bar{q}\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm, \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm \rightarrow \ell\nu\tilde{\chi}_{\text{LSP}}$	Same-Sign Dileptons	[19]
T3lh	$\tilde{g}\tilde{g}$	$\tilde{g} \rightarrow q\bar{q}\tilde{\chi}_{\text{LSP}}$ $\tilde{g} \rightarrow q\bar{q}\tilde{\chi}_2^0, \tilde{\chi}_2^0 \rightarrow \ell^+\ell^-\tilde{\chi}_{\text{LSP}}$	Opposite-Sign Dileptons	[21, 22]
T1bbbb	$\tilde{g}\tilde{g}$	$\tilde{g} \rightarrow b\bar{b}\tilde{\chi}_{\text{LSP}}$	All-Hadronic (b)	[12, 14–16]
T1tttt	$\tilde{g}\tilde{g}$	$\tilde{g} \rightarrow t\bar{t}\tilde{\chi}_{\text{LSP}}$	All-Hadronic (b) Single Lepton + Jets (b) Same-Sign Dileptons (b) Inclusive (b)	[12, 14, 15] [18] [19, 20] [16]
T2bb	$\tilde{b}\tilde{b}^*$	$\tilde{b} \rightarrow b\tilde{\chi}_{\text{LSP}}$	All-Hadronic (b)	[12, 16]
T6ttww	$\tilde{b}\tilde{b}^*$	$\tilde{b} \rightarrow t\tilde{\chi}^-, \tilde{\chi}^- \rightarrow W^-\tilde{\chi}_{\text{LSP}}$	Same-Sign Dileptons (b)	[20]
T2tt	$\tilde{t}\tilde{t}^*$	$\tilde{t} \rightarrow t\tilde{\chi}_{\text{LSP}}$	All-Hadronic (b)	[12, 16]
TChiSlepSlep	$\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm\tilde{\chi}_2^0$	$\tilde{\chi}_2^0 \rightarrow \ell^\pm\tilde{\ell}^\mp, \tilde{\ell} \rightarrow \ell\tilde{\chi}_{\text{LSP}}$ $\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm \rightarrow \nu\tilde{\ell}^\pm, \tilde{\ell}^\pm \rightarrow \ell^\pm\tilde{\chi}_{\text{LSP}}$	Multileptons	[23, 24]
TChiwz	$\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm\tilde{\chi}_2^0$	$\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm \rightarrow W^\pm\tilde{\chi}_{\text{LSP}}, \tilde{\chi}_2^0 \rightarrow Z\tilde{\chi}_{\text{LSP}}$	Multileptons	[23, 24]
TChizz	$\tilde{\chi}_2^0\tilde{\chi}_3^0$	$\tilde{\chi}_2^0, \tilde{\chi}_3^0 \rightarrow Z\tilde{\chi}_{\text{LSP}}$	Multileptons	[23, 24]
T5gg	$\tilde{g}\tilde{g}$	$\tilde{g} \rightarrow q\bar{q}\tilde{\chi}_2^0, \tilde{\chi}_2^0 \rightarrow \gamma\tilde{\chi}_{\text{LSP}}$	Photons	[26]
T5wg	$\tilde{g}\tilde{g}$	$\tilde{g} \rightarrow q\bar{q}\tilde{\chi}_2^0, \tilde{\chi}_2^0 \rightarrow \gamma\tilde{\chi}_{\text{LSP}}$ $\tilde{g} \rightarrow q\bar{q}\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm, \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm \rightarrow W^\pm\tilde{\chi}_{\text{LSP}}$	Photons	[26]

In the first step, the event selection is applied to simulated simplified model events. The ratio of selected to generated events determines $\mathcal{A} \times \epsilon$. The uncertainty on this quantity, which is a necessary input to the limit calculation, is described in the analysis references. This calculation is repeated for different values of the gluino and LSP masses. Values of $\mathcal{A} \times \epsilon$ for the two selections are shown in Figure 1 (left).

The acceptance of the \cancel{E}_T -based analysis (top-left) increases with increasing gluino mass, since the \cancel{E}_T and gluino mass are correlated. However, this acceptance decreases for smaller gluino-LSP mass splitting. The acceptance of the edge-based analysis (bottom-left) is relatively larger for small gluino-LSP mass splitting, but decreases for larger gluino mass. This decrease is an artifact of a choice made in the analysis to limit the $m_{\ell+\ell^-}$ distribution to $m_{\ell+\ell^-} < 300$ GeV. For small mass splitting, the presence of initial-state radiation (ISR) can strongly influence the experimental acceptance. The uncertainty on ISR is difficult to estimate. For this reason, some analyses report results for only a restricted region of mass splittings.

Estimates of $\mathcal{A} \times \epsilon$, the background, and their uncertainties are used to calculate $[\sigma \times \mathcal{B}]_{\text{UL}}$ for the given model using the CL_s criterion [49, 50]. A gluino and LSP mass pair in a simplified model is excluded if the derived $[\sigma \times \mathcal{B}]_{\text{UL}}$ result is below the predicted $\sigma^{\text{NLO+NLL}}$ for those mass values.

Values of $[\sigma \times \mathcal{B}]_{\text{UL}}$ are shown in Figure 1 (right) for the two analyses. The edge analysis (bottom-right) has less a stringent selection on \cancel{E}_T than the counting experiment (top-right): for the former the signal regions are defined by $H_T > 300$ GeV and $\cancel{E}_T > 150$ GeV, while for the latter different signal regions are obtained requiring high H_T ($H_T > 600$ GeV and $\cancel{E}_T > 200$ GeV), high \cancel{E}_T ($H_T > 300$ GeV and $\cancel{E}_T > 275$ GeV) or tight selection criteria ($H_T > 600$ GeV and $\cancel{E}_T > 275$ GeV). As a result, the edge analysis sets stronger limits than the counting analysis in this particular topology.

The expected limit and its experimental uncertainty, together with the observed limit and its theoretical uncertainty based on $\sigma^{\text{NLO+NLL}}$ for gluino pair production, are shown as curves overlaying the exclusion limit. In the case of the OS e/μ edge analysis, the most stringent limit on the gluino mass is obtained at around 900 GeV for low LSP masses and for the OS $e/\mu + \cancel{E}_T$ and is at around 775 GeV. The quoted estimates are determined from the observed exclusion based on the theoretical production cross section minus 1σ uncertainty.

The contours of constant $\mathcal{A} \times \epsilon$ do not coincide with those of constant $[\sigma \times \mathcal{B}]_{\text{UL}}$. For the OS $e/\mu + \cancel{E}_T$, this is an artifact of the changing uncertainty on $\mathcal{A} \times \epsilon$ as a function of gluino and LSP masses, signal contamination, and the observed distribution of \cancel{E}_T . In the OS e/μ edge analysis, this occurs because the allowed area of the signal $m_{\ell+\ell^-}$ distribution varies with the mass difference between the gluino and LSP.

5 Results and comparisons

This Section presents the results obtained applying the procedure described in Section 4 to the CMS analyses presented in Section 2. The individual results are described in detail in the analysis references, but comparisons of the results are presented in this paper for the first time. For each analysis, the lower limit on particle masses in a simplified model is determined by comparing $[\sigma \times \mathcal{B}]_{\text{UL}}$ with the predicted $\sigma^{\text{NLO+NLL}}$ or σ^{NLO} as described in Section 3. Only the observed $[\sigma \times \mathcal{B}]_{\text{UL}}$ values are used. The limits are thus subject to statistical fluctuations.

Figure 2 illustrates the results of the hadronic and inclusive analyses (left) and the leptonic analyses (right). Comparisons are made for two reference points of the mother and LSP masses:




Figure 1: OS dileptons [21]: Product of the experimental efficiency and acceptance (left) and the upper limit on the product of the cross section and branching fraction (right) for the T3lh model from the \cancel{E}_T and H_T selection (top) and from edge reconstruction (bottom). Results are shown as a function of gluino and LSP mass, with the intermediate neutralino mass set using $x = 0.5$.

one with a massless LSP (M_0 , dark blue in Figure 2), one with a fixed mass splitting between the mother particle and the LSP of 200 GeV (ΔM_{200} , light blue in Figure 2). The results shown in Figure 2 are summarized below.

All-Hadronic This class of analyses sets limits on those models, such as T1, T2, and T5zz, that produce several jets, but few leptons. The α_T and \cancel{H}_T +jets analyses yield similar limits in the T1 and T2 models despite the differences in their event selections. In the case of the T5zz model, the M_{T2} analysis is more sensitive to the model's mass splitting than the \cancel{H}_T +jets analysis: for M_0 , the M_{T2} analysis sets the stronger limit, while for ΔM_{200} the \cancel{H}_T +jets analysis is more sensitive. This is expected, since the M_{T2} analysis uses a higher cut on H_T than the \cancel{H}_T +jets analysis. In general, the limits for the T5zz model are reduced with respect to the T1 and T2 models, because of the reduced amount of \cancel{E}_T in cascade decays.

The \cancel{E}_T + b, the $M_{T2}b$, and the α_T analyses set limits on the T1bbbb, T1tttt, T2bb, and T2tt




Figure 2: Exclusion limits for the masses of the mother particles, for $m_{\text{LSP}} = 0$ GeV (dark blue) and $m_{\text{mother}} - m_{\text{LSP}} = 200$ GeV (light blue), for each analysis, for the hadronic and razor results (left) and the leptonic results (right). The limits are derived by comparing the allowed $[\sigma \times \mathcal{B}]_{\text{UL}}$ to the theory described in the text. For the T3, T5 and TChiSlepSlep models, the mass of the intermediate particle is defined by the relation $m_{\text{int}} = x m_{\text{mother}} + (1 - x) m_{\text{LSP}}$. For the T3w and T5zz models, the results are presented for $x = 0.25, 0.5, 0.75$, while for the T3lh, T5lnu, and TChiSlepSlep models, $x = 0.5$. The lowest mass value for m_{mother} depends on the particular analysis and the simplified model.




Figure 3: Best exclusion limits for the masses of the mother scales particles, for $m_{\text{LSP}} = 0 \text{ GeV}$ (dark blue) and $m_{\text{mother}} - m_{\text{LSP}} = 200 \text{ GeV}$ (light blue), for each simplified model, for all analyses considered. For the T3, T5 and TChiSlepSlep models, the mass of the intermediate particle is defined by the relation $m_{\text{int}} = x m_{\text{mother}} + (1 - x) m_{\text{LSP}}$. For the T3w and T5zz models, the results are presented for $x = 0.25, 0.5, 0.75$, while for the T3lh, T5lnu, and TChiSlepSlep models, $x = 0.5$. The lowest mass value for m_{mother} depends on the particular analysis and the simplified model.

models, visible in Figure 2 (left). The three analyses set comparable limits for ΔM_{200} , but the M_{T_2b} and α_T analyses set the stronger limits for M_0 . For the T1tttt model, the M_{T_2b} analysis is most sensitive.

The M_{T_2b} analysis is also compared with the M_{T_2} analysis with no b-tagging requirement. The limit for the M_{T_2b} analysis on the T1bbbb model is stronger than for the M_{T_2} analysis on the T1 model, since many of the backgrounds are removed by requiring a b-tagged jet, allowing for a lower threshold on the M_{T_2} variable. Also, the limit on the T5zz model from the M_{T_2b} analysis is stronger than for the M_{T_2} analysis, even though the b-tagged jets from the T5zz model arise mainly through the decay $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$.

Single Lepton + Jets This class of analyses is sensitive to simplified models that produce W bosons or direct decays to leptons. The e/μ LS, LP, and ANN analyses set limits on the T3w model for an intermediate (chargino) mass corresponding to $x = \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}, \text{ and } \frac{3}{4}$.

The LS and LP analyses are sensitive to the kinematic properties of the W boson produced in the chargino decay. For a large mass splitting between the mother and LSP (M_0), the

LP and ANN limits are less sensitive to x than the LS limit. For a fixed mass splitting (ΔM_{200}), however, the ANN limit is more sensitive. The limits for M_0 are stronger for all three analyses, with LP and ANN setting the best limits.

The $e/\mu \geq 2b + \cancel{E}_T$ and $e/\mu \geq 3b, Y_{\text{MET}}$ analyses set limits on the T1tttt model.

Opposite-Sign Dileptons The $Z + \cancel{E}_T$ and JZB analyses both set limits on the T5zz model relying on the leptonic decays of one of the Z bosons. The $Z + \cancel{E}_T$ analysis sets the stronger limit for $x = \frac{3}{4}$ and M_0 , for which more \cancel{E}_T is produced on average. The JZB analysis has the opposite behavior, since the separation between signal and background in the JZB variable is maximized in the signal when the \cancel{E}_T and $Z - p_T$ vectors point in the same direction. Therefore, the best limit is set for $x = \frac{1}{4}$.

Limits are also set on the T3lh model, with the non-resonant decay of the intermediate neutralino to leptons, by the \cancel{E}_T , the edge-based, and the neural-network-based analyses. The edge-based analysis sets significantly stronger limits.

Same-Sign Dileptons The T5lnu model produces equal numbers of OS and SS dileptons. Limits are set on the T5lnu model by the SS dilepton analysis. No comparisons are made for the OS dilepton analyses as these are expected to be much less sensitive due to their larger backgrounds.

The SS dilepton analysis with a b-tagged jet is used to set limits on the T1tttt and the T6ttww models. The analysis is not strongly sensitive to mass splittings, and a similar limit is set for the case of M_0 or ΔM_{200} .

Multileptons Limits are set on the TChiSlepSlep model, which produces leptons through slepton decays but not through gauge-boson decays. A limit is set on the chargino mass (which equals the heavy neutralino mass) near 500 GeV, which is not strongly dependent on the mass splitting. The limits on the model TChiwz are significantly reduced because of the corresponding reduction from the branching fraction of the gauge bosons into leptons. A limit on the T5zz model is also set. For the ΔM_{200} case the limit is competitive with the limits set by the hadronic analyses, despite the low $Z \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^-$ branching fraction.

Photons Limits are set on the T5gg and T5wg models, which produce two isolated photons and \cancel{E}_T or one isolated photon and \cancel{E}_T , respectively. The one- and two-photon analyses set comparable limits on the T5gg model. In addition, the one-photon analysis sets a competitive limit on the T5wg model.

Inclusive The razor and razor+b analyses set limits on the T1, T2, T1bbbb, T1tttt, T2bb, and T2tt models. The limits on each of these models are comparable with the best limits set by individual, exclusive analyses.

Figure 3 illustrates the best hadronic or leptonic result for each simplified model. Excluding the photon signatures, the best limits for the M_0 scenario exclude gluino masses below 1 TeV and squark masses below 800 GeV. For the ΔM_{200} scenario, the limit is reduced to near 800 GeV and 600 GeV, respectively. The limits on the gluino mass from the photon signatures are near 1.1 TeV, regardless of the mass splitting.

Figure 4 illustrates the exclusion contours in the two-dimensional plane of the mother versus LSP mass for the T1 (T1bbbb), T2 (T2bb), T5zz, T3w, T1tttt and T5gg (T5wg) models. The results shown in Figures 2 and 3 are a subset of these results. Regions where the analyses, due to the uncertainty in the acceptance calculation, do not produce a limit are denoted by dashed lines. Figure 4 (upper-left) shows the exclusion contours of the T1 and T1bbbb models using

the hadronic and b-tagged hadronic analyses. This tests the dependence on the assumption of whether the gluino decays to light or heavy flavors. Solid (dashed) lines are used for the T1 (T1bbbb) model. The α_T analysis covers a larger area in the gluino-LSP mass plane for the T1bbbb model than the hadronic decays do for the T1 model. However, this comparison is only valid if the gluino indeed decays only to bottom quarks. The fully hadronic \cancel{H}_T +jets and α_T analyses cover a similar region, while the M_{T2} analysis covers comparatively less. The inclusive analysis is particularly sensitive when the difference in mass between the mother and LSP is small, a situation known as a “compressed spectrum.”

Figure 4 (upper-right) compares the exclusion contours of the T2 and T2bb models. The α_T and \cancel{H}_T +jets analyses set similar limits on the T2 model. The α_T analysis sets weaker limits on the T2bb model, but the reference cross section is a factor of eight smaller than for the T2 model. The inclusive analysis sets the overall strongest limits, particularly in the low mass splitting region.

Figure 4 (middle-left) compares the exclusion contours of the T5zz model. The T5zz model comparison demonstrates the complementarity of leptonic, hadronic, and b-tagged hadronic analyses. In particular, the leptonic analyses are more limiting for smaller mass splittings, while the hadronic analyses are more limiting for larger gluino masses.

Figure 4 (middle-right) compares the exclusion contours of the T3w model. The e/μ ANN and e/μ LP analyses provide comparable results. The e/μ LS spectrum analysis excludes a smaller region.

Figure 4 (bottom-left) compares the exclusion contours of the T1tttt model. The inclusive analysis with b-tagged jets sets the strongest limit on the gluino mass. The SS+b analysis, however, sets limits that are almost independent of mass splitting.

Figure 4 (bottom-right) compares the exclusion contours of the T5gg and T5wg models. The limits on the T5gg and T5wg models demonstrate the insensitivity of these photon analyses to the NLSP mass. Also, the requirement on the number of photons (one or two) has little effect on the limit on the T5gg model. The limit on the T5wg model, which has only one signal photon per event, excludes a smaller region than the limit on the T5gg model.

Figure 5 shows values of $[\sigma \times \mathcal{B}]_{UL}$ for the T1 (T1bbbb), T2 (T2bb), T1tttt, T2tt, TChiSlepSlep, and TChiwz models as functions of the produced particle masses at fixed values of the LSP mass. In the top and middle figures, the LSP mass is fixed at 50 GeV, while in the lower figures the LSP is fixed to be massless. Figure 5 also illustrates the method for translating an upper limit on $[\sigma \times \mathcal{B}]_{UL}$ to a lower limit on the mass of a hypothetical particle. For example, Figure 5 (top-left) displays $[\sigma \times \mathcal{B}]_{UL}$ for the various analyses that are sensitive to the T1 and T1bbbb models. These limits can be compared to $\sigma^{NLO+NLL}$ for gluino pair production as a function of gluino mass. The intersection of $\sigma^{NLO+NLL}$ with $[\sigma \times \mathcal{B}]_{UL}$ determines a lower limit on the gluino mass. The analyses set a lower limit of approximately 1 TeV on the gluino mass for a LSP mass of 50 GeV, corresponding to an upper limit on the cross section of approximately 10 fb. This limit assumes $\mathcal{B} = 1$ for the decay of each gluino to a light-flavor quark-antiquark pair and the LSP. The (yellow) band on the $\sigma^{NLO+NLL}$ curve represents an estimate of the theoretical uncertainties on the cross section calculation. This figure also demonstrates the decrease in $[\sigma \times \mathcal{B}]_{UL}$ and the increase on the upper limit on the gluino mass for those analyses sensitive to the T1bbbb model.

Similar comparisons can be performed for the different simplified models. For example, Figure 5 (top-right) displays $[\sigma \times \mathcal{B}]_{UL}$ for the various analyses that are sensitive to the T2 and T2bb models. The analyses set a lower limit of approximately 800 GeV on the squark mass for

a LSP mass of 50 GeV, corresponding to an upper limit on the cross section of approximately 10 fb. This limit assumes there are four squarks with the same mass and that $\mathcal{B} = 1$ for the decay of each squark to a light-flavor quark and the LSP. If only bottom squark-antisquark production is considered, and each bottom squark decays to a bottom quark and the LSP, a lower limit of approximately 550 GeV is set on the bottom squark mass for a LSP mass of 50 GeV, corresponding to an upper limit on the cross section of approximately 20 fb. Figure 5 (bottom-left) displays the limits on the model TChiSlepSlep. A chargino mass of approximately 550 GeV is excluded, corresponding to an upper limit on the cross section of approximately 2 fb. This limit assumes that $\mathcal{B} = 1$ for the decay of the chargino and neutralino to sleptons that further decay to leptons and LSPs. For the model TChiwz, the limit decreases to 220 GeV, corresponding to an upper limit on the cross section of approximately 30 fb. This limit assumes that $\mathcal{B} = 1$ for the decay of the chargino to a W boson and the LSP and the decay of the neutralino to a Z boson and the LSP.

Many of the interpretations presented in Figure 4 exclude a gluino mass of less than approximately 1 TeV for a range of LSP masses ranging from 200 to 400 GeV. However, the exclusion of a particle mass in a simplified model using SUSY cross sections involves assumptions. For example, the $\sigma^{\text{NLO+NLL}}$ calculation for gluino pair production depends upon the choice of squark masses. If the light-flavor squarks in a specific model, rather than being decoupled, have masses of a few TeV, the predicted gluino cross sections drop significantly due to destructive interference between different amplitudes. The limits on models with cascade decays, T3w, T5l ν , and T5zz, assume a branching fraction of unity for a gluino decay to a chargino or neutralino. However, a realistic MSSM model would contain a degenerate chargino-neutralino pair, reducing the branching fraction to $\frac{1}{2}$ or $\frac{1}{4}$. Furthermore it should be noted that the lower limits on the sparticle masses have been derived for cross sections based on the spin assumed in the CMSSM. Also, the model T2 assumes degenerate copies of left- and right-handed light-flavor squarks, while a realistic model may have a significant mass hierarchy between different squark flavors or eigenstates. As mentioned earlier, the model T2tt has no spin correlation between the neutralino and the top quark decay products, while such a correlation will arise in the MSSM depending on the mixture of interaction quantum states in the mass quantum states of the top squark and the neutralino. The information contained in this paper and in the supplementary references can be used to set limits if any of these assumptions, or others, are removed or weakened. It must also be noted that the exclusion limits discussed here only serve to broadly summarize simplified model results; the full information on the exclusion power of an analysis in the context of simplified models is contained in the exclusion limits on the production cross section, as shown in Figure 1. This information is contained in the analysis references. A final caveat can be made regarding the setting of limits in simplified models. Since only one signal process is considered, potential backgrounds are ignored from other signal processes that may arise in a complete model.

6 Summary

The simplified model framework is a recently-developed method for interpreting the results of searches for new physics. This paper contains a compilation of simplified model interpretations of CMS supersymmetry analyses based on 2011 data. For each simplified model and analysis, an upper limit on the product of the cross section and branching fraction is derived as a function of hypothetical particle masses. Additionally, lower limits on particle masses are determined by comparing the 95% CL upper limit on the product of the cross section and branching fraction to the predicted cross section in Supersymmetry for the pair of primary particles. These lower limits depend upon theoretical assumptions that are described earlier in this




Figure 4: The 95% CL exclusion limits on the produced particle and LSP masses in the models T1(T1bbbb), T2(T2bb), T5zz, T3w, T1tttt, and T5gg(T5wg). The grey area represents the region where the decay mode is forbidden.




Figure 5: The 95% CL exclusion limits and the predicted cross section for the produced particle masses with a fixed LSP mass in the models T1(T1bbbb), T2(T2bb), T1tttt, T2tt, TChiSlepSlep and TChiwz.

paper. They should not be regarded as general exclusions on Supersymmetric particle masses.

The most stringent results for a few simplified models are summarized here. If the primary particles are gluinos that each decay to quark-antiquark pair and a neutralino, a gluino of mass of approximately 1 TeV is excluded for a neutralino of mass 50 GeV. These masses correspond to an upper limit on the gluino pair production cross section of approximately 10 fb. The excluded mass increases if each gluino decays to a bottom quark-antiquark pair and a neutralino, while the excluded mass decreases if each gluino decays to a top quark-antiquark pair and a neutralino. The excluded mass also decreases if the gluino undergoes a cascade of decays. If the primary particles are four squark-antisquark pairs, and each squark decays to a light-flavor quark and a neutralino, a squark mass of approximately 800 GeV is excluded for a neutralino of mass 50 GeV, corresponding to an upper limit on the squark-antisquark production cross section of approximately 10 fb. The excluded mass for a single bottom-antibottom squark pair is 550 GeV. The comparable exclusion in mass for a single top-antitop squark pair is approximately 150 GeV lower. In the case of the electroweak production of a chargino-neutralino pair, the upper limit on the cross section is approximately one order of magnitude higher than the corresponding limit for gluino pair production at the same mass.

The predictions for experimental acceptance and exclusion limits on cross sections presented here for a range of simplified models and mass parameters can be used to constrain other theoretical models and compare different analyses.

Acknowledgments

We congratulate our colleagues in the CERN accelerator departments for the excellent performance of the LHC and thank the technical and administrative staffs at CERN and at other CMS institutes for their contributions to the success of the CMS effort. In addition, we gratefully acknowledge the computing centres and personnel of the Worldwide LHC Computing Grid for delivering so effectively the computing infrastructure essential to our analyses. Finally, we acknowledge the enduring support for the construction and operation of the LHC and the CMS detector provided by the following funding agencies: the Austrian Federal Ministry of Science and Research; the Belgian Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique, and Fonds voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek; the Brazilian Funding Agencies (CNPq, CAPES, FAPERJ, and FAPESP); the Bulgarian Ministry of Education, Youth and Science; CERN; the Chinese Academy of Sciences, Ministry of Science and Technology, and National Natural Science Foundation of China; the Colombian Funding Agency (COLCIENCIAS); the Croatian Ministry of Science, Education and Sport; the Research Promotion Foundation, Cyprus; the Ministry of Education and Research, Recurrent financing contract SF0690030s09 and European Regional Development Fund, Estonia; the Academy of Finland, Finnish Ministry of Education and Culture, and Helsinki Institute of Physics; the Institut National de Physique Nucléaire et de Physique des Particules / CNRS, and Commissariat à l'Énergie Atomique et aux Énergies Alternatives / CEA, France; the Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, and Helmholtz-Gemeinschaft Deutscher Forschungszentren, Germany; the General Secretariat for Research and Technology, Greece; the National Scientific Research Foundation, and National Office for Research and Technology, Hungary; the Department of Atomic Energy and the Department of Science and Technology, India; the Institute for Studies in Theoretical Physics and Mathematics, Iran; the Science Foundation, Ireland; the Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Italy; the Korean Ministry of Education, Science and Technology and the World Class University program of NRF, Republic of Korea; the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences; the Mexican Funding Agencies (CINVESTAV, CONACYT, SEP, and UASLP-FAI); the Ministry of Sci-

ence and Innovation, New Zealand; the Pakistan Atomic Energy Commission; the Ministry of Science and Higher Education and the National Science Centre, Poland; the Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, Portugal; JINR (Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, Ukraine, Uzbekistan); the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation, the Federal Agency of Atomic Energy of the Russian Federation, Russian Academy of Sciences, and the Russian Foundation for Basic Research; the Ministry of Science and Technological Development of Serbia; the Secretaría de Estado de Investigación, Desarrollo e Innovación and Programa Consolider-Ingenio 2010, Spain; the Swiss Funding Agencies (ETH Board, ETH Zurich, PSI, SNF, UniZH, Canton Zurich, and SER); the National Science Council, Taipei; the Thailand Center of Excellence in Physics, the Institute for the Promotion of Teaching Science and Technology of Thailand and the National Science and Technology Development Agency of Thailand; the Scientific and Technical Research Council of Turkey, and Turkish Atomic Energy Authority; the Science and Technology Facilities Council, UK; the US Department of Energy, and the US National Science Foundation. Individuals have received support from the Marie-Curie programme and the European Research Council (European Union); the Leventis Foundation; the A. P. Sloan Foundation; the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation; the Belgian Federal Science Policy Office; the Fonds pour la Formation à la Recherche dans l'Industrie et dans l'Agriculture (FRIA-Belgium); the Agentschap voor Innovatie door Wetenschap en Technologie (IWT-Belgium); the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (MEYS) of Czech Republic; the Council of Science and Industrial Research, India; the Compagnia di San Paolo (Torino); and the HOMING PLUS programme of Foundation for Polish Science, cofinanced from European Union, Regional Development Fund.

References

- [1] J. Wess and B. Zumino, "Supergauge transformations in four dimensions", *Nucl. Phys. B* **70** (1974) 39, doi:10.1016/0550-3213(74)90355-1.
- [2] A. H. Chamseddine, R. Arnowitt, and P. Nath, "Locally Supersymmetric Grand Unification", *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **49** (1982) 970, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.49.970.
- [3] R. Arnowitt and P. Nath, "Supersymmetric mass spectrum in SU(5) supergravity grand unification", *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69** (1992) 725, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.69.725.
- [4] G. L. Kane, C. F. Kolda, L. Roszkowski, and J. D. Wells, "Study of constrained minimal supersymmetry", *Phys. Rev. D* **49** (1994) 6173, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.49.6173, arXiv:hep-ph/9312272.
- [5] N. Arkani-Hamed et al., "MARMOSSET: The Path from LHC Data to the New Standard Model via On-Shell Effective Theories", (2007). arXiv:hep-ph/0703088.
- [6] J. Alwall, P. C. Schuster, and N. Toro, "Simplified models for a first characterization of new physics at the LHC", *Phys. Rev. D* **79** (2009) 075020, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.79.075020, arXiv:0810.3921.
- [7] J. Alwall, M.-P. Le, M. Lisanti, and J. G. Wacker, "Model-Independent Jets plus Missing Energy Searches", *Phys. Rev. D* **79** (2009) 015005, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.79.015005, arXiv:0809.3264.
- [8] D. S. M. Alves, E. Izaguirre, and J. G. Wacker, "Where the sidewalk ends: jets and missing energy search strategies for the 7 TeV LHC", *JHEP* **10** (2011) 012, doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2011)012, arXiv:1102.5338.

- [9] LHC New Physics Working Group Collaboration, “Simplified models for LHC new physics searches”, *J. Phys. G* **39** (2012) 105005, doi:10.1088/0954-3899/39/10/105005, arXiv:1105.2838.
- [10] M. Papucci, J. T. Ruderman, and A. Weiler, “Natural SUSY endures”, *JHEP* **09** (2012) 035, doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2012)035, arXiv:1110.6926.
- [11] R. Mahbubani et al., “Light non-degenerate squarks at the LHC”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110** (2013) 151804, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.110.151804, arXiv:1212.3328.
- [12] CMS Collaboration, “Search for supersymmetry in final states with missing transverse energy and 0, 1, 2, or at least 3 b-quark jets in 7 TeV pp collisions using the variable α_T ”, *JHEP* **1301** (2013) 077, doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2013)077, arXiv:1210.8115.
- [13] CMS Collaboration, “Search for new physics in the multijet and missing transverse momentum final state in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109** (2012) 171803, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.171803, arXiv:1207.1898.
- [14] CMS Collaboration, “Search for supersymmetry in hadronic final states using M_{T2} in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV”, *JHEP* **10** (2012) 018, doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2012)018, arXiv:1207.1798.
- [15] CMS Collaboration, “Search for supersymmetry in events with b-quark jets and missing transverse energy in pp collisions at 7 TeV”, *Phys. Rev. D* **86** (2012) 072010, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.86.072010, arXiv:1208.4859.
- [16] CMS Collaboration, “Inclusive search for supersymmetry using the razor variables in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV”, (2012). arXiv:1212.6961. Submitted to Phys. Rev. Lett.
- [17] CMS Collaboration, “Search for supersymmetry in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV in events with a single lepton, jets, and missing transverse momentum”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **73** (2013) 2404, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-013-2404-z, arXiv:1212.6428.
- [18] CMS Collaboration, “Search for supersymmetry in final states with a single lepton, b-quark jets, and missing transverse energy in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV”, *Phys. Rev. D* **87** (2013) 052006, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.87.052006, arXiv:1211.3143.
- [19] CMS Collaboration, “Search for new physics with same-sign isolated dilepton events with jets and missing transverse energy”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109** (2012) 071803, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.071803, arXiv:1205.6615.
- [20] CMS Collaboration, “Search for new physics in events with same-sign dileptons and b-tagged jets in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV”, *JHEP* **08** (2012) 110, doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2012)110, arXiv:1205.3933.
- [21] CMS Collaboration, “Search for new physics in events with opposite-sign leptons, jets, and missing transverse energy in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV”, *Phys. Lett. B* **718** (2013) 815, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2012.11.036, arXiv:1206.3949.
- [22] CMS Collaboration, “Search for supersymmetry in events with opposite-sign dileptons and missing transverse energy using an artificial neural network”, *Phys. Rev. D* **87** (2013) 072001, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.87.072001, arXiv:1301.0916.

- [23] CMS Collaboration, “Search for anomalous production of multilepton events in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV”, *JHEP* **06** (2012) 169, doi:10.1007/JHEP06(2012)169, arXiv:1204.5341.
- [24] CMS Collaboration, “Search for electroweak production of charginos and neutralinos using leptonic final states in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV”, *JHEP* **11** (2012) 147, doi:10.1007/JHEP11(2012)147, arXiv:1209.6620.
- [25] CMS Collaboration, “Search for physics beyond the standard model in events with a Z boson, jets, and missing transverse energy in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV”, *Phys. Lett. B* **716** (2012) 260, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2012.08.026, arXiv:1204.3774.
- [26] CMS Collaboration, “Search for new physics in events with photons, jets, and missing transverse energy in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV”, *JHEP* **03** (2013) 111, doi:10.1007/JHEP03(2013)111, arXiv:1211.4784.
- [27] CMS Collaboration, “Search for New Physics with Jets and Missing Transverse Momentum in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV”, *JHEP* **08** (2011) 155, doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2011)155, arXiv:1106.4503.
- [28] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for squarks and gluinos with the ATLAS detector in final states with jets and missing transverse momentum using 4.7 fb^{-1} of $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV proton-proton collision data”, *Phys. Rev. D* **87** (2013) 012008, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.87.012008, arXiv:1208.0949.
- [29] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for top and bottom squarks from gluino pair production in final states with missing transverse energy and at least three b-jets with the ATLAS detector”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **72** (2012) 2174, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-012-2174-z, arXiv:1207.4686.
- [30] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for direct slepton and gaugino production in final states with two leptons and missing transverse momentum with the ATLAS detector in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV”, *Phys. Lett. B* **718** (2013) 879, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2012.11.058, arXiv:1208.2884.
- [31] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for direct production of charginos and neutralinos in events with three leptons and missing transverse momentum in $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV pp collisions with the ATLAS detector”, *Phys. Lett. B* **718** (2013) 841, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2012.11.039, arXiv:1208.3144.
- [32] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for supersymmetry in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV in final states with missing transverse momentum and b-jets with the ATLAS detector”, *Phys. Rev. D* **85** (2012) 112006, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.85.112006, arXiv:1203.6193.
- [33] ATLAS Collaboration, “Hunt for new phenomena using large jet multiplicities and missing transverse momentum with ATLAS in 4.7 fb^{-1} of $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV proton-proton collisions”, *JHEP* **07** (2012) 167, doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2012)167, arXiv:1206.1760.
- [34] ATLAS Collaboration, “Further search for supersymmetry at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV in final states with jets, missing transverse momentum and isolated leptons with the ATLAS detector”, *Phys. Rev. D* **86** (2012) 092002, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.86.092002, arXiv:1208.4688.

- [35] CMS Collaboration, “The CMS experiment at the CERN LHC”, *JINST* **3** (2008) S08004, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08004.
- [36] CMS Collaboration, “Absolute Calibration of the Luminosity Measurement at CMS: Winter 2012 Update”, CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-SMP-12-008, (2012).
- [37] L. Randall and D. Tucker-Smith, “Dijet Searches for Supersymmetry at the LHC”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101** (2008) 221803, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.101.221803, arXiv:0806.1049.
- [38] A. Barr, C. Lester, and P. Stephens, “A variable for measuring masses at hadron colliders when missing energy is expected; m_{T2} : the truth behind the glamour”, *J. Phys. G* **29** (2003) 2343, doi:10.1088/0954-3899/29/10/304, arXiv:hep-ph/0304226.
- [39] C. G. Lester and D. J. Summers, “Measuring masses of semi-invisibly decaying particles pair produced at hadron colliders”, *Phys. Lett. B* **463** (1999) 99, doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(99)00945-4, arXiv:hep-ph/9906349.
- [40] C. Rogan, “Kinematical variables towards new dynamics at the LHC”, (2010). arXiv:1006.2727.
- [41] P. Meade, N. Seiberg, and D. Shih, “General Gauge Mediation”, *Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl.* **177** (2009) 143, doi:10.1143/PTPS.177.143, arXiv:0801.3278.
- [42] T. Sjöstrand, S. Mrenna, and P. Z. Skands, “PYTHIA 6.4 physics and manual”, *JHEP* **05** (2006) 026, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2006/05/026, arXiv:hep-ph/0603175.
- [43] W. Beenakker, R. Hopker, M. Spira, and P. M. Zerwas, “Squark and gluino production at hadron colliders”, *Nucl. Phys. B* **492** (1997) 51, doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(97)00084-9, arXiv:hep-ph/9610490.
- [44] A. Kulesza and L. Motyka, “Threshold resummation for squark-antisquark and gluino-pair production at the LHC”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102** (2009) 111802, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.102.111802, arXiv:0807.2405.
- [45] A. Kulesza and L. Motyka, “Soft gluon resummation for the production of gluino-gluino and squark-antisquark pairs at the LHC”, *Phys. Rev. D* **80** (2009) 095004, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.80.095004, arXiv:0905.4749.
- [46] W. Beenakker et al., “Soft-gluon resummation for squark and gluino hadroproduction”, *JHEP* **12** (2009) 041, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2009/12/041, arXiv:0909.4418.
- [47] W. Beenakker et al., “Squark and Gluino Hadroproduction”, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **26** (2011) 2637, doi:10.1142/S0217751X11053560, arXiv:1105.1110.
- [48] M. Krämer et al., “Supersymmetry production cross sections in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV”, (2012). arXiv:1206.2892.
- [49] A. L. Read, “Presentation of search results: The CL_s technique”, *J. Phys. G* **28** (2002) 2693, doi:10.1088/0954-3899/28/10/313.
- [50] T. Junk, “Confidence level computation for combining searches with small statistics”, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **434** (1999) 435, doi:10.1016/S0168-9002(99)00498-2, arXiv:hep-ex/9902006.

A The CMS Collaboration

Yerevan Physics Institute, Yerevan, Armenia

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

Institut für Hochenergiephysik der OeAW, Wien, Austria

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

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

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

Universiteit Antwerpen, Antwerpen, Belgium

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

Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussel, Belgium

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

Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium

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

Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

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

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

S. Basegmez, G. Bruno, R. Castello, L. Ceard, C. Delaere, T. du Pree, D. Favart, L. Forthomme, A. Giammanco³, J. Hollar, V. Lemaitre, J. Liao, O. Militaru, C. Nuttens, D. Pagano, A. Pin, K. Piotrkowski, J.M. Vizan Garcia

Université de Mons, Mons, Belgium

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

Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Fisicas, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

G.A. Alves, M. Correa Martins Junior, T. Martins, M.E. Pol, M.H.G. Souza

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

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

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

T.S. Anjos^b, C.A. Bernardes^b, F.A. Dias^{a,4}, T.R. Fernandez Perez Tomei^a, E.M. Gregores^b, C. Lagana^a, F. Marinho^a, P.G. Mercadante^b, S.F. Novaes^a, Sandra S. Padula^a

Institute for Nuclear Research and Nuclear Energy, Sofia, Bulgaria

V. Genchev², P. Iaydjiev², S. Piperov, M. Rodozov, S. Stoykova, G. Sultanov, V. Tcholakov, R. Trayanov, M. Vutova

University of Sofia, Sofia, Bulgaria

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

Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing, China

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

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

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

Universidad de Los Andes, Bogota, Colombia

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

Technical University of Split, Split, Croatia

N. Godinovic, D. Lelas, R. Plestina⁵, D. Polic, I. Puljak²

University of Split, Split, Croatia

Z. Antunovic, M. Kovac

Institute Rudjer Boskovic, Zagreb, Croatia

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

University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus

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

Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

M. Finger, M. Finger Jr.

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

Y. Assran⁶, S. Elgammal⁷, A. Ellithi Kamel⁸, M.A. Mahmoud⁹, A. Mahrous¹⁰, A. Radi^{11,12}

National Institute of Chemical Physics and Biophysics, Tallinn, Estonia

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

Department of Physics, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

P. Eerola, G. Fedi, M. Voutilainen

Helsinki Institute of Physics, Helsinki, Finland

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

Lappeenranta University of Technology, Lappeenranta, Finland

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

F. Fassi, D. Mercier

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

S. Beauceron, N. Beaupere, O. Bondu, G. Boudoul, S. Brochet, J. Chasserat, R. Chierici², D. Contardo, P. Depasse, H. El Mamouni, J. Fay, S. Gascon, M. Gouzevitch, B. Ille, T. Kurca, M. Lethuillier, L. Mirabito, S. Perries, L. Sgandurra, V. Sordini, Y. Tschudi, P. Verdier, S. Viret

Institute of High Energy Physics and Informatization, Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia

Z. Tsamalaidze¹⁵

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

C. Autermann, S. Beranek, B. Calpas, M. Edelhoff, L. Feld, N. Heracleous, O. Hindrichs, R. Jussen, K. Klein, J. Merz, A. Ostapchuk, A. Perieanu, F. Raupach, J. Sammet, S. Schael, D. Sprenger, H. Weber, B. Wittmer, V. Zhukov¹⁶

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

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

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

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

Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Hamburg, Germany

M. Aldaya Martin, J. Behr, W. Behrenhoff, U. Behrens, M. Bergholz¹⁷, A. Bethani, K. Borras, A. Burgmeier, A. Cakir, L. Calligaris, A. Campbell, E. Castro, F. Costanza, D. Dammann, C. Diez Pardos, G. Eckerlin, D. Eckstein, G. Flucke, A. Geiser, I. Glushkov, P. Gunnellini, S. Habib, J. Hauk, G. Hellwig, H. Jung, M. Kasemann, P. Katsas, C. Kleinwort, H. Kluge, A. Knutsson, M. Krämer, D. Krücker, E. Kuznetsova, W. Lange, J. Leonard, W. Lohmann¹⁷, B. Lutz, R. Mankel, I. Marfin, M. Marienfeld, I.-A. Melzer-Pellmann, A.B. Meyer, J. Mnich, A. Mussgiller, S. Naumann-Emme, O. Novgorodova, J. Olzem, H. Perrey, A. Petrukhin, D. Pitzl, A. Raspereza, P.M. Ribeiro Cipriano, C. Riedl, E. Ron, M. Rosin, J. Salfeld-Nebgen, R. Schmidt¹⁷, T. Schoerner-Sadenius, N. Sen, A. Spiridonov, M. Stein, R. Walsh, C. Wissing

University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany

V. Blobel, H. Enderle, J. Erfle, U. Gebbert, M. Görner, M. Gosselink, J. Haller, T. Hermanns, R.S. Höing, K. Kaschube, G. Kaussen, H. Kirschenmann, R. Klanner, J. Lange, F. Nowak, T. Peiffer, N. Pietsch, D. Rathjens, C. Sander, H. Schettler, P. Schleper, E. Schlieckau, A. Schmidt, M. Schröder, T. Schum, M. Seidel, J. Sibille¹⁸, V. Sola, H. Stadie, G. Steinbrück, J. Thomsen, L. Vanelderen

Institut für Experimentelle Kernphysik, Karlsruhe, Germany

C. Barth, J. Berger, C. Böser, T. Chwalek, W. De Boer, A. Descroix, A. Dierlamm, M. Feindt, M. Guthoff², C. Hackstein, F. Hartmann², T. Hauth², M. Heinrich, H. Held, K.H. Hoffmann, U. Husemann, I. Katkov¹⁶, J.R. Komaragiri, P. Lobelle Pardo, D. Martschei, S. Mueller, Th. Müller, M. Niegel, A. Nürnberg, O. Oberst, A. Oehler, J. Ott, G. Quast, K. Rabbertz, F. Ratnikov, N. Ratnikova, S. Röcker, F.-P. Schilling, G. Schott, H.J. Simonis, F.M. Stober, D. Troendle, R. Ulrich, J. Wagner-Kuhr, S. Wayand, T. Weiler, M. Zeise

Institute of Nuclear Physics "Demokritos", Aghia Paraskevi, Greece

G. Anagnostou, G. Daskalakis, T. Gerasis, S. Kesisoglou, A. Kyriakis, D. Loukas, I. Manolakos, A. Markou, C. Markou, E. Ntomari

University of Athens, Athens, Greece

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

University of Ioánnina, Ioánnina, Greece

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

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

G. Bencze, C. Hajdu, P. Hidas, D. Horvath¹⁹, F. Sikler, V. Veszpremi, G. Vesztergombi²⁰

Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary

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

University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary

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

Panjab University, Chandigarh, India

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

University of Delhi, Delhi, India

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

Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, Kolkata, India

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

Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, Mumbai, India

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

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research - EHEP, Mumbai, India

T. Aziz, S. Ganguly, M. Guchait²¹, A. Gurtu²², M. Maity²³, G. Majumder, K. Mazumdar, G.B. Mohanty, B. Parida, K. Sudhakar, N. Wickramage

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research - HECR, Mumbai, India

S. Banerjee, S. Dugad

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

H. Arfaei²⁴, H. Bakhshiansohi, S.M. Etesami²⁵, A. Fahim²⁴, M. Hashemi²⁶, H. Hesari, A. Jafari, M. Khakzad, M. Mohammadi Najafabadi, S. Paktinat Mehdiabadi, B. Safarzadeh²⁷, M. Zeinali

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

M. Abbrescia^{a,b}, L. Barbone^{a,b}, C. Calabria^{a,b,2}, S.S. Chhibra^{a,b}, A. Colaleo^a, D. Creanza^{a,c}, N. De Filippis^{a,c,2}, M. De Palma^{a,b}, L. Fiore^a, G. Iaselli^{a,c}, G. Maggi^{a,c}, M. Maggi^a, B. Marangelli^{a,b},

S. My^{a,c}, S. Nuzzo^{a,b}, N. Pacifico^a, A. Pompili^{a,b}, G. Pugliese^{a,c}, G. Selvaggi^{a,b}, L. Silvestris^a, G. Singh^{a,b}, R. Venditti^{a,b}, P. Verwilligen^a, G. Zito^a

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

G. Abbiendi^a, A.C. Benvenuti^a, D. Bonacorsi^{a,b}, S. Braibant-Giacomelli^{a,b}, L. Brigliadori^{a,b}, P. Capiluppi^{a,b}, A. Castro^{a,b}, F.R. Cavallo^a, M. Cuffiani^{a,b}, G.M. Dallavalle^a, F. Fabbri^a, A. Fanfani^{a,b}, D. Fasanella^{a,b}, P. Giacomelli^a, C. Grandi^a, L. Guiducci^{a,b}, S. Marcellini^a, G. Masetti^a, M. Meneghelli^{a,b,2}, A. Montanari^a, F.L. Navarria^{a,b}, F. Odorici^a, A. Perrotta^a, F. Primavera^{a,b}, A.M. Rossi^{a,b}, T. Rovelli^{a,b}, G.P. Siroli^{a,b}, N. Tosi, R. Travaglini^{a,b}

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

S. Albergo^{a,b}, G. Cappello^{a,b}, M. Chiorboli^{a,b}, S. Costa^{a,b}, R. Potenza^{a,b}, A. Tricomi^{a,b}, C. Tuve^{a,b}

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

G. Barbagli^a, V. Ciulli^{a,b}, C. Civinini^a, R. D'Alessandro^{a,b}, E. Focardi^{a,b}, S. Frosali^{a,b}, E. Gallo^a, S. Gonzi^{a,b}, M. Meschini^a, S. Paoletti^a, G. Sguazzoni^a, A. Tropiano^{a,b}

INFN Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, Frascati, Italy

L. Benussi, S. Bianco, S. Colafranceschi²⁸, F. Fabbri, D. Piccolo

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

P. Fabbricatore^a, R. Musenich^a, S. Tosi^{a,b}

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

A. Benaglia^a, F. De Guio^{a,b}, L. Di Matteo^{a,b,2}, S. Fiorendi^{a,b}, S. Gennai^{a,2}, A. Ghezzi^{a,b}, S. Malvezzi^a, R.A. Manzoni^{a,b}, A. Martelli^{a,b}, A. Massironi^{a,b}, D. Menasce^a, L. Moroni^a, M. Paganoni^{a,b}, D. Pedrini^a, S. Ragazzi^{a,b}, N. Redaelli^a, S. Sala^a, T. Tabarelli de Fatis^{a,b}

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

S. Buontempo^a, C.A. Carrillo Montoya^a, N. Cavallo^{a,c}, A. De Cosa^{a,b,2}, O. Dogangun^{a,b}, F. Fabozzi^{a,c}, A.O.M. Iorio^{a,b}, L. Lista^a, S. Meola^{a,d,29}, M. Merola^a, P. Paolucci^{a,2}

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

P. Azzi^a, N. Bacchetta^{a,2}, D. Bisello^{a,b}, A. Branca^{a,b,2}, R. Carlin^{a,b}, P. Checchia^a, T. Dorigo^a, F. Gasparini^{a,b}, A. Gozzelino^a, K. Kanishchev^{a,c}, S. Lacaprara^a, I. Lazzizzera^{a,c}, M. Margoni^{a,b}, A.T. Meneguzzo^{a,b}, J. Pazzini^{a,b}, N. Pozzobon^{a,b}, P. Ronchese^{a,b}, F. Simonetto^{a,b}, E. Torassa^a, M. Tosi^{a,b}, A. Triossi^a, S. Vanini^{a,b}, P. Zotto^{a,b}, A. Zucchetta^{a,b}, G. Zumerle^{a,b}

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

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

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

M. Biasini^{a,b}, G.M. Bilei^a, L. Fanò^{a,b}, P. Lariccia^{a,b}, G. Mantovani^{a,b}, M. Menichelli^a, A. Nappi^{a,b,†}, F. Romeo^{a,b}, A. Saha^a, A. Santocchia^{a,b}, A. Spiezia^{a,b}, S. Taroni^{a,b}

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

P. Azzurri^{a,c}, G. Bagliesi^a, J. Bernardini^a, T. Boccali^a, G. Broccolo^{a,c}, R. Castaldi^a, R.T. D'Agnolo^{a,c,2}, R. Dell'Orso^a, F. Fiori^{a,b,2}, L. Foà^{a,c}, A. Giassi^a, A. Kraan^a, F. Ligabue^{a,c}, T. Lomtadze^a, L. Martini^{a,30}, A. Messineo^{a,b}, F. Palla^a, A. Rizzi^{a,b}, A.T. Serban^{a,31}, P. Spagnolo^a, P. Squillacioti^{a,2}, R. Tenchini^a, G. Tonelli^{a,b}, A. Venturi^a, P.G. Verdini^a

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

L. Barone^{a,b}, F. Cavallari^a, D. Del Re^{a,b}, M. Diemoz^a, C. Fanelli^{a,b}, M. Grassi^{a,b,2}, E. Longo^{a,b}

P. Meridiani^{a,2}, F. Micheli^{a,b}, S. Nourbakhsh^{a,b}, G. Organtini^{a,b}, R. Paramatti^a, S. Rahatlou^{a,b}, M. Sigamani^a, L. Soffi^{a,b}

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

N. Amapane^{a,b}, R. Arcidiacono^{a,c}, S. Argiro^{a,b}, M. Arneodo^{a,c}, C. Biino^a, N. Cartiglia^a, S. Casasso^{a,b}, M. Costa^{a,b}, N. Demaria^a, C. Mariotti^{a,2}, S. Maselli^a, E. Migliore^{a,b}, V. Monaco^{a,b}, M. Musich^{a,2}, M.M. Obertino^{a,c}, N. Pastrone^a, M. Pelliccioni^a, A. Potenza^{a,b}, A. Romero^{a,b}, M. Ruspa^{a,c}, R. Sacchi^{a,b}, A. Solano^{a,b}, A. Staiano^a

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

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

Kangwon National University, Chunchon, Korea

T.Y. Kim, S.K. Nam

Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea

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

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

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

Korea University, Seoul, Korea

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

University of Seoul, Seoul, Korea

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

Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon, Korea

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

Vilnius University, Vilnius, Lithuania

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

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

H. Castilla-Valdez, E. De La Cruz-Burelo, I. Heredia-de La Cruz, R. Lopez-Fernandez, J. Martínez-Ortega, A. Sanchez-Hernandez, L.M. Villasenor-Cendejas

Universidad Iberoamericana, Mexico City, Mexico

S. Carrillo Moreno, F. Vazquez Valencia

Benemerita Universidad Autonoma de Puebla, Puebla, Mexico

H.A. Salazar Ibarguen

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

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

University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

D. Krofcheck

University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand

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

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

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

National Centre for Nuclear Research, Swierk, Poland

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

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

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

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

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

Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia

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

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

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

Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia

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

Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia

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

Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia

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

P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia

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

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

I. Azhgirey, I. Bayshev, S. Bitioukov, V. Grishin², V. Kachanov, D. Konstantinov, V. Krychkin, V. Petrov, R. Ryutin, A. Sobol, L. Tourtchanovitch, S. Troshin, N. Tyurin, A. Uzunian, A. Volkov

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

P. Adzic³², M. Djordjevic, M. Ekmedzic, D. Krpic³², J. Milosevic

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

M. Aguilar-Benitez, J. Alcaraz Maestre, P. Arce, C. Battilana, E. Calvo, M. Cerrada, M. Chamizo Llatas, N. Colino, B. De La Cruz, A. Delgado Peris, D. Domínguez Vázquez, C. Fernandez

Bedoya, J.P. Fernández Ramos, A. Ferrando, J. Flix, M.C. Fouz, P. Garcia-Abia, O. Gonzalez Lopez, S. Goy Lopez, J.M. Hernandez, M.I. Josa, G. Merino, J. Puerta Pelayo, A. Quintario Olmeda, I. Redondo, L. Romero, J. Santaolalla, M.S. Soares, C. Willmott

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain

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

Universidad de Oviedo, Oviedo, Spain

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

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

J.A. Brochero Cifuentes, I.J. Cabrillo, A. Calderon, S.H. Chuang, J. Duarte Campderros, M. Felcini³³, M. Fernandez, G. Gomez, J. Gonzalez Sanchez, A. Graziano, C. Jorda, A. Lopez Virto, J. Marco, R. Marco, C. Martinez Rivero, F. Matorras, F.J. Munoz Sanchez, T. Rodrigo, A.Y. Rodríguez-Marrero, A. Ruiz-Jimeno, L. Scodellaro, I. Vila, R. Vilar Cortabitarte

CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland

D. Abbaneo, E. Auffray, G. Auzinger, M. Bachtis, P. Baillon, A.H. Ball, D. Barney, J.F. Benitez, C. Bernet⁵, G. Bianchi, P. Bloch, A. Bocci, A. Bonato, C. Botta, H. Breuker, T. Camporesi, G. Cerminara, T. Christiansen, J.A. Coarasa Perez, D. D'Enterria, A. Dabrowski, A. De Roeck, S. Di Guida, M. Dobson, N. Dupont-Sagorin, A. Elliott-Peisert, B. Frisch, W. Funk, G. Georgiou, M. Giffels, D. Gigi, K. Gill, D. Giordano, M. Girone, M. Giunta, F. Gluge, R. Gomez-Reino Garrido, P. Govoni, S. Gowdy, R. Guida, S. Gundacker, J. Hammer, M. Hansen, P. Harris, C. Hartl, J. Harvey, B. Hegner, A. Hinzmann, V. Innocente, P. Janot, K. Kaadze, E. Karavakis, K. Kousouris, P. Lecoq, Y.-J. Lee, P. Lenzi, C. Lourenço, N. Magini, T. Mäki, M. Malberti, L. Malgeri, M. Mannelli, L. Masetti, F. Meijers, S. Mersi, E. Meschi, R. Moser, M.U. Mozer, M. Mulders, P. Musella, E. Nesvold, L. Orsini, E. Palencia Cortezon, E. Perez, L. Perrozzi, A. Petrilli, A. Pfeiffer, M. Pierini, M. Pimiä, D. Piparo, G. Polese, L. Quertenmont, A. Racz, W. Reece, J. Rodrigues Antunes, G. Rolandi³⁴, C. Rovelli³⁵, M. Rovere, H. Sakulin, F. Santanastasio, C. Schäfer, C. Schwick, I. Segoni, S. Sekmen, A. Sharma, P. Siegrist, P. Silva, M. Simon, P. Sphicas³⁶, D. Spiga, A. Tsiros, G.I. Veres²⁰, J.R. Vlimant, H.K. Wöhri, S.D. Worm³⁷, W.D. Zeuner

Paul Scherrer Institut, Villigen, Switzerland

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

Institute for Particle Physics, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

L. Bäni, P. Bortignon, M.A. Buchmann, B. Casal, N. Chanon, A. Deisher, G. Dissertori, M. Dittmar, M. Donegà, M. Dünser, P. Eller, J. Eugster, K. Freudenreich, C. Grab, D. Hits, P. Lecomte, W. Lustermann, A.C. Marini, P. Martinez Ruiz del Arbol, N. Mohr, F. Moortgat, C. Nägeli³⁸, P. Nef, F. Nessi-Tedaldi, F. Pandolfi, L. Pape, F. Pauss, M. Peruzzi, F.J. Ronga, M. Rossini, L. Sala, A.K. Sanchez, A. Starodumov³⁹, B. Stieger, M. Takahashi, L. Tauscher[†], A. Thea, K. Theofilatos, D. Treille, C. Urscheler, R. Wallny, H.A. Weber, L. Wehrli

Universität Zürich, Zurich, Switzerland

C. AMSLER⁴⁰, V. Chiochia, S. De Visscher, C. Favaro, M. Ivova Rikova, B. Kilminster, B. Millan Mejias, P. Otiougova, P. Robmann, H. Snoek, S. Tupper, M. Verzetti

National Central University, Chung-Li, Taiwan

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

National Taiwan University (NTU), Taipei, Taiwan

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

Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand

B. Asavapibhop, N. Srimanobhas

Cukurova University, Adana, Turkey

A. Adiguzel, M.N. Bakirci⁴¹, S. Cerci⁴², C. Dozen, I. Dumanoglu, E. Eskut, S. Girgis, G. Gokbulut, E. Gurpinar, I. Hos, E.E. Kangal, T. Karaman, G. Karapinar⁴³, A. Kayis Topaksu, G. Onengut, K. Ozdemir, S. Ozturk⁴⁴, A. Polatoz, K. Sogut⁴⁵, D. Sunar Cerci⁴², B. Tali⁴², H. Topakli⁴¹, L.N. Vergili, M. Vergili

Middle East Technical University, Physics Department, Ankara, Turkey

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

Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey

E. Gülmez, B. Isildak⁴⁶, M. Kaya⁴⁷, O. Kaya⁴⁷, S. Ozkorucuklu⁴⁸, N. Sonmez⁴⁹

Istanbul Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey

K. Cankocak

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

L. Levchuk

University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom

J.J. Brooke, E. Clement, D. Cussans, H. Flacher, R. Frazier, J. Goldstein, M. Grimes, G.P. Heath, H.F. Heath, L. Kreczko, S. Metson, D.M. Newbold³⁷, K. Nirunpong, A. Poll, S. Senkin, V.J. Smith, T. Williams

Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom

L. Basso⁵⁰, K.W. Bell, A. Belyaev⁵⁰, C. Brew, R.M. Brown, D.J.A. Cockerill, J.A. Coughlan, K. Harder, S. Harper, J. Jackson, B.W. Kennedy, E. Olaiya, D. Petyt, B.C. Radburn-Smith, C.H. Shepherd-Themistocleous, I.R. Tomalin, W.J. Womersley

Imperial College, London, United Kingdom

R. Bainbridge, G. Ball, R. Beuselinck, O. Buchmuller, D. Colling, N. Cripps, M. Cutajar, P. Dauncey, G. Davies, M. Della Negra, W. Ferguson, J. Fulcher, D. Futyan, A. Gilbert, A. Guneratne Bryer, G. Hall, Z. Hatherell, J. Hays, G. Iles, M. Jarvis, G. Karapostoli, L. Lyons, A.-M. Magnan, J. Marrouche, B. Mathias, R. Nandi, J. Nash, A. Nikitenko³⁹, J. Pela, M. Pesaresi, K. Petridis, M. Pioppi⁵¹, D.M. Raymond, S. Rogerson, A. Rose, M.J. Ryan, C. Seez, P. Sharp[†], A. Sparrow, M. Stoye, A. Tapper, M. Vazquez Acosta, T. Virdee, S. Wakefield, N. Wardle, T. Whyntie

Brunel University, Uxbridge, United Kingdom

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

Baylor University, Waco, USA

K. Hatakeyama, H. Liu, T. Scarborough

The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, USA

O. Charaf, C. Henderson, P. Rumerio

Boston University, Boston, USA

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

Brown University, Providence, USA

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

University of California, Davis, Davis, USA

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

University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, USA

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

University of California, Riverside, Riverside, USA

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

University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, USA

W. Andrews, J.G. Branson, G.B. Cerati, S. Cittolin, D. Evans, A. Holzner, R. Kelley, M. Lebourgeois, J. Letts, I. Macneill, B. Mangano, S. Padhi, C. Palmer, G. Petrucciani, M. Pieri, M. Sani, V. Sharma, S. Simon, E. Sudano, M. Tadel, Y. Tu, A. Vartak, S. Wasserbaech⁵², F. Würthwein, A. Yagil, J. Yoo

University of California, Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, USA

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

California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA

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

Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, USA

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

University of Colorado at Boulder, Boulder, USA

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

Cornell University, Ithaca, USA

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

Fairfield University, Fairfield, USA

D. Winn

Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, USA

S. Abdullin, M. Albrow, J. Anderson, L.A.T. Bauerdick, A. Beretvas, J. Berryhill, P.C. Bhat, K. Burkett, J.N. Butler, V. Chetluru, H.W.K. Cheung, F. Chlebana, V.D. Elvira, I. Fisk, J. Freeman, Y. Gao, D. Green, O. Gutsche, J. Hanlon, R.M. Harris, J. Hirschauer, B. Hooberman, S. Jindariani, M. Johnson, U. Joshi, B. Klima, S. Kunori, S. Kwan, C. Leonidopoulos⁵³, J. Linacre, D. Lincoln, R. Lipton, J. Lykken, K. Maeshima, J.M. Marraffino, S. Maruyama, D. Mason, P. McBride, K. Mishra, S. Mrenna, Y. Musienko⁵⁴, C. Newman-Holmes, V. O'Dell, O. Prokofyev, E. Sexton-Kennedy, S. Sharma, W.J. Spalding, L. Spiegel, L. Taylor, S. Tkaczyk, N.V. Tran, L. Uplegger, E.W. Vaandering, R. Vidal, J. Whitmore, W. Wu, F. Yang, J.C. Yun

University of Florida, Gainesville, USA

D. Acosta, P. Avery, D. Bourilkov, M. Chen, T. Cheng, S. Das, M. De Gruttola, G.P. Di Giovanni, D. Dobur, A. Drozdetskiy, R.D. Field, M. Fisher, Y. Fu, I.K. Furic, J. Gartner, J. Hugon, B. Kim, J. Konigsberg, A. Korytov, A. Kropivnitskaya, T. Kypreos, J.F. Low, K. Matchev, P. Milenovic⁵⁵, G. Mitselmakher, L. Muniz, M. Park, R. Remington, A. Rinkevicius, P. Sellers, N. Skhirtladze, M. Snowball, J. Yelton, M. Zakaria

Florida International University, Miami, USA

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

Florida State University, Tallahassee, USA

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

Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, USA

M.M. Baarmand, B. Dorney, M. Hohlmann, H. Kalakhety, I. Vodopyanov, F. Yumiceva

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

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

The University of Iowa, Iowa City, USA

U. Akgun, E.A. Albayrak, B. Bilki⁵⁶, W. Clarida, F. Duru, S. Griffiths, J.-P. Merlo, H. Mermerkaya⁵⁷, A. Mestvirishvili, A. Moeller, J. Nachtman, C.R. Newsom, E. Norbeck, Y. Onel, F. Ozok⁵⁸, S. Sen, P. Tan, E. Tiras, J. Wetzel, T. Yetkin, K. Yi

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA

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

The University of Kansas, Lawrence, USA

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

Kansas State University, Manhattan, USA

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

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, USA

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

University of Maryland, College Park, USA

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

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, USA

A. Apyan, G. Bauer, J. Bendavid, W. Busza, E. Butz, I.A. Cali, M. Chan, V. Dutta, G. Gomez Ceballos, M. Goncharov, Y. Kim, M. Klute, K. Krajczar⁵⁹, A. Levin, P.D. Luckey, T. Ma, S. Nahn, C. Paus, D. Ralph, C. Roland, G. Roland, M. Rudolph, G.S.F. Stephans, F. Stöckli, K. Sumorok, K. Sung, D. Velicanu, E.A. Wenger, R. Wolf, B. Wyslouch, M. Yang, Y. Yilmaz, A.S. Yoon, M. Zanetti, V. Zhukova

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, USA

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

University of Mississippi, Oxford, USA

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

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, USA

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

State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, USA

A. Godshalk, I. Iashvili, S. Jain, A. Kharchilava, A. Kumar, S. Rappoccio

Northeastern University, Boston, USA

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

Northwestern University, Evanston, USA

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

University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, USA

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

The Ohio State University, Columbus, USA

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

Princeton University, Princeton, USA

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

University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez, USA

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

Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA

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

Purdue University Calumet, Hammond, USA

S. Guragain, N. Parashar

Rice University, Houston, USA

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

University of Rochester, Rochester, USA

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

The Rockefeller University, New York, USA

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

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

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

University of Tennessee, Knoxville, USA

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

Texas A&M University, College Station, USA

R. Eusebi, W. Flanagan, J. Gilmore, T. Kamon⁶⁰, V. Khotilovich, R. Montalvo, I. Osipenkov, Y. Pakhotin, A. Perloff, J. Roe, A. Safonov, T. Sakuma, S. Sengupta, I. Suarez, A. Tatarinov, D. Toback

Texas Tech University, Lubbock, USA

N. Akchurin, J. Damgov, C. Dragoiu, P.R. Duderu, C. Jeong, K. Kovitanggoon, S.W. Lee, T. Libeiro, I. Volobouev

Vanderbilt University, Nashville, USA

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

University of Virginia, Charlottesville, USA

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

Wayne State University, Detroit, USA

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

University of Wisconsin, Madison, USA

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

†: Deceased

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

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

3: Also at National Institute of Chemical Physics and Biophysics, Tallinn, Estonia

4: Also at California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA

5: Also at Laboratoire Leprince-Ringuet, Ecole Polytechnique, IN2P3-CNRS, Palaiseau, France

6: Also at Suez Canal University, Suez, Egypt

7: Also at Zewail City of Science and Technology, Zewail, Egypt

- 8: Also at Cairo University, Cairo, Egypt
- 9: Also at Fayoum University, El-Fayoum, Egypt
- 10: Also at Helwan University, Cairo, Egypt
- 11: Also at British University in Egypt, Cairo, Egypt
- 12: Now at Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt
- 13: Also at National Centre for Nuclear Research, Swierk, Poland
- 14: Also at Université de Haute-Alsace, Mulhouse, France
- 15: Also at Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia
- 16: Also at Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia
- 17: Also at Brandenburg University of Technology, Cottbus, Germany
- 18: Also at The University of Kansas, Lawrence, USA
- 19: Also at Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary
- 20: Also at Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary
- 21: Also at Tata Institute of Fundamental Research - HECR, Mumbai, India
- 22: Now at King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
- 23: Also at University of Visva-Bharati, Santiniketan, India
- 24: Also at Sharif University of Technology, Tehran, Iran
- 25: Also at Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, Iran
- 26: Also at Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran
- 27: Also at Plasma Physics Research Center, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
- 28: Also at Facoltà Ingegneria, Università di Roma, Roma, Italy
- 29: Also at Università degli Studi Guglielmo Marconi, Roma, Italy
- 30: Also at Università degli Studi di Siena, Siena, Italy
- 31: Also at University of Bucharest, Faculty of Physics, Bucuresti-Magurele, Romania
- 32: Also at Faculty of Physics of University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia
- 33: Also at University of California, Los Angeles, USA
- 34: Also at Scuola Normale e Sezione dell'INFN, Pisa, Italy
- 35: Also at INFN Sezione di Roma, Roma, Italy
- 36: Also at University of Athens, Athens, Greece
- 37: Also at Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom
- 38: Also at Paul Scherrer Institut, Villigen, Switzerland
- 39: Also at Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia
- 40: Also at Albert Einstein Center for Fundamental Physics, Bern, Switzerland
- 41: Also at Gaziosmanpasa University, Tokat, Turkey
- 42: Also at Adiyaman University, Adiyaman, Turkey
- 43: Also at Izmir Institute of Technology, Izmir, Turkey
- 44: Also at The University of Iowa, Iowa City, USA
- 45: Also at Mersin University, Mersin, Turkey
- 46: Also at Ozyegin University, Istanbul, Turkey
- 47: Also at Kafkas University, Kars, Turkey
- 48: Also at Suleyman Demirel University, Isparta, Turkey
- 49: Also at Ege University, Izmir, Turkey
- 50: Also at School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southampton, Southampton, United Kingdom
- 51: Also at INFN Sezione di Perugia; Università di Perugia, Perugia, Italy
- 52: Also at Utah Valley University, Orem, USA
- 53: Now at University of Edinburgh, Scotland, Edinburgh, United Kingdom
- 54: Also at Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia

55: Also at University of Belgrade, Faculty of Physics and Vinca Institute of Nuclear Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia

56: Also at Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, USA

57: Also at Erzincan University, Erzincan, Turkey

58: Also at Mimar Sinan University, Istanbul, Istanbul, Turkey

59: Also at KFKI Research Institute for Particle and Nuclear Physics, Budapest, Hungary

60: Also at Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea