

# Precise measurement of the top quark mass from lepton+jets events

V.M. Abazov<sup>36</sup>, B. Abbott<sup>75</sup>, M. Abolins<sup>65</sup>, B.S. Acharya<sup>29</sup>, M. Adams<sup>51</sup>, T. Adams<sup>49</sup>, E. Aguilo<sup>6</sup>, M. Ahsan<sup>59</sup>, G.D. Alexeev<sup>36</sup>, G. Alkhazov<sup>40</sup>, A. Alton<sup>64,a</sup>, G. Alverson<sup>63</sup>, G.A. Alves<sup>2</sup>, M. Anastasoiaie<sup>35</sup>, L.S. Ancu<sup>35</sup>, T. Andeen<sup>53</sup>, B. Andrieu<sup>17</sup>, M.S. Anzels<sup>53</sup>, M. Aoki<sup>50</sup>, Y. Arnoud<sup>14</sup>, M. Arov<sup>60</sup>, M. Arthaud<sup>18</sup>, A. Askew<sup>49</sup>, B. Åsman<sup>41</sup>, A.C.S. Assis Jesus<sup>3</sup>, O. Atramentov<sup>49</sup>, C. Avila<sup>8</sup>, F. Badaud<sup>13</sup>, L. Bagby<sup>50</sup>, B. Baldin<sup>50</sup>, D.V. Bandurin<sup>59</sup>, P. Banerjee<sup>29</sup>, S. Banerjee<sup>29</sup>, E. Barberis<sup>63</sup>, A.-F. Barfuss<sup>15</sup>, P. Bargassa<sup>80</sup>, P. Baringer<sup>58</sup>, J. Barreto<sup>2</sup>, J.F. Bartlett<sup>50</sup>, U. Bassler<sup>18</sup>, D. Bauer<sup>43</sup>, S. Beale<sup>6</sup>, A. Bean<sup>58</sup>, M. Begalli<sup>3</sup>, M. Begel<sup>73</sup>, C. Belanger-Champagne<sup>41</sup>, L. Bellantoni<sup>50</sup>, A. Bellavance<sup>50</sup>, J.A. Benitez<sup>65</sup>, S.B. Beri<sup>27</sup>, G. Bernardi<sup>17</sup>, R. Bernhard<sup>23</sup>, I. Bertram<sup>42</sup>, M. Besançon<sup>18</sup>, R. Beuselinck<sup>43</sup>, V.A. Bezzubov<sup>39</sup>, P.C. Bhat<sup>50</sup>, V. Bhatnagar<sup>27</sup>, C. Biscarat<sup>20</sup>, G. Blazey<sup>52</sup>, F. Blekman<sup>43</sup>, S. Blessing<sup>49</sup>, D. Bloch<sup>19</sup>, K. Bloom<sup>67</sup>, A. Boehnlein<sup>50</sup>, D. Boline<sup>62</sup>, T.A. Bolton<sup>59</sup>, E.E. Boos<sup>38</sup>, G. Borissov<sup>42</sup>, T. Bose<sup>77</sup>, A. Brandt<sup>78</sup>, R. Brock<sup>65</sup>, G. Brooijmans<sup>70</sup>, A. Bross<sup>50</sup>, D. Brown<sup>81</sup>, X.B. Bu<sup>7</sup>, N.J. Buchanan<sup>49</sup>, D. Buchholz<sup>53</sup>, M. Buehler<sup>81</sup>, V. Buescher<sup>22</sup>, V. Bunichev<sup>38</sup>, S. Burdin<sup>42,b</sup>, T.H. Burnett<sup>82</sup>, C.P. Buszello<sup>43</sup>, J.M. Butler<sup>62</sup>, P. Calfayan<sup>25</sup>, S. Calvet<sup>16</sup>, J. Cammin<sup>71</sup>, E. Carrera<sup>49</sup>, W. Carvalho<sup>3</sup>, B.C.K. Casey<sup>50</sup>, H. Castilla-Valdez<sup>33</sup>, S. Chakrabarti<sup>18</sup>, D. Chakraborty<sup>52</sup>, K.M. Chan<sup>55</sup>, A. Chandra<sup>48</sup>, E. Cheu<sup>45</sup>, F. Chevallier<sup>14</sup>, D.K. Cho<sup>62</sup>, S. Choi<sup>32</sup>, B. Choudhary<sup>28</sup>, L. Christofek<sup>77</sup>, T. Christoudias<sup>43</sup>, S. Cihangir<sup>50</sup>, D. Claes<sup>67</sup>, J. Clutter<sup>58</sup>, M. Cooke<sup>50</sup>, W.E. Cooper<sup>50</sup>, M. Corcoran<sup>80</sup>, F. Couderc<sup>18</sup>, M.-C. Cousinou<sup>15</sup>, S. Crépe-Renaudin<sup>14</sup>, V. Cuplov<sup>59</sup>, D. Cutts<sup>77</sup>, M. Cwiok<sup>30</sup>, H. da Motta<sup>2</sup>, A. Das<sup>45</sup>, G. Davies<sup>43</sup>, K. De<sup>78</sup>, S.J. de Jong<sup>35</sup>, E. De La Cruz-Burelo<sup>64</sup>, C. De Oliveira Martins<sup>3</sup>, J.D. Degenhardt<sup>64</sup>, F. Déliot<sup>18</sup>, M. Demarteau<sup>50</sup>, R. Demina<sup>71</sup>, D. Denisov<sup>50</sup>, S.P. Denisov<sup>39</sup>, S. Desai<sup>50</sup>, H.T. Diehl<sup>50</sup>, M. Diesburg<sup>50</sup>, A. Dominguez<sup>67</sup>, H. Dong<sup>72</sup>, T. Dorland<sup>82</sup>, A. Dubey<sup>28</sup>, L.V. Dudko<sup>38</sup>, L. Duflot<sup>16</sup>, S.R. Dugad<sup>29</sup>, D. Duggan<sup>49</sup>, A. Duperrin<sup>15</sup>, J. Dyer<sup>65</sup>, A. Dyshkant<sup>52</sup>, M. Eads<sup>67</sup>, D. Edmunds<sup>65</sup>, J. Ellison<sup>48</sup>, V.D. Elvira<sup>50</sup>, Y. Enari<sup>77</sup>, S. Eno<sup>61</sup>, P. Ermolov<sup>38,†</sup>, H. Evans<sup>54</sup>, A. Evdokimov<sup>73</sup>, V.N. Evdokimov<sup>39</sup>, A.V. Ferapontov<sup>59</sup>, T. Ferbel<sup>71</sup>, F. Fiedler<sup>24</sup>, F. Filthaut<sup>35</sup>, W. Fisher<sup>50</sup>, H.E. Fisk<sup>50</sup>, M. Fortner<sup>52</sup>, H. Fox<sup>42</sup>, S. Fu<sup>50</sup>, S. Fuess<sup>50</sup>, T. Gadfort<sup>70</sup>, C.F. Galea<sup>35</sup>, C. Garcia<sup>71</sup>, A. Garcia-Bellido<sup>82</sup>, V. Gavrilov<sup>37</sup>, P. Gay<sup>13</sup>, W. Geist<sup>19</sup>, D. Gelé<sup>19</sup>, W. Geng<sup>15,65</sup>, C.E. Gerber<sup>51</sup>, Y. Gershtein<sup>49</sup>, D. Gillberg<sup>6</sup>, G. Ginther<sup>71</sup>, N. Gollub<sup>41</sup>, B. Gómez<sup>8</sup>, A. Goussiou<sup>82</sup>, P.D. Grannis<sup>72</sup>, H. Greenlee<sup>50</sup>, Z.D. Greenwood<sup>60</sup>, E.M. Gregores<sup>4</sup>, G. Grenier<sup>20</sup>, Ph. Gris<sup>13</sup>, J.-F. Grivaz<sup>16</sup>, A. Grohsjean<sup>25</sup>, S. Grünendahl<sup>50</sup>, M.W. Grünewald<sup>30</sup>, F. Guo<sup>72</sup>, J. Guo<sup>72</sup>, G. Gutierrez<sup>50</sup>, P. Gutierrez<sup>75</sup>, A. Haas<sup>70</sup>, N.J. Hadley<sup>61</sup>, P. Haefner<sup>25</sup>, S. Hagopian<sup>49</sup>, J. Haley<sup>68</sup>, I. Hall<sup>65</sup>, R.E. Hall<sup>47</sup>, L. Han<sup>7</sup>, K. Harder<sup>44</sup>, A. Harel<sup>71</sup>, J.M. Hauptman<sup>57</sup>, R. Hauser<sup>65</sup>, J. Hays<sup>43</sup>, T. Hebbeker<sup>21</sup>, D. Hedin<sup>52</sup>, J.G. Hegeman<sup>34</sup>, A.P. Heinson<sup>48</sup>, U. Heintz<sup>62</sup>, C. Hensel<sup>22,d</sup>, K. Herner<sup>72</sup>, G. Hesketh<sup>63</sup>, M.D. Hildreth<sup>55</sup>, R. Hirosky<sup>81</sup>, J.D. Hobbs<sup>72</sup>, B. Hoeneisen<sup>12</sup>, H. Hoeth<sup>26</sup>, M. Hohlfield<sup>22</sup>, S. Hossain<sup>75</sup>, P. Houben<sup>34</sup>, Y. Hu<sup>72</sup>, Z. Hubacek<sup>10</sup>, V. Hynek<sup>9</sup>, I. Iashvili<sup>69</sup>, R. Illingworth<sup>50</sup>, A.S. Ito<sup>50</sup>, S. Jabeen<sup>62</sup>, M. Jaffré<sup>16</sup>, S. Jain<sup>75</sup>, K. Jakobs<sup>23</sup>, C. Jarvis<sup>61</sup>, R. Jesik<sup>43</sup>, K. Johns<sup>45</sup>, C. Johnson<sup>70</sup>, M. Johnson<sup>50</sup>, A. Jonckheere<sup>50</sup>, P. Jonsson<sup>43</sup>, A. Juste<sup>50</sup>, E. Kajfasz<sup>15</sup>, J.M. Kalk<sup>60</sup>, D. Karmanov<sup>38</sup>, P.A. Kasper<sup>50</sup>, I. Katsanos<sup>70</sup>, D. Kau<sup>49</sup>, V. Kaushik<sup>78</sup>, R. Kehoe<sup>79</sup>, S. Kermiche<sup>15</sup>, N. Khalatyan<sup>50</sup>, A. Khanov<sup>76</sup>, A. Kharchilava<sup>69</sup>, Y.M. Khazdzhiev<sup>36</sup>, D. Khatidze<sup>70</sup>, T.J. Kim<sup>31</sup>, M.H. Kirby<sup>53</sup>, M. Kirsch<sup>21</sup>, B. Klima<sup>50</sup>, J.M. Kohli<sup>27</sup>, J.-P. Konrath<sup>23</sup>, A.V. Kozelov<sup>39</sup>, J. Kraus<sup>65</sup>, T. Kuhl<sup>24</sup>, A. Kumar<sup>69</sup>, A. Kupco<sup>11</sup>, T. Kurča<sup>20</sup>, V.A. Kuzmin<sup>38</sup>, J. Kvita<sup>9</sup>, F. Lacroix<sup>13</sup>, D. Lam<sup>55</sup>, S. Lammers<sup>70</sup>, G. Landsberg<sup>77</sup>, P. Lebrun<sup>20</sup>, W.M. Lee<sup>50</sup>, A. Leflat<sup>38</sup>, J. Lellouch<sup>17</sup>, J. Li<sup>78,‡</sup>, L. Li<sup>48</sup>, Q.Z. Li<sup>50</sup>, S.M. Lietti<sup>5</sup>, J.K. Lim<sup>31</sup>, J.G.R. Lima<sup>52</sup>, D. Lincoln<sup>50</sup>, J. Linnemann<sup>65</sup>, V.V. Lipaev<sup>39</sup>, R. Lipton<sup>50</sup>, Y. Liu<sup>7</sup>, Z. Liu<sup>6</sup>, A. Lobodenko<sup>40</sup>, M. Lokajicek<sup>11</sup>, P. Love<sup>42</sup>, H.J. Lubatti<sup>82</sup>, R. Luna<sup>3</sup>, A.L. Lyon<sup>50</sup>, A.K.A. Maciel<sup>2</sup>, D. Mackin<sup>80</sup>, R.J. Madaras<sup>46</sup>, P. Mättig<sup>26</sup>, C. Magass<sup>21</sup>, A. Magerkurth<sup>64</sup>, P.K. Mal<sup>82</sup>, H.B. Malbouissou<sup>3</sup>, S. Malik<sup>67</sup>, V.L. Malyshev<sup>36</sup>, H.S. Mao<sup>50</sup>, Y. Maravin<sup>59</sup>, B. Martin<sup>14</sup>, R. McCarthy<sup>72</sup>, A. Melnitchouk<sup>66</sup>, L. Mendoza<sup>8</sup>, P.G. Mercadante<sup>5</sup>, M. Merkin<sup>38</sup>, K.W. Merritt<sup>50</sup>, A. Meyer<sup>21</sup>, J. Meyer<sup>22,d</sup>, T. Millet<sup>20</sup>, J. Mitrevski<sup>70</sup>, R.K. Mommsen<sup>44</sup>, N.K. Mondal<sup>29</sup>, R.W. Moore<sup>6</sup>, T. Moulik<sup>58</sup>, G.S. Muanza<sup>20</sup>, M. Mulhearn<sup>70</sup>, O. Mundal<sup>22</sup>, L. Mundim<sup>3</sup>, E. Nagy<sup>15</sup>, M. Naimuddin<sup>50</sup>, M. Narain<sup>77</sup>, N.A. Naumann<sup>35</sup>, H.A. Neal<sup>64</sup>, J.P. Negret<sup>8</sup>, P. Neustroev<sup>40</sup>, H. Nilsen<sup>23</sup>, H. Nogima<sup>3</sup>, S.F. Novaes<sup>5</sup>, T. Nunnemann<sup>25</sup>, V. O'Dell<sup>50</sup>, D.C. O'Neil<sup>6</sup>, G. Obrant<sup>40</sup>, C. Ochando<sup>16</sup>, D. Onoprienko<sup>59</sup>, N. Oshima<sup>50</sup>, N. Osman<sup>43</sup>, J. Osta<sup>55</sup>, R. Otec<sup>10</sup>, G.J. Otero y Garzón<sup>50</sup>, M. Owen<sup>44</sup>, P. Padley<sup>80</sup>, M. Pangilinan<sup>77</sup>, N. Parashar<sup>56</sup>, S.-J. Park<sup>22,d</sup>, S.K. Park<sup>31</sup>, J. Parsons<sup>70</sup>, R. Partridge<sup>77</sup>, N. Parua<sup>54</sup>, A. Patwa<sup>73</sup>, G. Pawloski<sup>80</sup>, B. Penning<sup>23</sup>, M. Perfilov<sup>38</sup>, K. Peters<sup>44</sup>, Y. Peters<sup>26</sup>, P. Pétroff<sup>16</sup>, M. Petteni<sup>43</sup>, R. Piegaia<sup>1</sup>, J. Piper<sup>65</sup>, M.-A. Pleier<sup>22</sup>, P.L.M. Podesta-Lerma<sup>33,c</sup>,

V.M. Podstavkov<sup>50</sup>, Y. Pogorelov<sup>55</sup>, M.-E. Pol<sup>2</sup>, P. Polozov<sup>37</sup>, B.G. Pope<sup>65</sup>, A.V. Popov<sup>39</sup>, C. Potter<sup>6</sup>, W.L. Prado da Silva<sup>3</sup>, H.B. Prosper<sup>49</sup>, S. Protopopescu<sup>73</sup>, J. Qian<sup>64</sup>, A. Quadt<sup>22,d</sup>, B. Quinn<sup>66</sup>, A. Rakitine<sup>42</sup>, M.S. Rangel<sup>2</sup>, K. Ranjan<sup>28</sup>, P.N. Ratoff<sup>42</sup>, P. Renkel<sup>79</sup>, S. Reucroft<sup>63</sup>, P. Rich<sup>44</sup>, J. Rieger<sup>54</sup>, M. Rijssenbeek<sup>72</sup>, I. Ripp-Baudot<sup>19</sup>, F. Rizatdinova<sup>76</sup>, S. Robinson<sup>43</sup>, R.F. Rodrigues<sup>3</sup>, M. Rominsky<sup>75</sup>, C. Royon<sup>18</sup>, P. Rubinov<sup>50</sup>, R. Ruchti<sup>55</sup>, G. Safronov<sup>37</sup>, G. Sajot<sup>14</sup>, A. Sánchez-Hernández<sup>33</sup>, M.P. Sanders<sup>17</sup>, B. Sanghi<sup>50</sup>, G. Savage<sup>50</sup>, L. Sawyer<sup>60</sup>, T. Scanlon<sup>43</sup>, D. Schaile<sup>25</sup>, R.D. Schamberger<sup>72</sup>, Y. Scheglov<sup>40</sup>, H. Schellman<sup>53</sup>, T. Schliephake<sup>26</sup>, S. Schlobohm<sup>82</sup>, C. Schwanenberger<sup>44</sup>, A. Schwartzman<sup>68</sup>, R. Schwienhorst<sup>65</sup>, J. Sekaric<sup>49</sup>, H. Severini<sup>75</sup>, E. Shabalina<sup>51</sup>, M. Shamim<sup>59</sup>, V. Shary<sup>18</sup>, A.A. Shchukin<sup>39</sup>, R.K. Shivpuri<sup>28</sup>, V. Siccadi<sup>19</sup>, V. Simak<sup>10</sup>, V. Sirotenko<sup>50</sup>, P. Skubic<sup>75</sup>, P. Slattery<sup>71</sup>, D. Smirnov<sup>55</sup>, G.R. Snow<sup>67</sup>, J. Snow<sup>74</sup>, S. Snyder<sup>73</sup>, S. Söldner-Rembold<sup>44</sup>, L. Sonnenschein<sup>17</sup>, A. Sopczak<sup>42</sup>, M. Sosebee<sup>78</sup>, K. Soustruznik<sup>9</sup>, B. Spurlock<sup>78</sup>, J. Stark<sup>14</sup>, J. Steele<sup>60</sup>, V. Stolin<sup>37</sup>, D.A. Stoyanova<sup>39</sup>, J. Strandberg<sup>64</sup>, S. Strandberg<sup>41</sup>, M.A. Strang<sup>69</sup>, E. Strauss<sup>72</sup>, M. Strauss<sup>75</sup>, R. Ströhmer<sup>25</sup>, D. Strom<sup>53</sup>, L. Stutte<sup>50</sup>, S. Sumowidagdo<sup>49</sup>, P. Svoisky<sup>55</sup>, A. Sznajder<sup>3</sup>, P. Tamburello<sup>45</sup>, A. Tanasijczuk<sup>1</sup>, W. Taylor<sup>6</sup>, B. Tiller<sup>25</sup>, F. Tissandier<sup>13</sup>, M. Titov<sup>18</sup>, V.V. Tokmenin<sup>36</sup>, I. Torchiani<sup>23</sup>, D. Tsybychev<sup>72</sup>, B. Tuchming<sup>18</sup>, C. Tully<sup>68</sup>, P.M. Tuts<sup>70</sup>, R. Unalan<sup>65</sup>, L. Uvarov<sup>40</sup>, S. Uvarov<sup>40</sup>, S. Uzunyan<sup>52</sup>, B. Vachon<sup>6</sup>, P.J. van den Berg<sup>34</sup>, R. Van Kooten<sup>54</sup>, W.M. van Leeuwen<sup>34</sup>, N. Varelas<sup>51</sup>, E.W. Varnes<sup>45</sup>, I.A. Vasilyev<sup>39</sup>, M. Vaupel<sup>26</sup>, P. Verdier<sup>20</sup>, L.S. Vertogradov<sup>36</sup>, M. Verzocchi<sup>50</sup>, D. Vilanova<sup>18</sup>, F. Villeneuve-Seguer<sup>43</sup>, P. Vint<sup>43</sup>, P. Vokac<sup>10</sup>, E. Von Toerne<sup>59</sup>, M. Voutilainen<sup>68,e</sup>, R. Wagner<sup>68</sup>, H.D. Wahl<sup>49</sup>, L. Wang<sup>61</sup>, M.H.L.S. Wang<sup>50</sup>, J. Warchol<sup>55</sup>, G. Watts<sup>82</sup>, M. Wayne<sup>55</sup>, G. Weber<sup>24</sup>, M. Weber<sup>50</sup>, L. Welty-Rieger<sup>54</sup>, A. Wenger<sup>23,f</sup>, N. Wermes<sup>22</sup>, M. Wetstein<sup>61</sup>, A. White<sup>78</sup>, D. Wicke<sup>26</sup>, G.W. Wilson<sup>58</sup>, S.J. Wimpenny<sup>48</sup>, M. Wobisch<sup>60</sup>, D.R. Wood<sup>63</sup>, T.R. Wyatt<sup>44</sup>, Y. Xie<sup>77</sup>, S. Yacoub<sup>53</sup>, R. Yamada<sup>50</sup>, W.-C. Yang<sup>44</sup>, T. Yasuda<sup>50</sup>, Y.A. Yatsunenko<sup>36</sup>, H. Yin<sup>7</sup>, K. Yip<sup>73</sup>, H.D. Yoo<sup>77</sup>, S.W. Youn<sup>53</sup>, J. Yu<sup>78</sup>, C. Zeitnitz<sup>26</sup>, S. Zelitch<sup>81</sup>, T. Zhao<sup>82</sup>, B. Zhou<sup>64</sup>, J. Zhu<sup>72</sup>, M. Zielinski<sup>71</sup>, D. Zieminska<sup>54</sup>, A. Zieminski<sup>54,†</sup>, L. Zivkovic<sup>70</sup>, V. Zutshi<sup>52</sup>, and E.G. Zverev<sup>38</sup>

(The DØ Collaboration)

<sup>1</sup>Universidad de Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires, Argentina

<sup>2</sup>LAFEX, Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Físicas, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

<sup>3</sup>Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

<sup>4</sup>Universidade Federal do ABC, Santo André, Brazil

<sup>5</sup>Instituto de Física Teórica, Universidade Estadual Paulista, São Paulo, Brazil

<sup>6</sup>University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada,

Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia,

Canada, York University, Toronto, Ontario, Canada,

and McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

<sup>7</sup>University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, People's Republic of China

<sup>8</sup>Universidad de los Andes, Bogotá, Colombia

<sup>9</sup>Center for Particle Physics, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

<sup>10</sup>Czech Technical University, Prague, Czech Republic

<sup>11</sup>Center for Particle Physics, Institute of Physics,  
Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Prague, Czech Republic

<sup>12</sup>Universidad San Francisco de Quito, Quito, Ecuador

<sup>13</sup>LPC, Université Blaise Pascal, CNRS/IN2P3, Clermont, France

<sup>14</sup>LPSC, Université Joseph Fourier Grenoble 1, CNRS/IN2P3,

Institut National Polytechnique de Grenoble, Grenoble, France

<sup>15</sup>CPPM, Aix-Marseille Université, CNRS/IN2P3, Marseille, France

<sup>16</sup>LAL, Université Paris-Sud, IN2P3/CNRS, Orsay, France

<sup>17</sup>LPNHE, IN2P3/CNRS, Universités Paris VI and VII, Paris, France

<sup>18</sup>CEA, Irfu, SPP, Saclay, France

<sup>19</sup>IPHC, Université Louis Pasteur, CNRS/IN2P3, Strasbourg, France

<sup>20</sup>IPNL, Université Lyon 1, CNRS/IN2P3, Villeurbanne, France and Université de Lyon, Lyon, France

<sup>21</sup>III. Physikalisches Institut A, RWTH Aachen University, Aachen, Germany

<sup>22</sup>Physikalisches Institut, Universität Bonn, Bonn, Germany

<sup>23</sup>Physikalisches Institut, Universität Freiburg, Freiburg, Germany

<sup>24</sup>Institut für Physik, Universität Mainz, Mainz, Germany

<sup>25</sup>Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, München, Germany

<sup>26</sup>Fachbereich Physik, University of Wuppertal, Wuppertal, Germany

<sup>27</sup>Panjab University, Chandigarh, India

<sup>28</sup>Delhi University, Delhi, India

<sup>29</sup>Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Mumbai, India

- <sup>30</sup> *University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland*  
<sup>31</sup> *Korea Detector Laboratory, Korea University, Seoul, Korea*  
<sup>32</sup> *SungKyunKwan University, Suwon, Korea*  
<sup>33</sup> *CINVESTAV, Mexico City, Mexico*  
<sup>34</sup> *FOM-Institute NIKHEF and University of Amsterdam/NIKHEF, Amsterdam, The Netherlands*  
<sup>35</sup> *Radboud University Nijmegen/NIKHEF, Nijmegen, The Netherlands*  
<sup>36</sup> *Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia*  
<sup>37</sup> *Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia*  
<sup>38</sup> *Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia*  
<sup>39</sup> *Institute for High Energy Physics, Protvino, Russia*  
<sup>40</sup> *Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, St. Petersburg, Russia*  
<sup>41</sup> *Lund University, Lund, Sweden, Royal Institute of Technology and Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden, and Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden*  
<sup>42</sup> *Lancaster University, Lancaster, United Kingdom*  
<sup>43</sup> *Imperial College, London, United Kingdom*  
<sup>44</sup> *University of Manchester, Manchester, United Kingdom*  
<sup>45</sup> *University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona 85721, USA*  
<sup>46</sup> *Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory and University of California, Berkeley, California 94720, USA*  
<sup>47</sup> *California State University, Fresno, California 93740, USA*  
<sup>48</sup> *University of California, Riverside, California 92521, USA*  
<sup>49</sup> *Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida 32306, USA*  
<sup>50</sup> *Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, Illinois 60510, USA*  
<sup>51</sup> *University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60607, USA*  
<sup>52</sup> *Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, Illinois 60115, USA*  
<sup>53</sup> *Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois 60208, USA*  
<sup>54</sup> *Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47405, USA*  
<sup>55</sup> *University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana 46556, USA*  
<sup>56</sup> *Purdue University Calumet, Hammond, Indiana 46323, USA*  
<sup>57</sup> *Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011, USA*  
<sup>58</sup> *University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66045, USA*  
<sup>59</sup> *Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas 66506, USA*  
<sup>60</sup> *Louisiana Tech University, Ruston, Louisiana 71272, USA*  
<sup>61</sup> *University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, USA*  
<sup>62</sup> *Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, USA*  
<sup>63</sup> *Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts 02115, USA*  
<sup>64</sup> *University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109, USA*  
<sup>65</sup> *Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824, USA*  
<sup>66</sup> *University of Mississippi, University, Mississippi 38677, USA*  
<sup>67</sup> *University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska 68588, USA*  
<sup>68</sup> *Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08544, USA*  
<sup>69</sup> *State University of New York, Buffalo, New York 14260, USA*  
<sup>70</sup> *Columbia University, New York, New York 10027, USA*  
<sup>71</sup> *University of Rochester, Rochester, New York 14627, USA*  
<sup>72</sup> *State University of New York, Stony Brook, New York 11794, USA*  
<sup>73</sup> *Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York 11973, USA*  
<sup>74</sup> *Langston University, Langston, Oklahoma 73050, USA*  
<sup>75</sup> *University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma 73019, USA*  
<sup>76</sup> *Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma 74078, USA*  
<sup>77</sup> *Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island 02912, USA*  
<sup>78</sup> *University of Texas, Arlington, Texas 76019, USA*  
<sup>79</sup> *Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas 75275, USA*  
<sup>80</sup> *Rice University, Houston, Texas 77005, USA*  
<sup>81</sup> *University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22901, USA and*  
<sup>82</sup> *University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195, USA*

(Dated: July 14, 2008)

We measure the mass of the top quark using top quark pair candidate events in the lepton+jets channel from data corresponding to  $1 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  of integrated luminosity collected by the D0 experiment at the Fermilab Tevatron collider. We use a likelihood technique that reduces the jet energy scale uncertainty by combining an *in-situ* jet energy calibration with the independent constraint on the jet energy scale (JES) from the calibration derived using photon+jets and dijet samples. We find the mass of the top quark to be  $171.5 \pm 1.8(\text{stat.}+\text{JES}) \pm 1.1(\text{syst.}) \text{ GeV}$ .

PACS numbers: 14.65.Ha, 12.15.Ff

Since the discovery of the top quark in 1995 [1], a substantial effort has gone into measuring and understanding its properties. Its large mass suggests a unique role in the mechanism of electroweak symmetry breaking. Through radiative corrections, a precise measurement of the top quark mass, together with that of the  $W$  boson, allows indirect constraints to be placed on the mass of the standard model Higgs boson [2]. A precise knowledge of the top quark mass could also provide a useful constraint to possible extensions of the standard model. It is therefore of great importance to continue improving measurements of the top quark mass [3, 4].

In this Letter, we present the most precise single measurement of the top quark mass from Run II of the Fermilab Tevatron collider. It uses a matrix element (ME) method with an *in-situ* jet energy scale calibration based on a global scale factor used to adjust the energies of all jets and thereby the invariant mass of the two jets assigned as the decay products of the hadronic  $W$  boson [3, 5]. This invariant mass is constrained to the well known  $W$  boson mass through the Breit-Wigner function (with pole  $m_0 = 80.4$  GeV) associated with the hadronic  $W$  boson in the ME for  $t\bar{t}$  production. The jet energy scale is further constrained to the standard scale derived from photon+jets and dijet samples within its uncertainties through the use of a prior probability distribution. This analysis is based on data collected by the D0 detector [6] from April 2002 to February 2006 comprising  $1 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  of integrated luminosity from  $p\bar{p}$  collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 1.96$  TeV.

The top quark is assumed to always decay into a  $W$  boson and a  $b$  quark producing a  $W^+W^-b\bar{b}$  final state from  $t\bar{t}$  production. This analysis is based on the lepton+jets channel with one  $W$  boson decaying via  $W \rightarrow \ell\nu$  and the other via  $W \rightarrow q\bar{q}'$ . This channel is characterized by a lepton with large transverse momentum ( $p_T$ ), large momentum imbalance due to the undetected neutrino ( $\not{p}_T$ ), and four high- $p_T$  jets. Events are selected for this analysis by requiring exactly one isolated electron (muon) with  $p_T > 20$  GeV and  $|\eta| < 1.1$  ( $|\eta| < 2$ ),  $\not{p}_T > 20$  GeV, and exactly four jets with  $p_T > 20$  GeV and  $|\eta| < 2.5$ , where the pseudorapidity  $\eta = -\ln[\tan(\theta/2)]$ , and  $\theta$  is the polar angle with respect to the proton beam direction. Multijet background is suppressed by requiring the azimuthal angular separation between the lepton and  $\not{p}_T$  to be  $\Delta\phi > 0.7\pi - 0.045 (\text{GeV}^{-1})\not{p}_T$  for electrons and  $\Delta\phi > 2.1 - 0.035 (\text{GeV}^{-1})\not{p}_T$  for muons, since  $\not{p}_T$  for such background tends to be aligned with the lepton direction. Jets are reconstructed using a cone algorithm [7] with radius  $R = \sqrt{(\Delta y)^2 + (\Delta\phi)^2} = 0.5$  where the  $y$  is the rapidity. Jet energies are corrected to the particle level using corrections derived from photon+jet and dijet samples. Jets containing a muon are assumed to originate from semileptonic  $b$  quark decays and corrected by the muon momentum and average neutrino energy. At least one jet is required to be tagged by a neural-network

based algorithm [8] as a  $b$ -jet candidate. The tagging efficiency for  $b$  jets is  $\sim 50\%$  with a misidentification rate of  $\sim 1\%$  from light jets. A total of 220 events, split equally between the electron and muon channels, satisfying these criteria is selected.

The top quark mass is determined from the selected data sample with a likelihood technique based on probability densities for each event constructed from the matrix elements of the relevant physics processes contributing to the observed events. Assuming only two contributing processes,  $t\bar{t}$  and  $W$ +jets production, the probability density to observe a given event with measured variables  $x$  is given by

$$P_{\text{evt}} = A(x) [f P_{\text{sig}}(x; m_t, k_{\text{jes}}) + (1 - f) P_{\text{bkg}}(x; k_{\text{jes}})],$$

where the top quark mass  $m_t$ , jet energy scale factor  $k_{\text{jes}}$  dividing the energies of all jets, and observed signal fraction  $f$  are the parameters to determine.  $P_{\text{sig}}$  and  $P_{\text{bkg}}$  are, respectively, probability densities for  $t\bar{t}$  and  $W$ +jets production. Multijet events satisfy  $P_{\text{bkg}} \gg P_{\text{sig}}$  and are also represented by  $P_{\text{bkg}}$ .  $A(x)$  is a function only of the measured variables  $x$  and accounts for the geometrical acceptance and efficiencies.

$P_{\text{sig}}$  and  $P_{\text{bkg}}$  are calculated by integrating over all possible parton states leading to the measured set  $x$ . In addition to the partonic final state described by the variables  $y$ , these states include the initial state partons carrying momenta  $q_1$  and  $q_2$  in the colliding  $p$  and  $\bar{p}$ . The integration involves a convolution of the partonic differential cross section  $d\sigma(y; m_t)$  with the probability densities for the initial state partons  $f(q_i)$  and the transfer function  $W(y, x; k_{\text{jes}})$ :

$$P_{\text{sig}} = \frac{1}{N} \int \sum d\sigma(y; m_t) dq_1 dq_2 f(q_1) f(q_2) W(y, x; k_{\text{jes}}),$$

where the sum runs over all possible initial state parton flavor combinations.  $f(q_i)$  includes parton density functions (PDFs) for finding a parton of a given flavor and longitudinal momentum fraction in the  $p$  or  $\bar{p}$  (CTEQ6L1 [9]) and parameterizations of the probability densities for the transverse components of  $q_i$  derived from PYTHIA [10]. Jet fragmentation effects and experimental resolution are taken into account by  $W(y, x; k_{\text{jes}})$ , representing the probability density for the measured set  $x$  to have arisen from the partonic set  $y$ . The normalization factor  $N$ , defined as the expected observed cross section for a given  $(m_t, k_{\text{jes}})$ , ensures  $A(x)P_{\text{sig}}$  (and ultimately  $P_{\text{evt}}$ ) is normalized to unity.

The differential cross section term in  $P_{\text{sig}}$  is calculated using the leading order ME of the quark-antiquark annihilation process. After all energy and momentum constraints are taken into account, this term is integrated over the energy associated with one of the quarks from the hadronic  $W$  boson decay, the masses of the two  $W$  bosons and two top quarks, and the energy ( $1/p_T$ ) of




FIG. 1: Comparison between data and MC 2-jet ( $m_{2j}$ ) and 3-jet ( $m_{3j}$ ) invariant mass distributions.

the electron (muon). It is summed over 24 possible jet-parton assignments each carrying a weight determined from the  $b$ -jet tagging information [11] and a second sum over the neutrino solutions.  $W(y, x; k_{jes})$  is the product of five terms for the four jets and one charged lepton. The jet terms are parameterized in terms of jet energy with a function involving the sum of two Gaussians whose parameters depend linearly on parton energy. Separate parameters are used for four different  $\eta$  regions of the detector and for  $b$  and light quarks. The term for the charged lepton is parameterized as a Gaussian distribution in energy ( $1/p_T$ ) for electrons (muons). All parameters for  $W(y, x; k_{jes})$  are derived using fully simulated MC events. The normalization cross section  $\sigma_{obs}^{t\bar{t}} = \int A(x) P_{sig} dx = \sigma^{t\bar{t}}(m_t) \langle A(m_t, k_{jes}) \rangle$  is calculated using the total cross section corresponding to the ME used and the mean acceptance for events whose dependencies on  $m_t$  and  $k_{jes}$  are determined from MC events.

The differential cross section term in  $P_{bkg}$  is calculated using the  $W+4$  jets matrix elements provided by VECBOS [12]. The integration is performed over the energies of the four partons producing the jets, the  $W$  boson mass, and the energy ( $1/p_T$ ) of the electron (muon) summing over 24 possible jet-parton assignments and two neutrino solutions. The transverse momenta of the initial state partons are assumed to be zero.

$P_{sig}$  and  $P_{bkg}$  are calculated using MC techniques on a 2-dimensional grid in  $m_t$  and  $k_{jes}$  having grid spacings of 1.5 GeV and 0.015, respectively. At each grid point, a likelihood function,  $L(x; m_t, k_{jes}, f)$ , is constructed from the product of the individual event probabilities  $P_{evt}$  and  $f$  is determined by minimizing  $-\ln L$  at that point.  $L(x; m_t, k_{jes})$  is then projected onto the  $m_t$  and  $k_{jes}$  axes according to  $L(x; m_t) = \int L(x; m_t, k_{jes}) G(k_{jes}) dk_{jes}$  and  $L(x; k_{jes}) = \int L(x; m_t, k_{jes}) dm_t$ . The prior  $G(k_{jes})$  is a Gaussian function centered at  $k_{jes} = 1$  with width  $\sigma = 0.019$  determined from the photon+jets and dijet samples used in the standard jet energy scale calibration. The best estimates of  $m_t$  and  $k_{jes}$  and their corresponding uncertainties are then extracted from the mean and rms of  $L(x; m_t)$  and  $L(x; k_{jes})$ .




FIG. 2: Mean values of  $m_t$  and  $k_{jes}$  from ensemble tests versus true values parameterized by straight lines. Dashed lines represent identical fitted and true values.

TABLE I: Estimated composition of the data sample.

Source	Estimated number of events	
	$e+jets$	$\mu+jets$
$t\bar{t}$	$91 \pm 9$	$71 \pm 8$
$W+jets$	$14 \pm 2$	$37 \pm 5$
Multijet	$5 \pm 1$	$2 \pm 3$

The measurement technique described above is calibrated using MC events produced with the ALPGEN event generator [13] employing PYTHIA for parton showering and hadronization and implementing the MLM matching scheme [14]. All generated events are processed by a full GEANT [15] detector simulation followed by the same reconstruction and analysis programs used on data. Fig. 1 shows comparisons of the 2-jet and 3-jet invariant mass distributions between data and MC using  $t\bar{t}$  events generated with a top quark mass of 170 GeV. These are calculated using jets assigned as the decay products of the top quark and  $W$  boson from the hadronic branch in the permutation with the largest weight (defined as the product of the signal probability and the  $b$ -jet tagging weight) around the peak of  $L(x; m_t, k_{jes})$ . The MC distributions are normalized to the data distributions. The estimated compositions for the electron and muon channels in the data sample used to make the MC distributions are shown in Table I. The expected number of  $t\bar{t}$  events ( $e + jets : 89 \pm 6$ ,  $\mu + jets : 73 \pm 5$ ) agrees with the estimated number of observed events (Table I).

Five  $t\bar{t}$  MC samples are generated with top quark masses of 160, 165, 170, 175, and 180 GeV, with six more produced from three of these by scaling all jet energies by  $\pm 5\%$ .  $P_{sig}$  and  $P_{bkg}$  are calculated for these events from which smaller ensembles of pseudo-experiments fixed to the number of data events are randomly drawn with a signal fraction fluctuated according to a binomial distribution around that determined from data. The mean values of  $m_t$  and  $k_{jes}$  for 1000 pseudo-experiments are shown in Fig. 2 as functions of the true values and fitted to a straight line. The average widths of the  $m_t$  and  $k_{jes}$




FIG. 3: Projections of data likelihoods onto the  $m_t$  and  $k_{\text{jes}}$  axes with best estimates shown.




FIG. 4: Expected uncertainty distributions for  $m_t$  and  $k_{\text{jes}}$ . Measured uncertainties are indicated by arrows.

pull distributions are 1.0 and 1.1, respectively. The pull is defined as the deviation of a measurement from the mean of all measurements divided by the uncertainty of the measurement per pseudo-experiment. The measured uncertainties in data are corrected by the deviation of the average pull width from 1.0.

The projected likelihoods,  $L(x; m_t)$  and  $L(x; k_{\text{jes}})$ , for the selected data samples are calibrated according to the parameterizations shown in Fig. 2 resulting in the distributions shown in Fig. 3 with best estimates of  $m_t$  and  $k_{\text{jes}}$  including their pull-width-corrected uncertainties. The uncertainty in  $m_t$  includes statistical and jet energy scale uncertainties. The measured  $k_{\text{jes}}$  represents a  $1.2 \sigma$  shift from  $k_{\text{jes}} = 1$  where  $\sigma$  is the sum in quadrature of the width of  $G(k_{\text{jes}})$  and the uncertainty of the measured  $k_{\text{jes}}$ . Fig. 4 shows distributions of the expected uncertainties from pseudo-experiments performed on MC  $t\bar{t}$  events generated with a top quark mass of 170 GeV. The measured uncertainties are indicated by the arrows.

To verify the *in-situ* jet energy scale calibration, we repeat the analysis on data by fixing  $k_{\text{jes}}$  to the measured value and removing the  $W$  boson mass constraint, replacing  $L(x; m_t, k_{\text{jes}}, f)$  with  $L(x; m_t, m_W, f)$ .  $P_{\text{sig}}$  and  $P_{\text{bkg}}$  are now calculated on a grid in  $(m_t, m_W)$  having grid spacings of 1.5 GeV and 1 GeV, respectively.  $L(x; m_t)$  and  $L(x; m_W)$  are calculated in the same way as for the grid in  $(m_t, k_{\text{jes}})$  except that no prior probability distribution is used for  $L(x; m_t)$ . The best estimate of  $m_W$

TABLE II: Summary of systematic uncertainties.

Source	Uncertainty (GeV)
<i>Physics modeling:</i>	
Signal modeling	$\pm 0.40$
PDF uncertainty	$\pm 0.14$
Background modeling	$\pm 0.10$
$b$ -fragmentation	$\pm 0.03$
<i>Detector Modeling:</i>	
$b$ /light response ratio	$\pm 0.83$
Jet identification and resolution	$\pm 0.26$
Trigger	$\pm 0.19$
Residual jet energy scale	$\pm 0.10$
Muon resolution	$\pm 0.10$
<i>Method:</i>	
MC calibration	$\pm 0.26$
$b$ -tagging efficiency	$\pm 0.15$
Multijet contamination	$\pm 0.14$
Signal contamination	$\pm 0.13$
Signal fraction	$\pm 0.09$
Total	$\pm 1.07$

extracted from  $L(x; m_W)$  is  $m_W = 80.3 \pm 1.0$  GeV which is consistent with the constraint of 80.4 GeV.

Systematic uncertainties are evaluated for three categories. The first category involves the modeling of MC  $t\bar{t}$  and  $W$ +jets events and includes uncertainties in the modeling of extra jets due to radiation in  $t\bar{t}$  events, the distribution shapes and the heavy flavor fraction in  $W$ +jets events,  $b$  fragmentation, and the PDFs used in generating events. The second category is associated with the simulation of detector response and includes possible effects due to the energy and  $|\eta|$  dependence of the jet energy scale unaccounted for by the *in-situ* calibration, uncertainties in the modeling of the relative calorimeter response to  $b$  and light quark jets, and uncertainties associated with the simulation of jet energy resolution and reconstruction efficiency, muon  $p_T$  resolution, and trigger efficiency. The third category is related to assumptions made in the method and uncertainties in the calibration and includes possible effects due to the exclusion of multijet events and non-lepton+jets  $t\bar{t}$  events from the calibration procedure, uncertainties in the signal fraction used in ensemble tests, and uncertainties associated with the parameters defining the calibration curve. Contributions from all these sources are summarized in Table II and sum in quadrature to  $\pm 1.1$  GeV.

The leading sources of uncertainty shown in Table II are those associated with the  $b$ /light response ratio and signal modeling. The first of these is evaluated by estimating the possible difference in this ratio between data and MC and scaling the energies of all jets matched to  $b$  quarks in a MC  $t\bar{t}$  sample by this amount. Probabilities are integrated for this sample and ensemble tests performed to extract the mass whose deviation from that of the unscaled sample is taken as the uncertainty. The un-

certainty associated with the modeling of additional jets in  $t\bar{t}$  events is evaluated using both data and MC samples. Using MC  $t\bar{t}$  events, the fraction of  $t\bar{t}$  signal events with  $\geq 5$  jets is varied such that the ratio of 4-jet to  $\geq 5$ -jet events in MC matches that in data including its uncertainties. The difference in the resulting extracted mass from that of the default sample is taken as the uncertainty. Using data, this is done through ensemble tests in which a fixed number of  $\geq 5$ -jet events not used in the measurement are randomly drawn for each experiment and combined with the default sample of selected 4-jet events. The ensemble tests are repeated for different fractions of  $\geq 5$ -jet events constituting up to 30% of each experiment. The extracted mass for the default sample is compared with the mean from each ensemble test and the largest difference taken as the systematic uncertainty. Both procedures yield consistent estimates for this systematic uncertainty.

In summary, we present a measurement of the top quark mass using  $t\bar{t}$  lepton+jets events from  $1\text{ fb}^{-1}$  of data collected by the D0 experiment. Using a ME technique combining an *in-situ* calibration of the jet energy scale with the calibration based on the photon+jets and dijet samples gives us

$$m_t = 171.5 \pm 1.8(\text{stat.}+\text{JES}) \pm 1.1(\text{syst.}) \text{ GeV},$$

representing the most precise single measurement to date.

We thank the staffs at Fermilab and collaborating institutions, and acknowledge support from the DOE and NSF (USA); CEA and CNRS/IN2P3 (France); FASI, Rosatom and RFBR (Russia); CNPq, FAPERJ, FAPESP and FUNDUNESP (Brazil); DAE and DST (India); Colciencias (Colombia); CONACyT (Mexico); KRF and KOSEF (Korea); CONICET and UBACyT (Argentina); FOM (The Netherlands); STFC (United Kingdom); MSMT and GACR (Czech Republic); CRC Program, CFI, NSERC and WestGrid Project (Canada); BMBF and DFG (Germany); SFI (Ireland); The Swedish Research Council (Sweden); CAS and CNSF (China); and the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation (Ger-

many).

- 
- [a] Visitor from Augustana College, Sioux Falls, SD, USA.
  - [b] Visitor from The University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK.
  - [c] Visitor from ECFM, Universidad Autonoma de Sinaloa, Culiacán, Mexico.
  - [d] Visitor from II. Physikalisches Institut, Georg-August-University, Göttingen, Germany.
  - [e] Visitor from Helsinki Institute of Physics, Helsinki, Finland.
  - [f] Visitor from Universität Zürich, Zürich, Switzerland.
  - [‡] Deceased.
- [1] F. Abe *et al.* (CDF Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 2626 (1995); S. Abachi *et al.* (D0 Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 2632 (1995).
  - [2] Tevatron Electroweak Working Group, <http://tevewwg.fnal.gov>.
  - [3] V. Abazov *et al.* (D0 Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **74**, 092005 (2006).
  - [4] T. Aaltonen *et al.* (CDF Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 182002 (2007).
  - [5] V. Abazov *et al.* (D0 Collaboration), Nature **429**, 638 (2004).
  - [6] V. Abazov *et al.* (D0 Collaboration), Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. Sect. A **565**, 463 (2006).
  - [7] G.C. Blazey *et al.*, arXiv:hep-ex/0005012 (2000).
  - [8] T. Scanlon, Ph.D. thesis, FERMILAB-THESIS-2006-43.
  - [9] J. Pumplin *et al.*, JHEP **0207**, 012 (2002).
  - [10] T. Sjöstrand *et al.*, Comp. Phys. Commun. **135**, 238 (2001).
  - [11] The weight for a  $b$ -tagged jet with a given  $p_T$  and  $\eta$  under a parton flavor hypothesis  $\alpha(=b, c, \text{light } q \text{ or gluon})$  is given by the parameterization of the average tagging efficiency  $\epsilon_\alpha(p_T, \eta)$ . Consequently, the weight for a jet not  $b$ -tagged is  $1-\epsilon_\alpha(p_T, \eta)$ . The event weight is defined as the product of jet weights.
  - [12] F.A. Berends *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B357**, 32 (1991).
  - [13] M.L. Mangano *et al.*, JHEP **307**, 001 (2003).
  - [14] S. Höche *et al.*, arXiv:hep-ph/0602031 (2006).
  - [15] R. Brun and F. Carminati, CERN Application Software Group, CERN Program Library Long Writeup W5013, 1993 (unpublished).