



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Physics Letters B

www.elsevier.com/locate/physletb



Search for high-mass diphoton resonances in proton–proton collisions at 13 TeV and combination with 8 TeV search

The CMS Collaboration ^{*}

CERN, Switzerland

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 8 September 2016

Received in revised form 1 December 2016

Accepted 16 January 2017

Available online xxx

Editor: M. Doser

Keywords:

LHC

extra dimensions

Randall–Sundrum

Heavy resonance

Spin-0

Proton–proton collision

Diphoton

ABSTRACT

A search for the resonant production of high-mass photon pairs is presented. The search focuses on spin-0 and spin-2 resonances with masses between 0.5 and 4.5 TeV, and with widths, relative to the mass, between 1.4×10^{-4} and 5.6×10^{-2} . The data sample corresponds to an integrated luminosity of 12.9 fb^{-1} of proton–proton collisions collected with the CMS detector in 2016 at a center-of-mass energy of 13 TeV. No significant excess is observed relative to the standard model expectation. The results of the search are combined statistically with those previously obtained in 2012 and 2015 at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ and 13 TeV, respectively, corresponding to integrated luminosities of 19.7 and 3.3 fb^{-1} , to derive exclusion limits on scalar resonances produced through gluon–gluon fusion, and on Randall–Sundrum gravitons. The lower mass limits for Randall–Sundrum gravitons range from 1.95 to 4.45 TeV for coupling parameters between 0.01 and 0.2. These are the most stringent limits on Randall–Sundrum graviton production to date.

© 2017 Published by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). Funded by SCOAP³.

1. Introduction

The standard model (SM) of particle physics has been highly successful in describing physical phenomena but it is widely considered to be an incomplete theory because of various shortcomings. In particular, the SM suffers from the so-called hierarchy problem [1], which refers to the large difference between the Higgs boson mass of 125 GeV [2] and the highest energy scale up to which the SM must be valid. Many extensions to the SM have been proposed to address the hierarchy problem, including theories with additional space-like dimensions [3] and models with extended Higgs boson sectors [4]. Some of these extensions predict new resonances that decay to a diphoton final state. For example, the Randall–Sundrum (RS) approach [3,5] to extra dimensions postulates massive excitations of spin-2 gravitons that can decay to two photons. A simple extension of the SM Higgs boson sector consists of the addition of a doublet of complex scalar fields. In such models [6], some of these additional scalar resonances can decay to a photon pair [7]. According to the Landau–Yang theorem, the spin of a resonance decaying to two photons can only be zero or an integer larger than one [8,9].

Recently, the ATLAS and CMS Collaborations at the CERN LHC presented results on searches for high-mass diphoton resonances in proton–proton (pp) collisions at a center-of-mass energy of 13 TeV [10,11]. The results were based on data collected in 2015, corresponding to integrated luminosities of approximately 3 fb^{-1} per experiment. The CMS results included a combined analysis with pp collision data at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV collected in 2012 [12] corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 19.7 fb^{-1} . Both collaborations reported the observation of a moderate excess of events compared to SM expectations, compatible with the production of a new resonance with a mass around 750 GeV.

In this Letter, we report on an updated search for spin-0 resonances and RS gravitons produced in pp collisions and decaying to two photons. The data were collected in 2016 with the CMS detector at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV and correspond to an integrated luminosity of 12.9 fb^{-1} . The analysis procedures are very similar to those presented in Ref. [11] for the 2015 data. A combined analysis of the 8 TeV data set of Ref. [12], the 13 TeV data set of Ref. [11], and the 13 TeV data set examined here is performed to improve the sensitivity of the results. Earlier LHC searches for RS gravitons are presented in Refs. [12–28], and for spin-0 particles decaying to two photons in Refs. [12,29]. These earlier searches are based on pp collisions at either $\sqrt{s} = 7$ or 8 TeV.

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

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2017.01.027>

0370-2693/© 2017 Published by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). Funded by SCOAP³.

2. The CMS detector

The central feature of the CMS apparatus is a superconducting solenoid of 6 m internal diameter, providing a magnetic field of 3.8 T. Within the solenoid volume are a silicon pixel and strip tracker, a lead tungstate crystal electromagnetic calorimeter (ECAL), and a brass and scintillator hadron calorimeter (HCAL). The tracking detectors cover the pseudorapidity range $|\eta| < 2.5$. The ECAL and HCAL, each composed of a barrel and two endcap sections, cover $|\eta| < 3.0$, with the boundary between the barrel and endcaps at around $|\eta| = 1.5$. Forward calorimeters extend the coverage to $|\eta| < 5.0$. The ECAL consists of 75 848 lead tungstate crystals. The barrel section has a granularity $\Delta\eta \times \Delta\phi = 0.0174 \times 0.0174$, with ϕ the azimuthal angle, while the endcap sections have a granularity that coarsens progressively up to $\Delta\eta \times \Delta\phi = 0.05 \times 0.05$. Preshower detectors consisting of two planes of silicon sensors interleaved with a total of $3X_0$ of lead are located in front of the endcap sections. Muons are measured within $|\eta| < 2.4$ by gaseous ionization detectors embedded in the steel flux-return yoke outside the solenoid. A more detailed description of the CMS detector, together with a definition of the coordinate system and the relevant kinematic variables, can be found in Ref. [30].

In the barrel section of the ECAL, for photons with energies on the scale of tens of GeV, an energy resolution of about 1% is achieved for unconverted photons and for photons that convert “late”, i.e., just before entering the ECAL. The remaining barrel photons have an energy resolution of about 1.3% up to $|\eta| = 1.0$, rising to about 2.5% for $|\eta| = 1.4$. In the endcaps, the corresponding resolution for unconverted and late-converting photons is about 2.5%, while the remaining endcap photons have a resolution between 3% and 4% [31].

The particle-flow algorithm [32,33] reconstructs and identifies each individual particle with an optimized combination of information from the various elements of the CMS detector. Particle candidates are classified as either muons, electrons, photons, τ leptons, charged hadrons, or neutral hadrons.

A two-stage trigger system selects events of interest for the analysis. The level-1 trigger, composed of custom hardware processors, selects events at a maximum readout rate of about 100 kHz using information from the calorimeters and muon detectors. The high-level trigger software algorithms use the full event information to reduce the event rate to less than 1 kHz before data storage.

3. Event simulation

The PYTHIA 8.2 [34] event generator with NNPDF2.3 [35] parton distribution functions (PDFs) is used to produce simulated signal samples of spin-0 and spin-2 resonances decaying to two photons. The samples are generated at leading order (LO), with values of the resonance mass m_X in the range $0.5 < m_X < 4.5$ TeV. Three values of the relative width Γ_X/m_X are used as benchmarks: 1.4×10^{-4} , 1.4×10^{-2} , and 5.6×10^{-2} , where Γ_X is the width of the resonance. These relative widths correspond, respectively, to resonances much narrower than, comparable to, and significantly wider than the detector resolution. In the context of the RS graviton model, for which $\Gamma_X/m_X = 1.4\tilde{k}^2$ [36], the relative widths correspond to the dimensionless coupling parameter $\tilde{k} = 0.01, 0.1$, and 0.2 . The scalar resonances are produced through gluon–gluon fusion, and RS graviton resonances through both gluon–gluon fusion and quark–antiquark annihilation. In the RS model, the first mechanism accounts for approximately 90% of the production cross section.

The SM background mostly arises from the direct production of two photons, the production of γ + jets events in which jet fragments are misidentified as photons, and the production of multijet

events with misidentified jet fragments. These backgrounds are simulated with the SHERPA 2.1 [37], MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO 2.2 [38] (interfaced with PYTHIA 8.2 for parton showering and hadronization), and PYTHIA 8.2 generators, respectively, using the CT10NLO [39], NNPDF3.0 [40], and NNPDF2.3 PDF sets, again respectively. The PYTHIA tune CUETP8M1 [41] is used.

For both the signal and background samples, the detector response is simulated using the GEANT4 package [42]. The simulated samples incorporate additional pp interactions within the same or a nearby bunch crossing (pileup) and are weighted to reproduce the measured distribution of the number of interactions per bunch crossing. The average number of interactions per bunch crossing is 18, with an RMS of 4.

4. Event selection and diphoton mass spectrum

The trigger requirements, photon identification criteria, and event selection procedures are described in Ref. [11]. Some details are given below. Energy deposits in the ECAL compatible with the shower shape expected for a photon are clustered together to define a photon candidate. Variations in the crystal transparency during the data collection period are corrected for using a dedicated monitoring system, and the single-channel response is equalized based on collision data [31]. A multivariate regression technique [31] is used to correct the photon energy for the incomplete containment of the shower in the clustered crystals, the shower losses for photons that convert before reaching the calorimeter, and the effects of pileup. The interaction vertex is selected using the algorithm described in Ref. [43], which combines information on the correlation between the diphoton system and the recoiling tracks, the average transverse momentum (p_T) of the recoiling tracks, and, when available, directional information from reconstructed photon conversions. For resonances with a mass above 500 GeV, the fraction of events in which the interaction vertex is correctly assigned is approximately 90%. For each photon candidate, the transverse size of the electromagnetic cluster in the η coordinate must be compatible with that expected for a photon from a hard interaction, and the ratio of the associated energy in the HCAL to the photon energy must be less than 0.05.

Photon candidates are required to have $p_T > 75$ GeV and to be reconstructed within $|\eta| < 2.5$. Candidates in the transition region between the barrel and endcap detectors ($1.44 < |\eta| < 1.57$), where the reconstruction efficiency is not well described by the simulation, are rejected. Photon candidates associated with electron tracks that are incompatible with conversion tracks are rejected [31]. Photon candidates are required to be isolated. There are two isolation criteria, both of which are imposed: i) the sum of the scalar p_T of charged hadron candidates from the interaction vertex that lie within a cone of radius $R = \sqrt{(\Delta\eta)^2 + (\Delta\phi)^2} = 0.3$ around the photon candidate must be less than 5 GeV, where charged hadron candidates identified as conversion tracks associated with the photon candidate are excluded; ii) the sum of the scalar p_T of additional neutral electromagnetic candidates within this same cone must be less than 2.5 GeV, after the contribution of additional interactions in the same bunch crossing has been removed.

The identification and trigger efficiencies are measured as functions of photon p_T using data events containing a Z boson decaying to a $\mu^+\mu^-$ pair in association with a photon, or to an e^+e^- pair where the electrons are treated as if they were photons [31]. The efficiency of the photon selection procedure in the kinematic range considered in the analysis is above 90% and 85% for candidates in the barrel and endcap regions, respectively. The ratio between the efficiencies measured in data and simulation is found to be lower than 1 by 3.5% for photons in the barrel region and by 6.5% for

photons in the endcap region. No significant p_T dependence of the efficiency ratios is observed, and a p_T -independent correction is applied to the normalization of the simulated event samples to account for this difference.

The photon candidates in an event are grouped into all possible pairs. At least one photon candidate in the pair must have $|\eta| < 1.44$, i.e., be reconstructed in the barrel. Events with both photons in the endcaps are not considered, since their inclusion would increase the signal efficiency by only a few percent, at the cost of introducing a large background. Photon pairs are divided into two categories. The first category, denoted “EBEB”, contains pairs for which both candidates lie in the barrel. For the second category, denoted “EBEE”, one candidate lies in the barrel and the other in an endcap. The invariant mass $m_{\gamma\gamma}$ of the pair must satisfy $m_{\gamma\gamma} > 230$ GeV for EBEB candidates and $m_{\gamma\gamma} > 330$ GeV for EBEE candidates. The fraction of events in which more than one photon pair satisfies the selection criteria is approximately 1%. In these cases, only the pair with the largest scalar sum of photon p_T is retained.

The selection efficiency times acceptance for signal events varies between 50% and 70%, depending on the signal hypothesis. Because of the different angular distribution of the decay products, the kinematic acceptance for the RS graviton resonances is lower than that of scalar resonances. For $m_\chi < 1$ TeV the difference is approximately 20%. The two acceptances are similar for $m_\chi > 3$ TeV.

The event selection procedure described above is the same as the one documented in [11]. It was finalized on the basis of studies with simulated signal and background event samples prior to inspection of the data in the search region of the diphoton invariant mass distribution, which is defined as $m_{\gamma\gamma} > 500$ GeV.

A total of 6284 (2791) photon pairs are selected in the EBEB (EBEE) category. Of these, 461 (800) pairs have an invariant mass above 500 GeV. According to simulation, the direct production of two photons accounts, respectively, for 90% and 80% of the background events selected in the EBEB and EBEE categories. This prediction is tested in data using the method described in Ref. [44] and good agreement is found between data and simulation.

The diphoton invariant mass distribution of the selected events is shown in Fig. 1, for both the EBEB and EBEE categories. We perform an independent maximum likelihood fit to the data in each category using the function

$$f(m_{\gamma\gamma}) = m_{\gamma\gamma}^{a+b} \log(m_{\gamma\gamma}). \quad (1)$$

This parametric form is chosen to model the background in the hypothesis tests discussed below. The results of the fits are shown in Fig. 1.

5. Likelihood fit

A simultaneous fit to the invariant mass spectra of events in the EBEB and EBEE event categories is performed to determine the compatibility of the data with the background-only and the signal+background hypotheses. The test statistic is based on the profile likelihood ratio:

$$q(\mu) = -2 \log \frac{L(\mu S + B | \hat{\theta}_\mu)}{L(\hat{\mu} S + B | \hat{\theta})}, \quad (2)$$

where S and B represent the probability density functions for resonant diphoton production and for the SM background, respectively. The parameter μ is the so-called signal strength, while θ represents the nuisance parameters of the model, used to account for systematic uncertainties. The $\hat{\theta}$ notation indicates the best fit value of the parameter θ for any μ value, while $\hat{\theta}_\mu$ denotes the best fit value of θ for a fixed value μ .




Fig. 1. The observed invariant mass spectra $m_{\gamma\gamma}$ for selected events in the (top) EBEB and (bottom) EBEE categories. There are no selected events with $m_{\gamma\gamma} > 2000$ GeV. The solid lines and the shaded bands show the results of likelihood fits to the data together with the associated 1 and 2 standard deviation statistical uncertainty bands. The ratio of the difference between the data and the fit to the statistical uncertainty in the data is given in the lower plots.

To set upper limits on the rate of resonant diphoton production, the modified frequentist method known as CL_s [45,46] is used, following the prescription described in Ref. [47]. The compatibility of the observation with the background-only hypothesis is evaluated by computing the background-only p -value. The latter is defined as the probability, in the background-only hypothesis, for $q(0)$ to exceed the value observed in data. This quantity, the “local p -value” p_0 , does not take into account the fact that many signal hypotheses are tested.

Asymptotic formulas [48] are used in the calculations of exclusion limits and local p -values. The accuracy of the asymptotic approximation in the estimation of exclusion limits and significance is studied, using pseudo-experiments, for a subset of the hypothesis tests and is found to be about 10%.

The signal shape in $m_{\gamma\gamma}$ is determined from the convolution of the intrinsic shape of the resonance and the CMS detector response to photons. The intrinsic shape is taken from the PYTHIA 8.2 generator. A grid of mass points with 125 GeV spacing, in the range 500–4500 GeV, is used. The resulting shapes

are interpolated to intermediate points using a parametric description of the distribution. The detector response is determined using fully simulated signal samples of small intrinsic width, corrected through Gaussian smearing to agree with measurements based on $Z \rightarrow e^+e^-$ data. Nine uniformly spaced mass hypotheses in the range 500–4500 GeV are employed. The signal mass resolution, quantified through the ratio of the full width at half maximum of the distribution, divided by 2.35, to the peak position, is approximately 1.0% and 1.5% for the EBEB and EBEE categories, respectively. The signal normalization coefficients are proportional to the product of the kinematic acceptance and the signal efficiency within the acceptance region. These are computed, for each category, in simulated samples and interpolated to intermediate points using quadratic functions of m_X and Γ_X/m_X .

The background shape in $m_{\gamma\gamma}$ is described by the parametric function given by Eq. (1). The values of the parameters a and b are determined by the fit to data, with separate values for the EBEB and EBEE categories, and are treated as unconstrained nuisance parameters in the hypothesis tests.

The accuracy of the background parameterization is assessed using simulation and is quantified by studying the difference between the true and predicted numbers of background events in several $m_{\gamma\gamma}$ intervals in the search region. The relative widths of the intervals, defined by $2(x_1 - x_2)/(x_1 + x_2)$ with x_1 and x_2 the lower and upper bin edges, range between 2% and 15%. Pseudo-experiments are drawn from the mass spectrum predicted by the simulation and are fit with the chosen background model. The total number of events in each pseudo-experiment is taken from a Poisson distribution whose mean is set equal to the observation in data. For each interval, the distribution of the pull variable, defined as the difference between the true and predicted numbers of events divided by the estimated statistical uncertainty, is constructed. If the absolute value of the median of this distribution is found to be above 0.5 in an interval, an additional uncertainty is assigned to the background parameterization. A modified pull distribution is then constructed, increasing the statistical uncertainty in the fit by an extra term, denoted the “bias term”. The bias term is parametrized as a smooth function of $m_{\gamma\gamma}$, which is tuned in such a manner that the absolute value of the median of the modified pull distribution is less than 0.5 in all intervals. The amplitude of the bias term function is comparable to that of the 1 standard deviation bands in Fig. 1. This additional uncertainty is included in the likelihood function by adding to the background model a component having the same shape as the signal. The normalization coefficient of this component is constrained to have a Gaussian distribution of mean zero, with a width equal to the integral of the bias term function over the full width at half maximum of the tested signal shape. The inclusion of this additional component has the effect of avoiding falsely positive or falsely negative tests that could be induced by a mismodeling of the background shape, and it reduces the sensitivity of the analysis by at most 10%.

6. Systematic uncertainties

The impact of systematic uncertainties in this analysis is smaller than that of the statistical uncertainties. The parametric background model has no associated systematic uncertainties except for the bias term uncertainty described in the previous section. Since the background shape coefficients a and b [Eq. (1)] are treated as unconstrained nuisance parameters, the associated uncertainties are statistical.

The systematic uncertainties in the signal normalization associated with the integrated luminosity, the selection efficiency, and the PDFs are 6.2%, 6.0%, and 6.0%, respectively. The uncertainty in




Fig. 2. The 95% CL upper limits on the production of diphoton resonances as a function of the resonance mass m_X , from the analysis of data collected in 2016. Exclusion limits for the scalar and RS graviton signals are given by the grey (darker) and green (lighter) curves, respectively. The observed limits are shown by the solid lines, while the median expected limits are given by the dashed lines together with their associated 1 standard deviation uncertainty bands. The leading-order production cross section for diphoton resonances in the RS graviton model is shown for three values of the dimensionless coupling parameter k together with the exclusion upper limits calculated for the corresponding three values of the width relative to the mass, Γ_X/m_X . Shown are the results for (upper) a narrow width, (middle) an intermediate-width, and (lower) a broad resonance.

the integrated luminosity is estimated from beam scans performed in August 2016, utilizing the methods of Ref. [49]. The uncertainty associated with the PDFs is evaluated by comparing the overall selection efficiency obtained with the CT10 [39], MSTW08 [50], and NNPDF2.3 [35] PDF sets and taking the largest deviation over all tested signal hypotheses. A 1% uncertainty is associated with the level of knowledge of the energy scale and accounts for the uncertainty in the energy scale at the Z boson peak and its extrapolation to higher masses. A 10% uncertainty is assigned to the knowledge of the photon energy resolution, corresponding to the uncertainty in the estimated additional Gaussian smearing determined at the Z boson peak.

7. Results for the 2016 data

The observed and expected 95% confidence level (CL) upper limits on the product of the production cross section ($\sigma_X^{13\text{ TeV}}$) and branching fraction to two photons ($B_{\gamma\gamma}$) for scalar and RS graviton resonances are shown in Fig. 2. Using the LO cross sections from PYTHIA 8.2, RS gravitons with masses below 1.75, 3.75, and 4.35 TeV are excluded for $\tilde{k} = 0.01, 0.1, \text{ and } 0.2$, respectively, corresponding to $\Gamma_X/m_X = 1.4 \times 10^{-4}, 1.4 \times 10^{-2}, \text{ and } 5.6 \times 10^{-2}$.

The value of p_0 for different signal hypotheses is shown in Fig. 3. The largest excess is observed for $m_X \approx 620$ GeV, and has a local significance of approximately 2.4 and 2.7 standard deviations for narrow spin-0 and RS graviton signal hypotheses, respectively. After taking into account the effect of searching for several signal hypotheses, i.e., searching over a range of widths and masses, the significance of the excess is reduced to less than one standard deviation. No excess is observed in the proximity of $m_X = 750$ GeV.




Fig. 3. Observed background-only p -values for resonances with (top) $\Gamma_X/m_X = 1.4 \times 10^{-4}$, (middle) 1.4×10^{-2} , and (bottom) 5.6×10^{-2} as a function of the resonance mass m_X , from the analysis of data collected in 2016. The solid black and dashed blue lines correspond to spin-0 and spin-2 resonances, respectively.

8. Combination with the 2012 and 2015 data

The results obtained for the 2016 data are combined statistically with those obtained for the data discussed in Ref. [11], namely 19.7 fb^{-1} of proton–proton collisions recorded at $\sqrt{s} = 8 \text{ TeV}$ in 2012 [12] and 3.3 fb^{-1} recorded at $\sqrt{s} = 13 \text{ TeV}$ in 2015. For a portion of the 2015 data (0.6 fb^{-1}), the CMS magnet was off (0 T), while for the rest of the 2015 data and for all of the 2012 and 2016 data, the magnet was at its operational field strength (3.8 T). The analysis of the 0 T data from 2015 is described in Ref. [11].

The procedure followed for the combined analysis of 8 and 13 TeV data is the same as in Ref. [11]. The ratio of the 8 to the 13 TeV production cross section is computed using PYTHIA 8.2, for the two types of signal hypotheses considered: scalar resonances and RS graviton resonances. The cross section ratio decreases from 0.27 and 0.29 at $m_X = 500 \text{ GeV}$ to 0.03 and 0.04 at $m_X = 4 \text{ TeV}$, for the scalar and RS graviton resonance hypotheses, respectively.

Exclusion limits are set on the 13 TeV production cross section for both models, and background-only p -values are computed for the signal hypotheses.

The correlation model between the systematic uncertainties associated with 8 and 13 TeV data is described in Ref. [11]. It assumes all uncertainties to be uncorrelated except for those related




Fig. 4. The 95% CL upper limits on the production of diphoton resonances as a function of the resonance mass m_X , from the combined analysis of data collected in 2015 and in 2016. Exclusion limits for the scalar and RS graviton signals are given by the grey (darker) curves and green (lighter) curves, respectively. The observed limits are shown by the solid lines, while the median expected limits are given by the dashed lines together with their associated 1 standard deviation uncertainty bands. The leading-order production cross section for diphoton resonances in the RS graviton model is shown for three values of the dimensionless coupling parameter k together with the exclusion upper limits calculated for the corresponding three values of the width relative to the mass, Γ_X/m_X . Shown are the results for (upper) a narrow width, (middle) an intermediate-width, and (lower) a broad resonance.

to the knowledge of the PDFs, which are taken to be fully correlated, and those related to the knowledge of the photon energy scale, which are taken to have a linear correlation of 0.5. Taking the value of the linear correlation to be 0 or 1 would lead to negligible changes in the results. For the combination of the two 13 TeV data sets, the background shape and the associated bias term uncertainties are assumed to be fully correlated between the corresponding categories of the 2015 (3.8 T) and 2016 data. Independent background normalization coefficients are used for the two data sets. The uncertainty in the signal selection efficiency is taken to be uncorrelated between the 2015 and 2016 data, to account for the large statistical contribution and for the effect on the systematic contribution arising from changes in the data taking conditions, particularly in the instantaneous luminosity. The uncertainty in the knowledge of the integrated luminosity is treated as follows: a 2.3% uncertainty, corresponding to the knowledge of the absolute luminosity scale calibration determined with beam scans, is taken to be fully correlated between the 2015 (3.8 T) and 2016 data, and additional uncertainties of 1.5% and 5.8%, corresponding to the uncertainty in extrapolating the scale calibration to the data collection conditions, are applied, again respectively. Finally, the photon energy scale uncertainties are taken to be fully correlated between the two data sets, being dominated by the extrapolation to high energy.

Fig. 4 shows the observed and expected 95% CL upper limits on the 13 TeV production cross section of the different signal hypotheses obtained with the combined analysis of the 13 TeV data recorded in 2015 and 2016. The upper limits on the production of scalar resonances decaying to two photons range from about 10 to 0.2 fb, for resonance masses between 0.5 and 4.5 TeV. Compared to the 2016 data alone, the sensitivity is improved by approximately




Fig. 5. Observed background-only p -values for resonances with (upper) $\Gamma_X/m_X = 1.4 \times 10^{-4}$ and (lower) 5.6×10^{-2} as a function of the resonance mass m_X , from the combined analysis of data recorded in 2015 and 2016. The results obtained for the two individual data sets are also shown. The curves corresponding to the scalar and RS graviton hypotheses are shown in left and right columns, respectively. The insets show an expanded region around $m_X = 750$ GeV.

10% and 20% at the high and low end of the m_X search region, respectively. Using the LO cross sections from PYTHIA 8.2, RS gravitons with masses below 3.85 and 4.45 TeV are excluded for $\tilde{k} = 0.1$ and 0.2, respectively. For $\tilde{k} = 0.01$, graviton masses below 1.95 TeV are excluded, except for the region between 1.75 and 1.85 TeV.

The observed p_0 for $\Gamma_X/m_X = 1.4 \times 10^{-4}$ and 5.6×10^{-2} obtained with the combined analysis of the 2015 and 2016 data is shown in Fig. 5. The largest excess is observed for $m_X \approx 1.3$ TeV and has a local significance of about 2.2 standard deviations, corresponding to less than 1 standard deviation after accounting for the effect of searching for several signal hypotheses. For $m_X = 750$ GeV, the 2.9 standard deviation local significance excess observed in the 2015 data is reduced to 0.8 standard deviations.

The observed and expected 95% CL upper limits on the 13 TeV signal production cross sections obtained through a combined analysis of the 8 TeV data from 2012 and the 13 TeV data from 2015 and 2016 are shown in Fig. 6. Compared to the combined 13 TeV data, the analysis sensitivity improves by about 10% at the low end of the m_X range, while the improvement is negligible at the higher end of the range. Thus the lower limits on the mass of RS gravitons obtained by combining the 8 and 13 TeV data coincide with those obtained with the 13 TeV data alone.

The observed p_0 for $\Gamma_X/m_X = 1.4 \times 10^{-4}$ and 5.6×10^{-2} obtained with the combined 8 and 13 TeV analysis is shown in Fig. 7. The largest excess, observed for $m_X \approx 0.9$ TeV, has a local significance of about 2.2 standard deviations, corresponding to less than 1 standard deviation overall. For $m_X = 750$ GeV, the excess with 3.4 standard deviation local significance [11] is reduced to about 1.9 standard deviations.

9. Summary

A search for the resonant production of high-mass photon pairs has been presented. The analysis is based on a sample of proton-proton collisions collected by the CMS experiment in 2016 at $\sqrt{s} =$




Fig. 6. The 95% CL upper limits on the production of diphoton resonances as a function of the resonance mass m_X , from the combined analysis of the 8 and 13 TeV data. The 8 TeV results are scaled by the ratio of the 8 to 13 TeV cross sections. Exclusion limits for the scalar and RS graviton signals are given by the grey (darker) and green (lighter) curves, respectively. The observed limits are shown by the solid lines, while the median expected limits are given by the dashed lines together with their associated 1 standard deviation uncertainty bands. The leading-order production cross section for diphoton resonances in the RS graviton model is shown for three values of the dimensionless coupling parameter \tilde{k} together with the exclusion upper limits calculated for the corresponding three values of the width relative to the mass, Γ_X/m_X . Shown are the results for (upper) a narrow width, (middle) an intermediate-width, and (lower) a broad resonance.




Fig. 7. Observed background-only p -values for resonances with (upper) $\Gamma_X/m_X = 1.4 \times 10^{-4}$ and (lower) 5.6×10^{-2} as a function of the resonance mass m_X , from the combined analysis of the 8 and 13 TeV data. The results obtained for the two individual center-of-mass energies are also shown. The curves corresponding to the scalar and RS graviton hypotheses are shown in left and right columns, respectively. The insets show an expanded region around $m_X = 750$ GeV.

13 TeV, corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 12.9 fb^{-1} . Events containing two photon candidates with transverse momenta above 75 GeV are selected. The diphoton mass spectrum above 500 GeV is examined for evidence of the production of high-mass spin-0 and spin-2 resonances.

Limits on the production of scalar resonances and Randall-Sundrum gravitons in the range $0.5 < m_X < 4.5$ TeV and $1.4 \times 10^{-4} < \Gamma_X/m_X < 5.6 \times 10^{-2}$ are determined using the modified frequentist approach, where m_X and Γ_X are the resonance mass and width, respectively. The results obtained with the 2016 data set are combined statistically with those obtained in 2012 and 2015, corresponding to integrated luminosities of 19.7 and 3.3 fb^{-1} of data recorded at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ and 13 TeV, respectively.

No significant excess is observed above the predictions of the standard model. Using the leading-order cross sections, Randall-Sundrum gravitons with masses below 3.85 and 4.45 TeV are excluded for values of the dimensionless coupling parameter $\tilde{k} = 0.1$ and 0.2, respectively. For $\tilde{k} = 0.01$, graviton masses below 1.95 TeV are excluded, except for the region between 1.75 and 1.85 TeV. These are the most stringent limits on Randall-Sundrum graviton production to date.

Acknowledgements

We congratulate our colleagues in the CERN accelerator departments for the excellent performance of the LHC and thank the technical and administrative staffs at CERN and at other CMS institutes for their contributions to the success of the CMS effort. In addition, we gratefully acknowledge the computing centers and personnel of the Worldwide LHC Computing Grid for delivering so effectively the computing infrastructure essential to our analyses. Finally, we acknowledge the enduring support for the construction and operation of the LHC and the CMS detector provided by the following funding agencies: BMWFW and FWF (Austria); FNRS and FWO (Belgium); CNPq, CAPES, FAPERJ, and FAPESP (Brazil);

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

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

[49] CMS Collaboration, CMS luminosity measurement for the 2015 data taking period, CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-LUM-15-001, <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2138682>, 2016.

[50] A.D. Martin, W.J. Stirling, R.S. Thorne, G. Watt, Parton distributions for the LHC, Eur. Phys. J. C 63 (2009) 189, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-009-1072-5>, arXiv:0901.0002.

CMS Collaboration

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

Yerevan Physics Institute, Yerevan, Armenia

W. Adam, E. Asilar, T. Bergauer, J. Brandstetter, E. Brondolin, M. Dragicevic, J. Erö, M. Flechl, M. Friedl, R. Frühwirth¹, V.M. Ghete, C. Hartl, N. Hörmann, J. Hrubec, M. Jeitler¹, A. König, I. Krätschmer, D. Liko, T. Matsushita, I. Mikulec, D. Rabadý, N. Rad, B. Rahbaran, H. Rohringer, J. Schieck¹, J. Strauss, W. Waltenberger, C.-E. Wulz¹

Institut für Hochenergiephysik der OeAW, Wien, Austria

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

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

O. Dvornikov, V. Makarenko, V. Zykunov

Research Institute for Nuclear Problems, Minsk, Belarus

S. Alderweireldt, E.A. De Wolf, X. Janssen, J. Lauwers, M. Van De Klundert, H. Van Haevermaet, P. Van Mechelen, N. Van Remortel, A. Van Spilbeeck

Universiteit Antwerpen, Antwerpen, Belgium

S. Abu Zeid, F. Blekman, J. D'Hondt, N. Daci, I. De Bruyn, K. Deroover, S. Lowette, S. Moortgat, L. Moreels, A. Olbrechts, Q. Python, S. Tavernier, W. Van Doninck, P. Van Mulders, I. Van Parijs

Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussel, Belgium

H. Brun, B. Clerbaux, G. De Lentdecker, H. Delannoy, G. Fasanella, L. Favart, R. Goldouzian, A. Grebenyuk, G. Karapostoli, T. Lenzi, A. Léonard, J. Luetic, T. Maerschalk, A. Marinov, A. Randle-conde, T. Seva, C. Vander Velde, P. Vanlaer, D. Vannerom, R. Yonamine, F. Zenoni, F. Zhang²

Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium

A. Cimmino, T. Cornelis, D. Dobur, A. Fagot, G. Garcia, M. Gul, I. Khvastunov, D. Poyraz, S. Salva, R. Schöfbeck, A. Sharma, M. Tytgat, W. Van Driessche, E. Yazgan, N. Zaganidis

Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

H. Bakhshiansohi, C. Beluffi³, O. Bondu, S. Brochet, G. Bruno, A. Caudron, S. De Visscher, C. Delaere, M. Delcourt, B. Francois, A. Giammanco, A. Jafari, P. Jez, M. Komm, G. Krintiras, V. Lemaître, A. Magitteri, A. Mertens, M. Musich, C. Nuttens, K. Piotrkowski, L. Quertenmont, M. Selvaggi, M. Vidal Marono, S. Wertz

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

N. Belyi

Université de Mons, Mons, Belgium

W.L. Aldá Júnior, F.L. Alves, G.A. Alves, L. Brito, C. Hensel, A. Moraes, M.E. Pol, P. Rebello Teles

Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Físicas, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

1 E. Belchior Batista Das Chagas, W. Carvalho, J. Chinellato⁴, A. Custódio, E.M. Da Costa, G.G. Da Silveira⁵, 66
 2 D. De Jesus Damiao, C. De Oliveira Martins, S. Fonseca De Souza, L.M. Huertas Guativa, H. Malbouisson, 67
 3 D. Matos Figueiredo, C. Mora Herrera, L. Mundim, H. Nogima, W.L. Prado Da Silva, A. Santoro, 68
 4 A. Sznajder, E.J. Tonelli Manganote⁴, A. Vilela Pereira 69
 5

6 *Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil* 71
 7

8 S. Ahuja^a, C.A. Bernardes^b, S. Dogra^a, T.R. Fernandez Perez Tomei^a, E.M. Gregores^b, P.G. Mercadante^b, 73
 9 C.S. Moon^a, S.F. Novaes^a, Sandra S. Padula^a, D. Romero Abad^b, J.C. Ruiz Vargas 74
 10

11 ^a *Universidade Estadual Paulista, São Paulo, Brazil* 76

12 ^b *Universidade Federal do ABC, São Paulo, Brazil* 77
 13

14 A. Aleksandrov, R. Hadjiiska, P. Iaydjiev, M. Rodozov, S. Stoykova, G. Sultanov, M. Vutova 79
 15

16 *Institute for Nuclear Research and Nuclear Energy, Sofia, Bulgaria* 81
 17

18 A. Dimitrov, I. Glushkov, L. Litov, B. Pavlov, P. Petkov 82
 19

20 *University of Sofia, Sofia, Bulgaria* 83
 21

22 W. Fang⁶ 84
 23

24 *Beihang University, Beijing, China* 85
 25

26 M. Ahmad, J.G. Bian, G.M. Chen, H.S. Chen, M. Chen, Y. Chen⁷, T. Cheng, C.H. Jiang, D. Leggat, Z. Liu, 90
 27 F. Romeo, S.M. Shaheen, A. Spiezia, J. Tao, C. Wang, Z. Wang, H. Zhang, J. Zhao 91
 28

29 *Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing, China* 92
 30

31 Y. Ban, G. Chen, Q. Li, S. Liu, Y. Mao, S.J. Qian, D. Wang, Z. Xu 93
 32

33 *State Key Laboratory of Nuclear Physics and Technology, Peking University, Beijing, China* 94
 34

35 C. Avila, A. Cabrera, L.F. Chaparro Sierra, C. Florez, J.P. Gomez, C.F. González Hernández, J.D. Ruiz Alvarez, 95
 36 J.C. Sanabria 96
 37

38 *Universidad de Los Andes, Bogota, Colombia* 97
 39

40 N. Godinovic, D. Lelas, I. Puljak, P.M. Ribeiro Cipriano, T. Sculac 98
 41

42 *University of Split, Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering and Naval Architecture, Split, Croatia* 99
 43

44 Z. Antunovic, M. Kovac 100
 45

46 *University of Split, Faculty of Science, Split, Croatia* 101
 47

48 V. Brigljevic, D. Ferencek, K. Kadija, S. Micanovic, L. Sudic, T. Susa 102
 49

50 *Institute Rudjer Boskovic, Zagreb, Croatia* 103
 51

52 A. Attikis, G. Mavromanolakis, J. Mousa, C. Nicolaou, F. Ptochos, P.A. Razis, H. Rykaczewski, D. Tsiakkouri 104
 53

54 *University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus* 105
 55

56 M. Finger⁸, M. Finger Jr.⁸ 106
 57

58 *Charles University, Prague, Czechia* 107
 59

60 E. Carrera Jarrin 108
 61

62 *Universidad San Francisco de Quito, Quito, Ecuador* 109
 63

64 A.A. Abdelalim^{9,10}, E. El-khateeb¹¹, E. Salama^{12,11} 110
 65

Academy of Scientific Research and Technology of the Arab Republic of Egypt, Egyptian Network of High Energy Physics, Cairo, Egypt 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130

1 M. Kadastik, M. Murumaa, L. Perrini, M. Raidal, A. Tiko, C. Veelken

2 *National Institute of Chemical Physics and Biophysics, Tallinn, Estonia*

4 P. Eerola, J. Pekkanen, M. Voutilainen

6 *Department of Physics, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland*

8 J. Härkönen, T. Järvinen, V. Karimäki, R. Kinnunen, T. Lampén, K. Lassila-Perini, S. Lehti, T. Lindén,
9 P. Luukka, J. Tuominiemi, E. Tuovinen, L. Wendland

11 *Helsinki Institute of Physics, Helsinki, Finland*

13 J. Talvitie, T. Tuuva

15 *Lappeenranta University of Technology, Lappeenranta, Finland*

17 M. Besancon, F. Couderc, M. Dejardin, D. Denegri, B. Fabbro, J.L. Faure, C. Favaro, F. Ferri, S. Ganjour,
18 S. Ghosh, A. Givernaud, P. Gras, G. Hamel de Monchenault, P. Jarry, I. Kucher, E. Locci, M. Mached,
19 J. Malcles, J. Rander, A. Rosowsky, M. Titov, A. Zghiche

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

23 A. Abdulsalam, I. Antropov, S. Baffioni, F. Beaudette, P. Busson, L. Cadamuro, E. Chapon, C. Charlot,
24 O. Davignon, R. Granier de Cassagnac, M. Jo, S. Lisniak, P. Miné, M. Nguyen, C. Ochando, G. Ortona,
25 P. Paganini, P. Pigard, S. Regnard, R. Salerno, Y. Sirois, T. Strebler, Y. Yilmaz, A. Zabi

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

29 J.-L. Agram¹³, J. Andrea, A. Aubin, D. Bloch, J.-M. Brom, M. Buttignol, E.C. Chabert, N. Chanon, C. Collard,
30 E. Conte¹³, X. Coubez, J.-C. Fontaine¹³, D. Gelé, U. Goerlach, A.-C. Le Bihan, K. Skovpen, P. Van Hove

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

34 S. Gadrat

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

38 S. Beauceron, C. Bernet, G. Boudoul, E. Bouvier, C.A. Carrillo Montoya, R. Chierici, D. Contardo,
39 B. Courbon, P. Depasse, H. El Mamouni, J. Fan, J. Fay, S. Gascon, M. Gouzevitch, G. Grenier, B. Ille,
40 F. Lagarde, I.B. Laktineh, M. Lethuillier, L. Mirabito, A.L. Pequegnot, S. Perries, A. Popov¹⁴, D. Sabes,
41 V. Sordini, M. Vander Donckt, P. Verdier, S. Viret

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

46 T. Toriashvili¹⁵

48 *Georgian Technical University, Tbilisi, Georgia*

50 Z. Tsamalaidze⁸

52 *Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia*

54 C. Autermann, S. Beranek, L. Feld, A. Heister, M.K. Kiesel, K. Klein, M. Lipinski, A. Ostapchuk, M. Preuten,
55 F. Raupach, S. Schael, C. Schomakers, J. Schulz, T. Verlage, H. Weber, V. Zhukov¹⁴

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

59 A. Albert, M. Brodski, E. Dietz-Laursonn, D. Duchardt, M. Endres, M. Erdmann, S. Erdweg, T. Esch,
60 R. Fischer, A. Güth, M. Hamer, T. Hebbeker, C. Heidemann, K. Hoepfner, S. Knutzen, M. Merschmeyer,
61 A. Meyer, P. Millet, S. Mukherjee, M. Olschewski, K. Padeken, T. Pook, M. Radziej, H. Reithler, M. Rieger,
62 F. Scheuch, L. Sonnenschein, D. Teyssier, S. Thüer

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

V. Cherepanov, G. Flügge, F. Hoehle, B. Kargoll, T. Kress, A. Künsken, J. Lingemann, T. Müller,
A. Nehrkorn, A. Nowack, I.M. Nugent, C. Pistone, O. Pooth, A. Stahl¹⁶

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

M. Aldaya Martin, T. Arndt, C. Asawatrangkuldee, K. Beernaert, O. Behnke, U. Behrens, A.A. Bin Anuar,
K. Borras¹⁷, A. Campbell, P. Connor, C. Contreras-Campana, F. Costanza, C. Diez Pardos, G. Dolinska,
G. Eckerlin, D. Eckstein, T. Eichhorn, E. Eren, E. Gallo¹⁸, J. Garay Garcia, A. Geiser, A. Gizhko,
J.M. Grados Luyando, P. Gunnellini, A. Harb, J. Hauk, M. Hempel¹⁹, H. Jung, A. Kalogeropoulos,
O. Karacheban¹⁹, M. Kasemann, J. Keaveney, C. Kleinwort, I. Korol, D. Krücker, W. Lange, A. Lelek,
J. Leonard, K. Lipka, A. Lobanov, W. Lohmann¹⁹, R. Mankel, I.-A. Melzer-Pellmann, A.B. Meyer, G. Mittag,
J. Mnich, A. Mussgiller, E. Ntomari, D. Pitzl, R. Placakyte, A. Raspereza, B. Roland, M.Ö. Sahin, P. Saxena,
T. Schoerner-Sadenius, C. Seitz, S. Spannagel, N. Stefaniuk, G.P. Van Onsem, R. Walsh, C. Wissing

Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Hamburg, Germany

V. Blobel, M. Centis Vignali, A.R. Draeger, T. Dreyer, E. Garutti, D. Gonzalez, J. Haller, M. Hoffmann,
A. Junkes, R. Klanner, R. Kogler, N. Kovalchuk, T. Lapsien, T. Lenz, I. Marchesini, D. Marconi, M. Meyer,
M. Niedziela, D. Nowatschin, F. Pantaleo¹⁶, T. Peiffer, A. Perieanu, J. Poehlsen, C. Sander, C. Scharf,
P. Schleper, A. Schmidt, S. Schumann, J. Schwandt, H. Stadie, G. Steinbrück, F.M. Stober, M. Stöver,
H. Tholen, D. Troendle, E. Usai, L. Vanelderen, A. Vanhoefer, B. Vormwald

University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany

M. Akbiyik, C. Barth, S. Baur, C. Baus, J. Berger, E. Butz, R. Caspart, T. Chwalek, F. Colombo, W. De Boer,
A. Dierlamm, S. Fink, B. Freund, R. Friese, M. Giffels, A. Gilbert, P. Goldenzweig, D. Haitz, F. Hartmann¹⁶,
S.M. Heindl, U. Husemann, I. Katkov¹⁴, S. Kudella, P. Lobelle Pardo, H. Mildner, M.U. Mozer, Th. Müller,
M. Plagge, G. Quast, K. Rabbertz, S. Röcker, F. Roscher, M. Schröder, I. Shvetsov, G. Sieber, H.J. Simonis,
R. Ulrich, J. Wagner-Kuhr, S. Wayand, M. Weber, T. Weiler, S. Williamson, C. Wöhrmann, R. Wolf

Institut für Experimentelle Kernphysik, Karlsruhe, Germany

G. Anagnostou, G. Daskalakis, T. Gerasis, V.A. Giakoumopoulou, A. Kyriakis, D. Loukas, I. Topsis-Giotis

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

S. Kesisoglou, A. Panagiotou, N. Saoulidou, E. Tziaferi

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece

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

University of Ioánnina, Ioánnina, Greece

N. Filipovic

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

G. Bencze, C. Hajdu, D. Horvath²⁰, F. Sikler, V. Veszpremi, G. Vesztergombi²¹, A.J. Zsigmond

Wigner Research Centre for Physics, Budapest, Hungary

N. Beni, S. Czellar, J. Karacsi²², A. Makovec, J. Molnar, Z. Szillasi

Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary

M. Bartók²¹, P. Raics, Z.L. Trocsanyi, B. Ujvari

University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary

S. Bahinipati, S. Choudhury²³, P. Mal, K. Mandal, A. Nayak²⁴, D.K. Sahoo, N. Sahoo, S.K. Swain

National Institute of Science Education and Research, Bhubaneswar, India

1 S. Bansal, S.B. Beri, V. Bhatnagar, R. Chawla, U. Bhawandeep, A.K. Kalsi, A. Kaur, M. Kaur, R. Kumar,
2 P. Kumari, A. Mehta, M. Mittal, J.B. Singh, G. Walia

3
4 *Panjab University, Chandigarh, India*

5
6 Ashok Kumar, A. Bhardwaj, B.C. Choudhary, R.B. Garg, S. Keshri, S. Malhotra, M. Naimuddin, N. Nishu,
7 K. Ranjan, R. Sharma, V. Sharma

8
9 *University of Delhi, Delhi, India*

10
11 R. Bhattacharya, S. Bhattacharya, K. Chatterjee, S. Dey, S. Dutt, S. Dutta, S. Ghosh, N. Majumdar,
12 A. Modak, K. Mondal, S. Mukhopadhyay, S. Nandan, A. Purohit, A. Roy, D. Roy, S. Roy Chowdhury,
13 S. Sarkar, M. Sharan, S. Thakur

14
15 *Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, Kolkata, India*

16
17 P.K. Behera

18
19 *Indian Institute of Technology Madras, Madras, India*

20
21 R. Chudasama, D. Dutta, V. Jha, V. Kumar, A.K. Mohanty¹⁶, P.K. Netrakanti, L.M. Pant, P. Shukla, A. Topkar

22
23 *Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, Mumbai, India*

24
25 T. Aziz, S. Dugad, G. Kole, B. Mahakud, S. Mitra, G.B. Mohanty, B. Parida, N. Sur, B. Sutar

26
27 *Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-A, Mumbai, India*

28
29 S. Banerjee, S. Bhowmik²⁵, R.K. Dewanjee, S. Ganguly, M. Guchait, Sa. Jain, S. Kumar, M. Maity²⁵,
30 G. Majumder, K. Mazumdar, T. Sarkar²⁵, N. Wickramage²⁶

31
32 *Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-B, Mumbai, India*

33
34 S. Chauhan, S. Dube, V. Hegde, A. Kapoor, K. Kotheekar, S. Pandey, A. Rane, S. Sharma

35
36 *Indian Institute of Science Education and Research (IISER), Pune, India*

37
38 H. Behnamian, S. Chenarani²⁷, E. Eskandari Tadavani, S.M. Etesami²⁷, A. Fahim²⁸, M. Khakzad,
39 M. Mohammadi Najafabadi, M. Naseri, S. Paktinat Mehdiabadi²⁹, F. Rezaei Hosseinabadi,
40 B. Safarzadeh³⁰, M. Zeinali

41
42 *Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM), Tehran, Iran*

43
44 M. Felcini, M. Grunewald

45
46 *University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland*

47
48 M. Abbrescia^{a,b}, C. Calabria^{a,b}, C. Caputo^{a,b}, A. Colaleo^a, D. Creanza^{a,c}, L. Cristella^{a,b}, N. De Filippis^{a,c},
49 M. De Palma^{a,b}, L. Fiore^a, G. Iaselli^{a,c}, G. Maggi^{a,c}, M. Maggi^a, G. Miniello^{a,b}, S. My^{a,b}, S. Nuzzo^{a,b},
50 A. Pompili^{a,b}, G. Pugliese^{a,c}, R. Radogna^{a,b}, A. Ranieri^a, G. Selvaggi^{a,b}, L. Silvestris^{a,16}, R. Venditti^{a,b},
51 P. Verwilligen^a

52
53 ^a *INFN Sezione di Bari, Bari, Italy*

54 ^b *Università di Bari, Bari, Italy*

55 ^c *Politecnico di Bari, Bari, Italy*

56
57 G. Abbiendi^a, C. Battilana, D. Bonacorsi^{a,b}, S. Braibant-Giacomelli^{a,b}, L. Brigliadori^{a,b}, R. Campanini^{a,b},
58 P. Capiluppi^{a,b}, A. Castro^{a,b}, F.R. Cavallo^a, S.S. Chhibra^{a,b}, G. Codispoti^{a,b}, M. Cuffiani^{a,b},
59 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},
60 S. Marcellini^a, G. Masetti^a, A. Montanari^a, F.L. Navarria^{a,b}, A. Perrotta^a, A.M. Rossi^{a,b}, T. Rovelli^{a,b},
61 G.P. Siroli^{a,b}, N. Tosi^{a,b,16}

62
63 ^a *INFN Sezione di Bologna, Bologna, Italy*

64 ^b *Università di Bologna, Bologna, Italy*

65
Please cite this article in press as: The CMS Collaboration, Search for high-mass diphoton resonances in proton–proton collisions at 13 TeV and combination with 8 TeV search, Phys. Lett. B (2017), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2017.01.027>

1 S. Albergo ^{a,b}, S. Costa ^{a,b}, A. Di Mattia ^a, F. Giordano ^{a,b}, R. Potenza ^{a,b}, A. Tricomi ^{a,b}, C. Tuve ^{a,b} 66

2 ^a INFN Sezione di Catania, Catania, Italy 67

3 ^b Università di Catania, Catania, Italy 68

4 69

5 G. Barbagli ^a, V. Ciulli ^{a,b}, C. Civinini ^a, R. D'Alessandro ^{a,b}, E. Focardi ^{a,b}, P. Lenzi ^{a,b}, M. Meschini ^a, 70

6 S. Paoletti ^a, G. Sguazzoni ^a, L. Viliani ^{a,b,16} 71

7 72

8 ^a INFN Sezione di Firenze, Firenze, Italy 73

9 ^b Università di Firenze, Firenze, Italy 74

10 75

11 L. Benussi, S. Bianco, F. Fabbri, D. Piccolo, F. Primavera ¹⁶ 76

12 77

13 INFN Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, Frascati, Italy 78

14 79

15 V. Calvelli ^{a,b}, F. Ferro ^a, M. Lo Vetere ^{a,b}, M.R. Monge ^{a,b}, E. Robutti ^a, S. Tosi ^{a,b} 80

16 81

17 ^a INFN Sezione di Genova, Genova, Italy 82

18 ^b Università di Genova, Genova, Italy 83

19 84

20 L. Brianza ¹⁶, M.E. Dinardo ^{a,b}, S. Fiorendi ^{a,b,16}, S. Gennai ^a, A. Ghezzi ^{a,b}, P. Govoni ^{a,b}, M. Malberti, 85

21 S. Malvezzi ^a, R.A. Manzoni ^{a,b,16}, D. Menasce ^a, L. Moroni ^a, M. Paganoni ^{a,b}, D. Pedrini ^a, S. Pigazzini, 86

22 S. Ragazzi ^{a,b}, T. Tabarelli de Fatis ^{a,b} 87

23 88

24 ^a INFN Sezione di Milano-Bicocca, Milano, Italy 89

25 ^b Università di Milano-Bicocca, Milano, Italy 90

26 91

27 S. Buontempo ^a, N. Cavallo ^{a,c}, G. De Nardo, S. Di Guida ^{a,d,16}, M. Esposito ^{a,b}, F. Fabozzi ^{a,c}, F. Fienga ^{a,b}, 92

28 A.O.M. Iorio ^{a,b}, G. Lanza ^a, L. Lista ^a, S. Meola ^{a,d,16}, P. Paolucci ^{a,16}, C. Sciacca ^{a,b}, F. Thyssen 93

29 94

30 ^a INFN Sezione di Napoli, Napoli, Italy 95

31 ^b Università di Napoli "Federico II", Napoli, Italy 96

32 ^c Università della Basilicata, Potenza, Italy 97

33 ^d Università G. Marconi, Roma, Italy 98

34 99

35 P. Azzi ^{a,16}, N. Bacchetta ^a, L. Benato ^{a,b}, D. Bisello ^{a,b}, A. Boletti ^{a,b}, R. Carlin ^{a,b}, 100

36 A. Carvalho Antunes De Oliveira ^{a,b}, P. Checchia ^a, M. Dall'Osso ^{a,b}, P. De Castro Manzano ^a, T. Dorigo ^a, 101

37 U. Dosselli ^a, F. Gasparini ^{a,b}, U. Gasparini ^{a,b}, A. Gozzelino ^a, S. Lacaprara ^a, M. Margoni ^{a,b}, 102

38 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. Zanetti, 103

39 P. Zotto ^{a,b}, G. Zumerle ^{a,b} 104

40 105

41 ^a INFN Sezione di Padova, Padova, Italy 106

42 ^b Università di Padova, Padova, Italy 107

43 ^c Università di Trento, Trento, Italy 108

44 109

45 A. Braghieri ^a, A. Magnani ^{a,b}, P. Montagna ^{a,b}, S.P. Ratti ^{a,b}, V. Re ^a, C. Riccardi ^{a,b}, P. Salvini ^a, I. Vai ^{a,b}, 110

46 P. Vitulo ^{a,b} 111

47 112

48 ^a INFN Sezione di Pavia, Pavia, Italy 113

49 ^b Università di Pavia, Pavia, Italy 114

50 115

51 L. Alunni Solestizi ^{a,b}, G.M. Bilei ^a, D. Ciangottini ^{a,b}, L. Fanò ^{a,b}, P. Lariccia ^{a,b}, R. Leonardi ^{a,b}, 116

52 G. Mantovani ^{a,b}, M. Menichelli ^a, A. Saha ^a, A. Santocchia ^{a,b} 117

53 118

54 ^a INFN Sezione di Perugia, Perugia, Italy 119

55 ^b Università di Perugia, Perugia, Italy 120

56 121

57 K. Androsov ^{a,31}, P. Azzurri ^{a,16}, G. Bagliesi ^a, J. Bernardini ^a, T. Boccali ^a, R. Castaldi ^a, M.A. Ciocci ^{a,31}, 122

58 R. Dell'Orso ^a, S. Donato ^{a,c}, G. Fedi, A. Giassi ^a, M.T. Grippo ^{a,31}, F. Ligabue ^{a,c}, T. Lomtadze ^a, L. Martini ^{a,b}, 123

59 A. Messineo ^{a,b}, F. Palla ^a, A. Rizzi ^{a,b}, A. Savoy-Navarro ^{a,32}, P. Spagnolo ^a, R. Tenchini ^a, G. Tonelli ^{a,b}, 124

60 A. Venturi ^a, P.G. Verdini ^a 125

61 126

62 ^a INFN Sezione di Pisa, Pisa, Italy 127

63 ^b Università di Pisa, Pisa, Italy 128

64 ^c Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Pisa, Italy 129

65 130

1 L. Barone ^{a,b}, F. Cavallari ^a, M. Cipriani ^{a,b}, D. Del Re ^{a,b,16}, M. Diemoz ^a, S. Gelli ^{a,b}, E. Longo ^{a,b},
 2 F. Margaroli ^{a,b}, B. Marzocchi ^{a,b}, P. Meridiani ^a, G. Organtini ^{a,b}, R. Paramatti ^a, F. Preiato ^{a,b},
 3 S. Rahatlou ^{a,b}, C. Rovelli ^a, F. Santanastasio ^{a,b}

4
 5 ^a INFN Sezione di Roma, Roma, Italy

6 ^b Università di Roma, Roma, Italy

7
 8 N. Amapane ^{a,b}, R. Arcidiacono ^{a,c,16}, S. Argiro ^{a,b}, M. Arneodo ^{a,c}, N. Bartosik ^a, R. Bellan ^{a,b}, C. Biino ^a,
 9 N. Cartiglia ^a, F. Cenna ^{a,b}, M. Costa ^{a,b}, R. Covarelli ^{a,b}, A. Degano ^{a,b}, N. Demaria ^a, L. Finco ^{a,b}, B. Kiani ^{a,b},
 10 C. Mariotti ^a, S. Maselli ^a, E. Migliore ^{a,b}, V. Monaco ^{a,b}, E. Monteil ^{a,b}, M. Monteno ^a, M.M. Obertino ^{a,b},
 11 L. Pacher ^{a,b}, N. Pastrone ^a, M. Pelliccioni ^a, G.L. Pinna Angioni ^{a,b}, F. Ravera ^{a,b}, A. Romero ^{a,b}, M. Ruspa ^{a,c},
 12 R. Sacchi ^{a,b}, K. Shchelina ^{a,b}, V. Sola ^a, A. Solano ^{a,b}, A. Staiano ^a, P. Traczyk ^{a,b}

13
 14
 15 ^a INFN Sezione di Torino, Torino, Italy

16 ^b Università di Torino, Torino, Italy

17 ^c Università del Piemonte Orientale, Novara, Italy

18 S. Belforte ^a, M. Casarsa ^a, F. Cossutti ^a, G. Della Ricca ^{a,b}, A. Zanetti ^a

19
 20 ^a INFN Sezione di Trieste, Trieste, Italy

21 ^b Università di Trieste, Trieste, Italy

22
 23 D.H. Kim, G.N. Kim, M.S. Kim, S. Lee, S.W. Lee, Y.D. Oh, S. Sekmen, D.C. Son, Y.C. Yang

24
 25 *Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Republic of Korea*

26
 27 A. Lee

28
 29 *Chonbuk National University, Jeonju, Republic of Korea*

30
 31 H. Kim

32
 33 *Chonnam National University, Institute for Universe and Elementary Particles, Kwangju, Republic of Korea*

34
 35 J.A. Brochero Cifuentes, T.J. Kim

36
 37 *Hanyang University, Seoul, Republic of Korea*

38
 39 S. Cho, S. Choi, Y. Go, D. Gyun, S. Ha, B. Hong, Y. Jo, Y. Kim, B. Lee, K. Lee, K.S. Lee, S. Lee, J. Lim,
 40 S.K. Park, Y. Roh

41
 42 *Korea University, Seoul, Republic of Korea*

43
 44 J. Almond, J. Kim, H. Lee, S.B. Oh, B.C. Radburn-Smith, S.h. Seo, U.K. Yang, H.D. Yoo, G.B. Yu

45
 46 *Seoul National University, Seoul, Republic of Korea*

47
 48 M. Choi, H. Kim, J.H. Kim, J.S.H. Lee, I.C. Park, G. Ryu, M.S. Ryu

49
 50 *University of Seoul, Seoul, Republic of Korea*

51
 52 Y. Choi, J. Goh, C. Hwang, J. Lee, I. Yu

53
 54 *Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon, Republic of Korea*

55
 56 V. Dudenas, A. Juodagalvis, J. Vaitkus

57
 58 *Vilnius University, Vilnius, Lithuania*

59
 60 I. Ahmed, Z.A. Ibrahim, J.R. Komaragiri, M.A.B. Md Ali ³³, F. Mohamad Idris ³⁴, W.A.T. Wan Abdullah,
 61 M.N. Yusli, Z. Zolkapli

62
 63 *National Centre for Particle Physics, Universiti Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia*

1 H. Castilla-Valdez, E. De La Cruz-Burelo, I. Heredia-De La Cruz³⁵, A. Hernandez-Almada,
2 R. Lopez-Fernandez, R. Magaña Villalba, J. Mejia Guisao, A. Sanchez-Hernandez

3
4 *Centro de Investigacion y de Estudios Avanzados del IPN, Mexico City, Mexico*

5
6 S. Carrillo Moreno, C. Oropeza Barrera, F. Vazquez Valencia

7
8 *Universidad Iberoamericana, Mexico City, Mexico*

9
10 S. Carpitneyro, I. Pedraza, H.A. Salazar Ibarquen, C. Uribe Estrada

11
12 *Benemerita Universidad Autonoma de Puebla, Puebla, Mexico*

13
14 A. Morelos Pineda

15
16 *Universidad Autónoma de San Luis Potosí, San Luis Potosí, Mexico*

17
18 D. Krofcheck

19
20 *University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand*

21
22 P.H. Butler

23
24 *University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand*

25
26 A. Ahmad, M. Ahmad, Q. Hassan, H.R. Hoorani, W.A. Khan, A. Saddique, M.A. Shah, M. Shoaib, M. Waqas

27
28 *National Centre for Physics, Quaid-I-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan*

29
30 H. Bialkowska, M. Bluj, B. Boimska, T. Frueboes, M. Górski, M. Kazana, K. Nawrocki,
31 K. Romanowska-Rybinska, M. Szleper, P. Zalewski

32
33 *National Centre for Nuclear Research, Swierk, Poland*

34
35 K. Bunkowski, A. Byszuk³⁶, K. Doroba, A. Kalinowski, M. Konecki, J. Krolikowski, M. Misiura,
36 M. Olszewski, M. Walczak

37
38 *Institute of Experimental Physics, Faculty of Physics, University of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland*

39
40 P. Bargassa, C. Beirão Da Cruz E Silva, B. Calpas, A. Di Francesco, P. Faccioli, P.G. Ferreira Parracho,
41 M. Gallinaro, J. Hollar, N. Leonardo, L. Lloret Iglesias, M.V. Nemallapudi, J. Rodrigues Antunes, J. Seixas,
42 O. Toldaiev, D. Vadrucio, J. Varela, P. Vischia

43
44 *Laboratório de Instrumentação e Física Experimental de Partículas, Lisboa, Portugal*

45
46 S. Afanasiev, P. Bunin, M. Gavrilenko, I. Golutvin, I. Gorbunov, A. Kamenev, V. Karjavin, A. Lanev,
47 A. Malakhov, V. Matveev^{37,38}, V. Palichik, V. Perelygin, S. Shmatov, S. Shulha, N. Skatchkov, V. Smirnov,
48 N. Voytishin, A. Zarubin

49
50 *Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia*

51
52 L. Chtchipounov, V. Golovtsov, Y. Ivanov, V. Kim³⁹, E. Kuznetsova⁴⁰, V. Murzin, V. Oreshkin, V. Sulimov,
53 A. Vorobyev

54
55 *Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, Gatchina (St. Petersburg), Russia*

56
57 Yu. Andreev, A. Dermenev, S. Gninenko, N. Golubev, A. Karneyeu, M. Kirsanov, N. Krasnikov,
58 A. Pashenkov, D. Tlisov, A. Toropin

59
60 *Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia*

61
62 V. Epshteyn, V. Gavrilo, N. Lychkovskaya, V. Popov, I. Pozdnyakov, G. Safronov, A. Spiridonov, M. Toms,
63 E. Vlasov, A. Zhokin

64
65 *Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia*

1 A. Bylinkin³⁸

2 *Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Russia*

4 M. Chadeeva⁴¹, R. Chistov⁴¹, S. Polikarpov, V. Rusinov, E. Zhemchugov

6 *National Research Nuclear University, 'Moscow Engineering Physics Institute' (MEPhI), Moscow, Russia*

8 V. Andreev, M. Azarkin³⁸, I. Dremin³⁸, M. Kirakosyan, A. Leonidov³⁸, A. Terkulov

10 *P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia*

12 A. Baskakov, A. Belyaev, E. Boos, V. Bunichev, M. Dubinin⁴², L. Dudko, A. Ershov, V. Klyukhin,
13 O. Kodolova, I. Lokhtin, I. Miagkov, S. Obraztsov, S. Petrushanko, V. Savrin, A. Snigirev

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

17 V. Blinov⁴³, Y. Skovpen⁴³, D. Shtol⁴³

19 *Novosibirsk State University (NSU), Novosibirsk, Russia*

21 I. Azhgirey, I. Bayshev, S. Bitioukov, D. Elumakhov, V. Kachanov, A. Kalinin, D. Konstantinov,
22 V. Krychkin, V. Petrov, R. Ryutin, A. Sobol, S. Troshin, N. Tyurin, A. Uzunian, A. Volkov

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

26 P. Adzic⁴⁴, P. Cirkovic, D. Devetak, M. Dordevic, J. Milosevic, V. Rekovic

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

30 J. Alcaraz Maestre, M. Barrio Luna, E. Calvo, M. Cerrada, M. Chamizo Llatas, N. Colino, B. De La Cruz,
31 A. Delgado Peris, A. Escalante Del Valle, C. Fernandez Bedoya, J.P. Fernández Ramos, J. Flix, M.C. Fouz,
32 P. Garcia-Abia, O. Gonzalez Lopez, S. Goy Lopez, J.M. Hernandez, M.I. Josa, E. Navarro De Martino,
33 A. Pérez-Calero Yzquierdo, J. Puerta Pelayo, A. Quintario Olmeda, I. Redondo, L. Romero, M.S. Soares

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

37 J.F. de Trocóniz, M. Missiroli, D. Moran

39 *Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain*

41 J. Cuevas, J. Fernandez Menendez, I. Gonzalez Caballero, J.R. González Fernández, E. Palencia Cortezon,
42 S. Sanchez Cruz, I. Suárez Andrés, J.M. Vizán Garcia

44 *Universidad de Oviedo, Oviedo, Spain*

46 I.J. Cabrillo, A. Calderon, J.R. Castiñeiras De Saa, E. Curras, M. Fernandez, J. Garcia-Ferrero, G. Gomez,
47 A. Lopez Virto, J. Marco, C. Martinez Rivero, F. Matorras, J. Piedra Gomez, T. Rodrigo, A. Ruiz-Jimeno,
48 L. Scodellaro, N. Trevisani, I. Vila, R. Vilar Cortabitarte

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

52 D. Abbaneo, E. Auffray, G. Auzinger, M. Bachtis, P. Baillon, A.H. Ball, D. Barney, P. Bloch, A. Bocci,
53 A. Bonato, C. Botta, T. Camporesi, R. Castello, M. Cepeda, G. Cerminara, M. D'Alfonso, D. d'Enterria,
54 A. Dabrowski, V. Daponte, A. David, M. De Gruttola, A. De Roeck, E. Di Marco⁴⁵, M. Dobson, B. Dorney,
55 T. du Pree, D. Duggan, M. Dünser, N. Dupont, A. Elliott-Peisert, S. Fartoukh, G. Franzoni, J. Fulcher,
56 W. Funk, D. Gigi, K. Gill, M. Girone, F. Glege, D. Gulhan, S. Gundacker, M. Guthoff, J. Hammer, P. Harris,
57 J. Hegeman, V. Innocente, P. Janot, J. Kieseler, H. Kirschenmann, V. Knünz, A. Kornmayer¹⁶,
58 M.J. Kortelainen, K. Kousouris, M. Kramer¹, C. Lange, P. Lecoq, C. Lourenço, M.T. Lucchini, L. Malgeri,
59 M. Mannelli, A. Martelli, F. Meijers, J.A. Merlin, S. Mersi, E. Meschi, P. Milenovic⁴⁶, F. Moortgat,
60 S. Morovic, M. Mulders, H. Neugebauer, S. Orfanelli, L. Orsini, L. Pape, E. Perez, M. Peruzzi, A. Petrilli,
61 G. Petrucciani, A. Pfeiffer, M. Pierini, A. Racz, T. Reis, G. Rolandi⁴⁷, M. Rovere, M. Ruan, H. Sakulin,

J.B. Sauvan, C. Schäfer, C. Schwick, M. Seidel, A. Sharma, P. Silva, P. Sphicas⁴⁸, J. Steggemann, M. Stoye, Y. Takahashi, M. Tosi, D. Treille, A. Triossi, A. Tsirou, V. Veckalns⁴⁹, G.I. Veres²¹, M. Verweij, N. Wardle, H.K. Wöhri, A. Zagozdinska³⁶, W.D. Zeuner

CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland

W. Bertl, K. Deiters, W. Erdmann, R. Horisberger, Q. Ingram, H.C. Kaestli, D. Kotlinski, U. Langenegger, T. Rohe

Paul Scherrer Institut, Villigen, Switzerland

F. Bachmair, L. Bäni, L. Bianchini, B. Casal, G. Dissertori, M. Dittmar, M. Donegà, C. Grab, C. Heidegger, D. Hits, J. Hoss, G. Kasieczka, P. Lecomte[†], W. Lustermann, B. Mangano, M. Marionneau, P. Martinez Ruiz del Arbol, M. Masciovecchio, M.T. Meinhard, D. Meister, F. Micheli, P. Musella, F. Nessi-Tedaldi, F. Pandolfi, J. Pata, F. Pauss, G. Perrin, L. Perrozzi, M. Quittnat, M. Rossini, M. Schönenberger, A. Starodumov⁵⁰, V.R. Tavolaro, K. Theofilatos, R. Wallny

Institute for Particle Physics, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

T.K. Aarrestad, C. Amsler⁵¹, L. Caminada, M.F. Canelli, A. De Cosa, C. Galloni, A. Hinzmann, T. Hreus, B. Kilminster, J. Ngadiuba, D. Pinna, G. Rauco, P. Robmann, D. Salerno, Y. Yang, A. Zucchetta

Universität Zürich, Zurich, Switzerland

V. Candelise, T.H. Doan, Sh. Jain, R. Khurana, M. Konyushikhin, C.M. Kuo, W. Lin, Y.J. Lu, A. Pozdnyakov, S.S. Yu

National Central University, Chung-Li, Taiwan

Arun Kumar, P. Chang, Y.H. Chang, Y.W. Chang, Y. Chao, K.F. Chen, P.H. Chen, C. Dietz, F. Fiori, W.-S. Hou, Y. Hsiung, Y.F. Liu, R.-S. Lu, M. Miñano Moya, E. Paganis, A. Psallidas, J.f. Tsai, Y.M. Tzeng

National Taiwan University (NTU), Taipei, Taiwan

B. Asavapibhop, G. Singh, N. Srimanobhas, N. Suwonjandee

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

A. Adiguzel, S. Cerci⁵², S. Damarseckin, Z.S. Demiroglu, C. Dozen, I. Dumanoglu, S. Girgis, G. Gokbulut, Y. Guler, I. Hos⁵³, E.E. Kangal⁵⁴, O. Kara, A. Kayis Topaksu, U. Kiminsu, M. Oglakci, G. Onengut⁵⁵, K. Ozdemir⁵⁶, D. Sunar Cerci⁵², B. Tali⁵², S. Turkcapar, I.S. Zorbakir, C. Zorbilmez

Cukurova University, Adana, Turkey

B. Bilin, S. Bilmis, B. Isildak⁵⁷, G. Karapinar⁵⁸, M. Yalvac, M. Zeyrek

Middle East Technical University, Physics Department, Ankara, Turkey

E. Gülmez, M. Kaya⁵⁹, O. Kaya⁶⁰, E.A. Yetkin⁶¹, T. Yetkin⁶²

Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey

A. Cakir, K. Cankocak, S. Sen⁶³

Istanbul Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey

B. Grynyov

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

L. Levchuk, P. Sorokin

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

1 R. Aggleton, F. Ball, L. Beck, J.J. Brooke, D. Burns, E. Clement, D. Cussans, H. Flacher, J. Goldstein, 66
2 M. Grimes, G.P. Heath, H.F. Heath, J. Jacob, L. Kreczko, C. Lucas, D.M. Newbold⁶⁴, S. Paramesvaran, 67
3 A. Poll, T. Sakuma, S. Seif El Nasr-storey, D. Smith, V.J. Smith 68
4 69

5 *University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom* 70
6 71

7 K.W. Bell, A. Belyaev⁶⁵, C. Brew, R.M. Brown, L. Calligaris, D. Cieri, D.J.A. Cockerill, J.A. Coughlan, 72
8 K. Harder, S. Harper, E. Olaiya, D. Petyt, C.H. Shepherd-Themistocleous, A. Thea, I.R. Tomalin, T. Williams 73
9 74

10 *Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom* 75
11 76

12 M. Baber, R. Bainbridge, O. Buchmuller, A. Bundock, D. Burton, S. Casasso, M. Citron, D. Colling, L. Corpe, 77
13 P. Dauncey, G. Davies, A. De Wit, M. Della Negra, R. Di Maria, P. Dunne, A. Elwood, D. Futyan, Y. Haddad, 78
14 G. Hall, G. Iles, T. James, R. Lane, C. Laner, R. Lucas⁶⁴, L. Lyons, A.-M. Magnan, S. Malik, L. Mastrolorenzo, 79
15 J. Nash, A. Nikitenko⁵⁰, J. Pela, B. Penning, M. Pesaresi, D.M. Raymond, A. Richards, A. Rose, C. Seez, 80
16 S. Summers, A. Tapper, K. Uchida, M. Vazquez Acosta⁶⁶, T. Virdee¹⁶, J. Wright, S.C. Zenz 81
17 82
18 83

19 *Imperial College, London, United Kingdom* 84
20 85

21 J.E. Cole, P.R. Hobson, A. Khan, P. Kyberd, D. Leslie, I.D. Reid, P. Symonds, L. Teodorescu, M. Turner 86
22 87

23 *Brunel University, Uxbridge, United Kingdom* 88
24 89

25 A. Borzou, K. Call, J. Dittmann, K. Hatakeyama, H. Liu, N. Pastika 90
26 91

27 *Baylor University, Waco, USA* 92
28 93

29 S.I. Cooper, C. Henderson, P. Rumerio, C. West 94
30 95

31 *The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, USA* 96
32 97

33 D. Arcaro, A. Avetisyan, T. Bose, D. Gastler, D. Rankin, C. Richardson, J. Rohlf, L. Sulak, D. Zou 98
34 99

35 *Boston University, Boston, USA* 100
36 101

37 G. Benelli, E. Berry, D. Cutts, A. Garabedian, J. Hakala, U. Heintz, J.M. Hogan, O. Jesus, K.H.M. Kwok, 102
38 E. Laird, G. Landsberg, Z. Mao, M. Narain, S. Piperov, S. Sagir, E. Spencer, R. Syarif 103
39 104

40 *Brown University, Providence, USA* 105
41 106

42 R. Breedon, G. Breto, D. Burns, M. Calderon De La Barca Sanchez, S. Chauhan, M. Chertok, J. Conway, 107
43 R. Conway, P.T. Cox, R. Erbacher, C. Flores, G. Funk, M. Gardner, W. Ko, R. Lander, C. Mclean, 108
44 M. Mulhearn, D. Pellett, J. Pilot, S. Shalhout, J. Smith, M. Squires, D. Stolp, M. Tripathi 109
45 110

46 *University of California, Davis, Davis, USA* 111
47 112

48 C. Bravo, R. Cousins, A. Dasgupta, P. Everaerts, A. Florent, J. Hauser, M. Ignatenko, N. Mccoll, D. Saltzberg, 113
49 C. Schnaible, E. Takasugi, V. Valuev, M. Weber 114
50 115

51 *University of California, Los Angeles, USA* 116
52 117

53 K. Burt, R. Clare, J. Ellison, J.W. Gary, S.M.A. Ghiasi Shirazi, G. Hanson, J. Heilman, P. Jandir, E. Kennedy, 118
54 F. Lacroix, O.R. Long, M. Olmedo Negrete, M.I. Paneva, A. Shrinivas, W. Si, H. Wei, S. Wimpenny, 119
55 B.R. Yates 120
56 121

57 *University of California, Riverside, Riverside, USA* 122
58 123

59 J.G. Branson, G.B. Cerati, S. Cittolin, M. Derdzinski, A. Holzner, D. Klein, V. Krutelyov, J. Letts, I. Macneill, 124
60 D. Olivito, S. Padhi, M. Pieri, M. Sani, V. Sharma, S. Simon, M. Tadel, A. Vartak, S. Wasserbaech⁶⁷, 125
61 C. Welke, J. Wood, F. Würthwein, A. Yagil, G. Zevi Della Porta 126
62 127

63 *University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, USA* 128
64 129
65 130

1 N. Amin, R. Bhandari, J. Bradmiller-Feld, C. Campagnari, A. Dishaw, V. Dutta, M. Franco Sevilla, C. George, 66
 2 F. Golf, L. Gouskos, J. Gran, R. Heller, J. Incandela, S.D. Mullin, A. Ovcharova, H. Qu, J. Richman, D. Stuart, 67
 3 I. Suarez, J. Yoo 68
 4 69

5 *University of California, Santa Barbara, Department of Physics, Santa Barbara, USA* 70
 6 71

7 D. Anderson, A. Apresyan, J. Bendavid, A. Bornheim, J. Bunn, Y. Chen, J. Duarte, J.M. Lawhorn, A. Mott, 72
 8 H.B. Newman, C. Pena, M. Spiropulu, J.R. Vlimant, S. Xie, R.Y. Zhu 73
 9 74

10 *California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA* 75
 11 76

12 M.B. Andrews, V. Azzolini, T. Ferguson, M. Paulini, J. Russ, M. Sun, H. Vogel, I. Vorobiev, M. Weinberg 77
 13 78

14 *Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, USA* 79
 15 80

16 J.P. Cumalat, W.T. Ford, F. Jensen, A. Johnson, M. Krohn, T. Mulholland, K. Stenson, S.R. Wagner 81
 17 82

18 *University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, USA* 83
 19 84

20 J. Alexander, J. Chaves, J. Chu, S. Dittmer, K. Mcdermott, N. Mirman, G. Nicolas Kaufman, J.R. Patterson, 85
 21 A. Rinkevicius, A. Ryd, L. Skinnari, L. Soffi, S.M. Tan, Z. Tao, J. Thom, J. Tucker, P. Wittich, M. Zientek 86
 22 87

23 *Cornell University, Ithaca, USA* 88
 24 89

25 D. Winn 90
 26 91

27 *Fairfield University, Fairfield, USA* 92
 28 93

29 S. Abdullin, M. Albrow, G. Apollinari, S. Banerjee, L.A.T. Bauerdick, A. Beretvas, J. Berryhill, P.C. Bhat, 94
 30 G. Bolla, K. Burkett, J.N. Butler, H.W.K. Cheung, F. Chlebana, S. Cihangir[†], M. Cremonesi, V.D. Elvira, 95
 31 I. Fisk, J. Freeman, E. Gottschalk, L. Gray, D. Green, S. Grünendahl, O. Gutsche, D. Hare, R.M. Harris, 96
 32 S. Hasegawa, J. Hirschauer, Z. Hu, B. Jayatilaka, S. Jindariani, M. Johnson, U. Joshi, B. Klima, B. Kreis, 97
 33 S. Lammel, J. Linacre, D. Lincoln, R. Lipton, T. Liu, R. Lopes De Sá, J. Lykken, K. Maeshima, N. Magini, 98
 34 J.M. Marraffino, S. Maruyama, D. Mason, P. McBride, P. Merkel, S. Mrenna, S. Nahn, C. Newman-Holmes[†], 99
 35 V. O'Dell, K. Pedro, O. Prokofyev, G. Rakness, L. Ristori, E. Sexton-Kennedy, A. Soha, W.J. Spalding, 100
 36 L. Spiegel, S. Stoynev, N. Strobbe, L. Taylor, S. Tkaczyk, N.V. Tran, L. Uplegger, E.W. Vaandering, 101
 37 C. Vernieri, M. Verzocchi, R. Vidal, M. Wang, H.A. Weber, A. Whitbeck, Y. Wu 102
 38 103
 39 104

40 *Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, USA* 105
 41 106

42 D. Acosta, P. Avery, P. Bortignon, D. Bourilkov, A. Brinkerhoff, A. Carnes, M. Carver, D. Curry, S. Das, 107
 43 R.D. Field, I.K. Furic, J. Konigsberg, A. Korytov, J.F. Low, P. Ma, K. Matchev, H. Mei, G. Mitselmakher, 108
 44 D. Rank, L. Shchutska, D. Sperka, L. Thomas, J. Wang, S. Wang, J. Yelton 109
 45 110

46 *University of Florida, Gainesville, USA* 111
 47 112

48 S. Linn, P. Markowitz, G. Martinez, J.L. Rodriguez 113
 49 114

50 *Florida International University, Miami, USA* 115
 51 116

52 A. Ackert, J.R. Adams, T. Adams, A. Askew, S. Bein, B. Diamond, S. Hagopian, V. Hagopian, K.F. Johnson, 117
 53 A. Khatiwada, H. Prosper, A. Santra, R. Yohay 118
 54 119

55 *Florida State University, Tallahassee, USA* 120
 56 121

57 M.M. Baarmand, V. Bhopatkar, S. Colafranceschi, M. Hohlmann, D. Noonan, T. Roy, F. Yumiceva 122
 58 123

59 *Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, USA* 124
 60 125

61 M.R. Adams, L. Apanasevich, D. Berry, R.R. Betts, I. Bucinskaite, R. Cavanaugh, O. Evdokimov, L. Gauthier, 126
 62 C.E. Gerber, D.J. Hofman, K. Jung, P. Kurt, C. O'Brien, I.D. Sandoval Gonzalez, P. Turner, N. Varelas, 127
 63 H. Wang, Z. Wu, M. Zakaria, J. Zhang 128
 64 129
 65 130

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

2
3 B. Bilki⁶⁸, W. Clarida, K. Dilsiz, S. Durgut, R.P. Gandrajula, M. Haytmyradov, V. Khristenko, J.-P. Merlo,
4 H. Mermerkaya⁶⁹, A. Mestvirishvili, A. Moeller, J. Nachtman, H. Ogul, Y. Onel, F. Ozok⁷⁰, A. Penzo,
5 C. Snyder, E. Tiras, J. Wetzel, K. Yi

6
7 The University of Iowa, Iowa City, USA

8
9 I. Anderson, B. Blumenfeld, A. Cocoros, N. Eminizer, D. Fehling, L. Feng, A.V. Gritsan, P. Maksimovic,
10 C. Martin, M. Osherson, J. Roskes, U. Sarica, M. Swartz, M. Xiao, Y. Xin, C. You

11
12 Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA

13
14 A. Al-bataineh, P. Baringer, A. Bean, S. Boren, J. Bowen, C. Bruner, J. Castle, L. Forthomme, R.P. Kenny III,
15 S. Khalil, A. Kropivnitskaya, D. Majumder, W. Mcbrayer, M. Murray, S. Sanders, R. Stringer,
16 J.D. Tapia Takaki, Q. Wang

17
18 The University of Kansas, Lawrence, USA

19
20 A. Ivanov, K. Kaadze, Y. Maravin, A. Mohammadi, L.K. Saini, N. Skhirtladze, S. Toda

21
22 Kansas State University, Manhattan, USA

23
24 F. Rebassoo, D. Wright

25
26 Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, USA

27
28 C. Anelli, A. Baden, O. Baron, A. Belloni, B. Calvert, S.C. Eno, C. Ferraioli, J.A. Gomez, N.J. Hadley,
29 S. Jabeen, R.G. Kellogg, T. Kolberg, J. Kunkle, Y. Lu, A.C. Mignerey, F. Ricci-Tam, Y.H. Shin, A. Skuja,
30 M.B. Tonjes, S.C. Tonwar

31
32 University of Maryland, College Park, USA

33
34 D. Abercrombie, B. Allen, A. Apyan, R. Barbieri, A. Baty, R. Bi, K. Bierwagen, S. Brandt, W. Busza, I.A. Cali,
35 Z. Demiragli, L. Di Matteo, G. Gomez Ceballos, M. Goncharov, D. Hsu, Y. Iiyama, G.M. Innocenti, M. Klute,
36 D. Kovalskyi, K. Krajczar, Y.S. Lai, Y.-J. Lee, A. Levin, P.D. Luckey, B. Maier, A.C. Marini, C. McGinn,
37 C. Mironov, S. Narayanan, X. Niu, C. Paus, C. Roland, G. Roland, J. Salfeld-Nebgen, G.S.F. Stephans,
38 K. Sumorok, K. Tatar, M. Varma, D. Velicanu, J. Veverka, J. Wang, T.W. Wang, B. Wyslouch, M. Yang,
39 V. Zhukova

40
41
42 Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, USA

43
44 A.C. Benvenuti, R.M. Chatterjee, A. Evans, A. Finkel, A. Gude, P. Hansen, S. Kalafut, S.C. Kao, Y. Kubota,
45 Z. Lesko, J. Mans, S. Nourbakhsh, N. Ruckstuhl, R. Rusack, N. Tambe, J. Turkewitz

46
47 University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, USA

48
49 J.G. Acosta, S. Oliveros

50
51 University of Mississippi, Oxford, USA

52
53 E. Avdeeva, R. Bartek⁷¹, K. Bloom, D.R. Claes, A. Dominguez⁷¹, C. Fangmeier, R. Gonzalez Suarez,
54 R. Kamalieddin, I. Kravchenko, A. Malta Rodrigues, F. Meier, J. Monroy, J.E. Siado, G.R. Snow, B. Stieger

55
56 University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, USA

57
58 M. Alyari, J. Dolen, J. George, A. Godshalk, C. Harrington, I. Iashvili, J. Kaisen, A. Kharchilava, A. Kumar,
59 A. Parker, S. Rappoccio, B. Roozbahani

60
61 State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, USA

62
63 G. Alverson, E. Barberis, A. Hortiangtham, A. Massironi, D.M. Morse, D. Nash, T. Orimoto,
64 R. Teixeira De Lima, D. Trocino, R.-J. Wang, D. Wood

1 *Northeastern University, Boston, USA*

2
3 **S. Bhattacharya, O. Charaf, K.A. Hahn, A. Kubik, A. Kumar, N. Mucia, N. Odell, B. Pollack, M.H. Schmitt,**
4 **K. Sung, M. Trovato, M. Velasco**

5
6 *Northwestern University, Evanston, USA*

7
8 **N. Dev, M. Hildreth, K. Hurtado Anampa, C. Jessop, D.J. Karmgard, N. Kellams, K. Lannon, N. Marinelli,**
9 **F. Meng, C. Mueller, Y. Musienko³⁷, M. Planer, A. Reinsvold, R. Ruchti, G. Smith, S. Taroni, M. Wayne,**
10 **M. Wolf, A. Woodard**

11
12 *University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, USA*

13
14 **J. Alimena, L. Antonelli, J. Brinson, B. Bylsma, L.S. Durkin, S. Flowers, B. Francis, A. Hart, C. Hill,**
15 **R. Hughes, W. Ji, B. Liu, W. Luo, D. Puigh, B.L. Winer, H.W. Wulsin**

16
17 *The Ohio State University, Columbus, USA*

18
19 **S. Cooperstein, O. Driga, P. Elmer, J. Hardenbrook, P. Hebda, D. Lange, J. Luo, D. Marlow, J. Mc Donald,**
20 **T. Medvedeva, K. Mei, M. Mooney, J. Olsen, C. Palmer, P. Piroué, D. Stickland, A. Svyatkovskiy, C. Tully,**
21 **A. Zuranski**

22
23 *Princeton University, Princeton, USA*

24
25 **S. Malik**

26
27 *University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez, USA*

28
29 **A. Barker, V.E. Barnes, S. Folgueras, L. Gutay, M.K. Jha, M. Jones, A.W. Jung, D.H. Miller, N. Neumeister,**
30 **J.F. Schulte, X. Shi, J. Sun, F. Wang, W. Xie**

31
32 *Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA*

33
34 **N. Parashar, J. Stupak**

35
36 *Purdue University Calumet, Hammond, USA*

37
38 **A. Adair, B. Akgun, Z. Chen, K.M. Ecklund, F.J.M. Geurts, M. Guilbaud, W. Li, B. Michlin, M. Northup,**
39 **B.P. Padley, R. Redjimi, J. Roberts, J. Rorie, Z. Tu, J. Zabel**

40
41 *Rice University, Houston, USA*

42
43 **B. Betchart, A. Bodek, P. de Barbaro, R. Demina, Y.t. Duh, T. Ferbel, M. Galanti, A. Garcia-Bellido, J. Han,**
44 **O. Hindrichs, A. Khukhunaishvili, K.H. Lo, P. Tan, M. Verzetti**

45
46 *University of Rochester, Rochester, USA*

47
48 **A. Agapitos, J.P. Chou, E. Contreras-Campana, Y. Gershtein, T.A. Gómez Espinosa, E. Halkiadakis,**
49 **M. Heindl, D. Hidas, E. Hughes, S. Kaplan, R. Kunnawalkam Elayavalli, S. Kyriacou, A. Lath, K. Nash,**
50 **H. Saka, S. Salur, S. Schnetzer, D. Sheffield, S. Somalwar, R. Stone, S. Thomas, P. Thomassen, M. Walker**

51
52 *Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, Piscataway, USA*

53
54 **A.G. Delannoy, M. Foerster, J. Heideman, G. Riley, K. Rose, S. Spanier, K. Thapa**

55
56 *University of Tennessee, Knoxville, USA*

57
58 **O. Bouhali⁷², A. Celik, M. Dalchenko, M. De Mattia, A. Delgado, S. Dildick, R. Eusebi, J. Gilmore, T. Huang,**
59 **E. Juska, T. Kamon⁷³, R. Mueller, Y. Pakhotin, R. Patel, A. Perloff, L. Perniè, D. Rathjens, A. Rose,**
60 **A. Safonov, A. Tatarinov, K.A. Ulmer**

61
62 *Texas A&M University, College Station, USA*

63
64
65

66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130

1 N. Akchurin, C. Cowden, J. Damgov, F. De Guio, C. Dragoiu, P.R. Duerdo, J. Faulkner, E. Gurpinar,
2 S. Kunori, K. Lamichhane, S.W. Lee, T. Libeiro, T. Peltola, S. Undleeb, I. Volobouev, Z. Wang

3
4 *Texas Tech University, Lubbock, USA*

5
6 S. Greene, A. Gurrola, R. Janjam, W. Johns, C. Maguire, A. Melo, H. Ni, P. Sheldon, S. Tuo, J. Velkovska,
7 Q. Xu

8
9 *Vanderbilt University, Nashville, USA*

10
11 M.W. Arenton, P. Barria, B. Cox, J. Goodell, R. Hirosky, A. Ledovskoy, H. Li, C. Neu, T. Sinthuprasith,
12 X. Sun, Y. Wang, E. Wolfe, F. Xia

13
14 *University of Virginia, Charlottesville, USA*

15
16 C. Clarke, R. Harr, P.E. Karchin, J. Sturdy

17
18 *Wayne State University, Detroit, USA*

19
20 D.A. Belknap, C. Caillol, S. Dasu, L. Dodd, S. Duric, B. Gomber, M. Grothe, M. Herndon, A. Hervé,
21 P. Klabbers, A. Lanaro, A. Levine, K. Long, R. Loveless, I. Ojalvo, T. Perry, G.A. Pierro, G. Polese, T. Ruggles,
22 A. Savin, N. Smith, W.H. Smith, D. Taylor, N. Woods

23
24 *University of Wisconsin – Madison, Madison, WI, USA*

25
26 † Deceased.

27
28 1 Also at Vienna University of Technology, Vienna, Austria.

29 2 Also at State Key Laboratory of Nuclear Physics and Technology, Peking University, Beijing, China.

30 3 Also at Institut Pluridisciplinaire Hubert Curien, Université de Strasbourg, Université de Haute Alsace Mulhouse, CNRS/IN2P3, Strasbourg, France.

31 4 Also at Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, Brazil.

32 5 Also at Universidade Federal de Pelotas, Pelotas, Brazil.

33 6 Also at Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium.

34 7 Also at Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Hamburg, Germany.

35 8 Also at Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia.

36 9 Also at Helwan University, Cairo, Egypt.

37 10 Now at Zewail City of Science and Technology, Zewail, Egypt.

38 11 Also at Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt.

39 12 Also at British University in Egypt, Cairo, Egypt.

40 13 Also at Université de Haute Alsace, Mulhouse, France.

41 14 Also at Skobeltsyn Institute of Nuclear Physics, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia.

42 15 Also at Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia.

43 16 Also at CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland.

44 17 Also at RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut A, Aachen, Germany.

45 18 Also at University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany.

46 19 Also at Brandenburg University of Technology, Cottbus, Germany.

47 20 Also at Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary.

48 21 Also at MTA-ELTE Lendület CMS Particle and Nuclear Physics Group, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary.

49 22 Also at University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary.

50 23 Also at Indian Institute of Science Education and Research, Bhopal, India.

51 24 Also at Institute of Physics, Bhubaneswar, India.

52 25 Also at University of Visva-Bharati, Santiniketan, India.

53 26 Also at University of Ruhuna, Matara, Sri Lanka.

54 27 Also at Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, Iran.

55 28 Also at University of Tehran, Department of Engineering Science, Tehran, Iran.

56 29 Also at Yazd University, Yazd, Iran.

57 30 Also at Plasma Physics Research Center, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.

58 31 Also at Università degli Studi di Siena, Siena, Italy.

59 32 Also at Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA.

60 33 Also at International Islamic University of Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

61 34 Also at Malaysian Nuclear Agency, MOSTI, Kajang, Malaysia.

62 35 Also at Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología, Mexico city, Mexico.

63 36 Also at Warsaw University of Technology, Institute of Electronic Systems, Warsaw, Poland.

64 37 Also at Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia.

65 38 Now at National Research Nuclear University 'Moscow Engineering Physics Institute' (MEPhI), Moscow, Russia.

39 Also at St. Petersburg State Polytechnical University, St. Petersburg, Russia.

40 Also at University of Florida, Gainesville, USA.

41 Also at P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia.

1	42	Also at California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA.	66
2	43	Also at Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, Novosibirsk, Russia.	67
3	44	Also at Faculty of Physics, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia.	68
4	45	Also at INFN Sezione di Roma; Università di Roma, Roma, Italy.	69
5	46	Also at University of Belgrade, Faculty of Physics and Vinca Institute of Nuclear Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia.	70
6	47	Also at Scuola Normale e Sezione dell'INFN, Pisa, Italy.	71
7	48	Also at National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece.	72
8	49	Also at Riga Technical University, Riga, Latvia.	73
9	50	Also at Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia.	74
10	51	Also at Albert Einstein Center for Fundamental Physics, Bern, Switzerland.	75
11	52	Also at Adiyaman University, Adiyaman, Turkey.	76
12	53	Also at Istanbul Aydin University, Istanbul, Turkey.	77
13	54	Also at Mersin University, Mersin, Turkey.	78
14	55	Also at Cag University, Mersin, Turkey.	79
15	56	Also at Piri Reis University, Istanbul, Turkey.	80
16	57	Also at Ozyegin University, Istanbul, Turkey.	81
17	58	Also at Izmir Institute of Technology, Izmir, Turkey.	82
18	59	Also at Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey.	83
19	60	Also at Kafkas University, Kars, Turkey.	84
20	61	Also at Istanbul Bilgi University, Istanbul, Turkey.	85
21	62	Also at Yildiz Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey.	86
22	63	Also at Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.	87
23	64	Also at Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom.	88
24	65	Also at School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southampton, Southampton, United Kingdom.	89
25	66	Also at Instituto de Astrofísica de Canarias, La Laguna, Spain.	90
26	67	Also at Utah Valley University, Orem, USA.	91
27	68	Also at Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, USA.	92
28	69	Also at Erzincan University, Erzincan, Turkey.	93
29	70	Also at Mimar Sinan University, Istanbul, Istanbul, Turkey.	94
30	71	Now at The Catholic University of America, Washington, USA.	95
31	72	Also at Texas A&M University at Qatar, Doha, Qatar.	96
32	73	Also at Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Republic of Korea.	97
33			98
34			99
35			100
36			101
37			102
38			103
39			104
40			105
41			106
42			107
43			108
44			109
45			110
46			111
47			112
48			113
49			114
50			115
51			116
52			117
53			118
54			119
55			120
56			121
57			122
58			123
59			124
60			125
61			126
62			127
63			128
64			129
65			130