



The performance of missing transverse momentum reconstruction and its significance with the ATLAS detector using 140 fb^{-1} of $\sqrt{s} = 13 \text{ TeV}$ pp collisions

The ATLAS Collaboration

This paper presents the reconstruction of missing transverse momentum ($p_{\text{T}}^{\text{miss}}$) in proton-proton collisions, at a center-of-mass energy of 13 TeV. This is a challenging task involving many detector inputs, combining fully calibrated electrons, muons, photons, hadronically decaying τ -leptons, hadronic jets, and soft activity from remaining tracks. Possible double counting of momentum is avoided by applying a signal ambiguity resolution procedure which rejects detector inputs that have already been used. Several $p_{\text{T}}^{\text{miss}}$ ‘working points’ are defined with varying stringency of selections, the tightest improving the resolution at high pile-up by up to 30% compared to the loosest. The $p_{\text{T}}^{\text{miss}}$ performance is evaluated using data and Monte Carlo simulation, with an emphasis on understanding the impact of pile-up, primarily using events consistent with leptonic Z decays. The studies use 140 fb^{-1} of data, collected by the ATLAS experiment at the Large Hadron Collider between 2015 and 2018. The results demonstrate that $p_{\text{T}}^{\text{miss}}$ reconstruction, and its associated significance, are well understood and reliably modelled by simulation. Finally, the systematic uncertainties on the soft $p_{\text{T}}^{\text{miss}}$ component are calculated. After various improvements the scale and resolution uncertainties are reduced by up to 76% and 51%, respectively, compared to the previous calculation at a lower luminosity.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	ATLAS detector	4
3	Data and simulation samples	4
4	Object selection	5
5	Event selection	7
6	p_T^{miss} reconstruction	8
6.1	p_T^{miss} introduction	8
6.2	Object association	9
6.3	Signal ambiguity resolution	10
6.4	p_T^{miss} working points	12
6.5	p_T^{miss} soft term	13
6.6	p_T^{miss} scale	13
7	Modelling and performance of p_T^{miss}	14
7.1	p_T^{miss} modelling in MC simulation and data	14
7.2	p_T^{miss} performance	17
8	Systematic uncertainties	22
8.1	Methodology	22
8.2	Uncertainty values	23
9	p_T^{miss} significance	24
9.1	p_T^{miss} significance definitions	24
9.2	p_T^{miss} significance modelling and performance	28
10	Conclusion	30
	Appendix	32
A	p_T^{miss} significance	32
B	p_T^{miss} with EMTopo jets	35

1 Introduction

Missing transverse momentum (p_T^{miss} , also referred to as E_T^{miss} or MET) is a crucial observable for the ATLAS experiment at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC). It is an experimental proxy for the transverse momentum carried by undetected particles produced in proton–proton (pp) collisions recorded by the ATLAS detector [1]. As such, the p_T^{miss} is the magnitude of the 2-dimensional momentum vector, $\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss}}$,

defined transverse to the proton beam direction. The p_T^{miss} in a given collision event is constructed, using the principle of momentum conservation, from the reconstructed hard objects¹ and recorded tracks in the final state. A non-zero value of ‘real’ p_T^{miss} can indicate not just the production of Standard Model (SM) neutrinos, but potentially the production of certain beyond-SM particles like dark matter, which are stable on detector scales and would escape ATLAS undetected. Reconstructing p_T^{miss} is a challenging pursuit, since all detector subsystems are involved, and a highly unambiguous representation of all of the hard objects formed in the hard scatter interaction of interest is required — including calorimeter, tracker and muon spectrometer signals. This representation is obscured by detector resolution and acceptance limitations, object mis-measurement, calibration errors, and signal remnants from additional pp interactions occurring in the same — or neighbouring — LHC bunch crossings relative to the triggered hard-scatter event (pile-up). All of these effects cause ‘fake’ p_T^{miss} , which ATLAS aims to minimise.

To date, ATLAS’s approaches to p_T^{miss} reconstruction have prioritised minimising the impact of pile-up. These were designed based on the data recorded between 2010 and 2012 (Run 1) [2, 3], and substantially re-developed using data collected in 2015 (the first year of Run 2), as described in Ref. [4]. These approaches provide a basis for the p_T^{miss} reconstruction utilised for the full 2015–2018 dataset (Run 2), described in this paper alongside evaluations of its performance and systematic uncertainties. In comparison to Run 1, there are two major improvements in p_T^{miss} reconstruction: first, the move from using calorimeter to tracker information to form the soft component of the p_T^{miss} as default increases pile-up resilience. Second, the change to a dynamic approach to p_T^{miss} reconstruction — such that it is calculated based on the choice of reconstructed and calibrated hard objects considered in any given analysis — leads to more consistency within an analysis and p_T^{miss} reconstruction to exploit any improvements to hard object calibrations. The second development is discussed in more detail in Ref. [5]. Furthermore, improvements since early Run 2 [4] come from the introduction of the particle flow jet algorithm [6], which combines calorimeter and tracking information, and the development of multiple p_T^{miss} working points, which place varying requirements on jets used to build the p_T^{miss} to reduce pile-up contamination. Moving from the loosest to tightest working point improves the p_T^{miss} resolution by 15–40% for events with average interactions per bunch crossing exceeding 30 that satisfy a $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ selection. The modelling and performance of p_T^{miss} is studied in event topologies that permit a focus on the impacts of pile-up, fake p_T^{miss} and the new developments related to jets. The larger dataset allows for more consideration of the dependence of systematic uncertainties in the scale and resolution of the soft component of the p_T^{miss} on the component of p_T^{miss} built from hard objects. The uncertainty values in $Z \rightarrow ee$ events reduce throughout the kinematic range considered, in comparison to preliminary results in Ref. [7] when using particle flow, with these improvements. Scale uncertainties are reduced by up to 76% and resolution uncertainties are reduced by up to 51%. Finally, a sophisticated p_T^{miss} significance variable was also developed using an object-based approach which significantly improves discrimination between events with real and fake p_T^{miss} . This variable has been widely used in ATLAS searches, for example Refs. [8, 9].

This paper is organised as follows. A brief overview of the ATLAS detector is provided in Section 2. The data and Monte Carlo simulation samples used in the paper are detailed in Section 3, followed by an outline of the hard object and event selections used in Sections 4 and 5 respectively. The reconstruction of p_T^{miss} , and other kinematic variables associated with it, is described in Section 6. The results of p_T^{miss} performance studies are presented in Section 7. In Section 8, the methodology of the p_T^{miss} systematic uncertainties calculation, and the results of their measurement, are detailed. Finally, the p_T^{miss} significance is introduced — and its performance studied — in Section 9.

¹ ‘Hard objects’ here refer to the outputs of reconstruction algorithms applied to detector signals, which are candidates to be electrons, muons, jets, hadronically-decaying taus, and photons.

2 ATLAS detector

The ATLAS experiment [1] at the LHC is a multi-purpose particle detector with a forward-backward symmetric cylindrical geometry and a near 4π coverage in solid angle.² It consists of an inner tracking detector (ID) surrounded by a thin superconducting solenoid providing a 2 T axial magnetic field, electromagnetic and hadron calorimeters, and a muon spectrometer (MS). The ID covers the pseudorapidity range $|\eta| < 2.5$. It consists of silicon pixel, silicon microstrip, and transition radiation tracking detectors. Lead/liquid-argon (LAr) sampling calorimeters provide electromagnetic (EM) energy measurements with high granularity. A hadron (steel/scintillator-tile) calorimeter covers the central pseudorapidity range $|\eta| < 1.7$. The end-cap and forward regions are instrumented with LAr calorimeters for both EM and hadronic energy measurements up to $|\eta| = 4.9$. The MS surrounds the calorimeters and is based on three large air-core toroidal superconducting magnets with eight coils each. The field integral of the toroids ranges between 2.0 and 6.0 T m across most of the detector. The MS includes a system of precision tracking chambers and fast detectors for triggering. A two-level trigger system is used to select events. The first-level trigger is implemented in hardware and uses a subset of the detector information to reduce the accepted rate to at most nearly 100 kHz. This is followed by a software-based trigger that reduces the accepted event rate to 1 kHz on average depending on the data-taking conditions. An extensive software suite [10] is used in data simulation, in the reconstruction and analysis of real and simulated data, in detector operations, and in the trigger and data acquisition systems of the experiment.

3 Data and simulation samples

The proton–proton collisions analysed in this paper were collected between 2015 and 2018, at a centre-of-mass energy of $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV and a 25 ns inter-bunch spacing. They correspond to an integrated luminosity of 140 fb^{-1} , with an uncertainty of 0.83% [11] obtained using the LUCID-2 detector [12] for the primary luminosity measurements, complemented by measurements using the inner detector and calorimeters.

In any given data-taking period, the unprescaled single-lepton triggers with the lowest p_T thresholds were used [13–15]. These thresholds ranged from 20 GeV to 140 GeV. The offline lepton selection was kept more stringent than the trigger-level requirement to ensure that trigger efficiencies are constant.

Simulated events are used to model the SM processes considered in this paper. The Monte Carlo (MC) simulated events were processed through a full simulation of the ATLAS detector [16] based on GEANT4 [17]. All samples used are listed in Table 1 along with the relevant parton distribution function (PDF) sets used for the matrix element (ME) and parton shower (PS), the configuration of underlying-event and hadronisation parameters (tune), and the cross-section order in α_s (and α_{EW} if corrections are used) used to normalise the event yields for these samples. Further information on the ATLAS simulations of $t\bar{t}$, single-top-quark (Wt), multiboson, vector-boson plus jets and Higgs boson processes can be found in the relevant public notes and paper [18–23].

² ATLAS uses a right-handed coordinate system with its origin at the nominal interaction point (IP) in the centre of the detector and the z -axis along the beam pipe. The x -axis points from the IP to the centre of the LHC ring, and the y -axis points upwards. Polar coordinates (r, ϕ) are used in the transverse plane, ϕ being the azimuthal angle around the z -axis. The pseudorapidity is defined in terms of the polar angle θ as $\eta = -\ln \tan(\theta/2)$ and is equal to the rapidity $y = \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(\frac{E+p_z c}{E-p_z c} \right)$ in the relativistic limit. Angular distance is measured in units of $\Delta R \equiv \sqrt{(\Delta y)^2 + (\Delta \phi)^2}$.

The effect of pile-up in the same and neighbouring bunch crossings was modelled by overlaying the simulated hard-scattering event with inelastic proton–proton events generated with PYTHIA8.186 [24] using the NNPDF2.3lo set of parton distribution functions (PDF) [25] and the A3 set of tuned parameters [26]. The MC samples were reweighted so that the distribution of the average number of interactions per bunch crossing reproduces the observed distribution in the data.

Table 1: Simulated SM event samples with the corresponding matrix element and parton shower generators, cross-section order in α_s (and α_{EW} if corrections are used) used to normalise the event yield, underlying-event tune and the generator PDF sets used. $Z \rightarrow \ell\ell$ SHERPA2.2.1 is used for the derivation of systematic uncertainties only.

Physics process	Generator (ME)	Parton shower	Normalisation	Tune	PDF (ME)	PDF (PS)
$t\bar{t}$	POWHEG Boxv2 [27–30]	PYTHIA8.230 [31]	NNLO+NNLL [32]	A14 [33]	NNPDF3.0nlo [34]	NNPDF2.3lo [25]
Single top (Wt)	POWHEG Boxv2	PYTHIA8.230	NLO [35, 36]	A14	NNPDF3.0nlo	NNPDF2.3lo
$Z \rightarrow \ell\ell$ (SHERPA)	SHERPA2.2.11 [37, 38]	SHERPA2.2.11	NNLO [39]	SHERPA de-fault [40]	NNPDF3.0nlo [34]	NNPDF3.0nlo [34]
$Z \rightarrow \ell\ell$ (SHERPA)	SHERPA2.2.1	SHERPA2.2.1	NNLO	SHERPA de-fault	NNPDF3.0nlo	NNPDF3.0nlo
$Z \rightarrow \ell\ell$ (POWHEG)	POWHEG Boxv1 [28–30, 41]	PYTHIA8.186 [24]	NLO [20, 42, 43]	AZNLO [44]	CT10nlo [45]	CTEQ6L1 [46]
$Z \rightarrow \ell\ell$ (MADGRAPH)	MADGRAPH5_AMC@NLO2.2.2 [47]	PYTHIA8.186	NNLO [48]	A14	NNPDF3.0nlo	NNPDF2.3lo
WW, WZ, ZZ	POWHEG Boxv2 [28–30]	PYTHIA8.186	NLO	AZNLO	CT10nlo	CTEQ6L1
$W \rightarrow \ell\nu$ (SHERPA)	SHERPA2.2.1 [37, 38]	SHERPA2.2.1	NNLO [39]	SHERPA de-fault [40]	NNPDF3.0nlo [34]	NNPDF3.0nlo [34]
$t\bar{t}V$	MADGRAPH5_AMC@NLO2.3.3	PYTHIA8.210	NLO	A14	NNPDF3.0nlo	NNPDF2.3lo
$t\bar{t}H$	POWHEG Boxv2	PYTHIA8.230	NLO	A14	NNPDF3.0nlo	NNPDF2.3lo
VH	POWHEG Boxv2	PYTHIA8	NNLO(QCD)+NLO(EW) [49–55]	AZNLO	PDF4LHC15nlo [56]	PDF4LHC15nlo
$ggFH$	POWHEG Boxv2	PYTHIA8	NNLO(QCD)+NLO(EW)	AZNLO	PDF4LHC15nlo [56]	PDF4LHC15nlo

4 Object selection

This section describes the hard object selection for building p_T^{miss} for the performance studies in this paper. It is emphasised that other ATLAS papers may use different selection requirements to define the hard objects used to reconstruct p_T^{miss} , which is made possible by the sophisticated software model described in Ref. [5]. Photons and hadronically decaying τ -leptons (τ_{had}) can be included in the p_T^{miss} calculation, as described in Section 6. However, since this paper focuses on topologies where they aren’t featured (to instead focus on the impact of jets, pile-up and fake p_T^{miss}), they aren’t included here.

ID hits are used to reconstruct tracks originating from a particular collision vertex [57]. Both the tracks themselves and the vertices they are associated with must satisfy basic quality requirements to be accepted, detailed in Ref. [57]. Tracks are required to have $p_T > 400$ MeV. Vertices are constructed from at least two tracks that satisfy requirements on the transverse impact parameter $|d_0| < 1.5$ mm, and for the longitudinal impact parameter $|z_0 \sin \theta| < 1.5$ mm, relative to the candidate vertex. A requirement is also placed on the number of hits in the ID. Amongst the primary vertices in a given event, that with the largest sum of p_T^2 of tracks associated with it is defined as the hard-scatter vertex. Typically, each event has many reconstructed primary vertices (N_{PV}), and so npv can be used as a measure of the amount of pile-up coming from other collisions in the same bunch crossing (in-time pile-up). In comparison, the average number of interactions per bunch crossing (μ) — averaged over data in a time interval with assumed constant experimental conditions — relates more to the out-of-time pile-up coming from collisions in neighbouring bunch crossings.

Electrons are reconstructed using calibrated EM calorimeter clusters of energy depositions which are matched to an ID track. A likelihood-based identification algorithm is built using both the calorimeter and tracking information, as described in Ref. [58]; electrons are required to satisfy the Tight Working Point defined therein. In addition, electrons must have $p_T > 25$ GeV and $|\eta| < 1.37$ or $1.52 < |\eta| < 2.47$.

To ensure consistency with the hard-scatter vertex, their impact parameters must satisfy $|d_0| < 5.0$ mm and $|z_0 \sin \theta| < 0.5$ mm. Finally, contributions from semileptonic hadron decays and jets misidentified as electrons are minimised by applying p_T -dependent isolation requirements: the Tight Working Point is used, as defined in Ref. [58].

Muon reconstruction combines ID tracks with muon spectrometer (MS) tracks, and requires that muons possess $p_T > 25$ GeV and $|\eta| < 2.5$. The number of hits in the ID and MS sub-detectors — along with the significance of the charge-to-momentum ratio — are used to create the muon identification algorithm [59]. Muons must satisfy the Medium identification Working Point defined in Ref. [59]. To suppress muons originating from secondary vertices, the muons' transverse impact parameters must satisfy $|d_0| < 3.0$ mm and $|z_0 \sin \theta| < 0.5$ mm. As with electrons, isolation requirements are applied to reduce contributions from semi-leptonic hadron decays and misidentified jets. These are defined in Ref. [59], considering for this paper the Tight_VarRad isolation working point.

The default reconstruction algorithm supported for jets in ATLAS is Particle Flow (PFlow) [6]. This combines information from both the calorimeters and ID to provide improved performance compared with reconstructing jets solely from calorimeter information. A second — calorimeter-based — algorithm, EMTopo [60], was previously the default algorithm, and is still used in a few cases such as long-lived particle searches where PFlow's track use is suboptimal. More details of EMTopo jets, and the modelling and performance that result from using them to build p_T^{miss} , are given in Appendix B.

Particle Flow jets [6] combine ID and calorimeter measurements to reconstruct the energy flow of the event to improve jet energy resolution at low p_T . Three-dimensional topological clusters (topo-clusters) of calorimeter energy deposits are used. Tracks are used to calculate an estimate for the momentum in cases when the tracker resolution is better than the calorimeter resolution, avoiding use of calorimeter energy deposits stemming from charged pile-up. The algorithm produces two kinds of jet constituent objects from the topo-clusters and tracks: charged particle flow objects which each derive primarily from one ID track associated with the hard-scatter vertex, and neutral particle flow objects each derived from a topo-cluster. The anti- k_r algorithm [61] is used with a radius parameter of $R = 0.4$, taking the charged and neutral particle flow objects as inputs. The algorithm also improves the jet reconstruction efficiency and increases the accuracy of the jet direction in the (η, ϕ) plane.

Requirements of $p_T > 20$ GeV and $|\eta| < 4.5$ are made on the calibrated EMPFlow jets. After reconstruction and calibration, PFlow jets with $p_T < 60$ GeV and $|\eta| < 2.4$ are filtered further using the Jet Vertex Tagger (JVT) algorithm to select those originating from the hard-scatter, as detailed in Ref. [62]. This tagger is designed to remove pile-up jets in favour of hard-scatter primary vertex jets, with a 96% efficiency of correctly identifying hard-scatter jets for the requirements chosen here. The JVT algorithm uses a likelihood discriminant based on observables derived from the tracks matched to each jet, to produce a JVT score ranging from 0 (pile-up-like), to 1 (hard-scatter-like). These consider, for example, the fraction of p_T carried by tracks matched to a given jet that come from the hard-scatter vertex. PFlow jets are associated to the hard-scatter interaction by requiring a JVT score greater than 0.5. Jets outside this p_T and η range are considered for analysis without extra requirements.

For event selection purposes, a b -tagging algorithm is applied to jets with $p_T > 20$ GeV and $|\eta| < 2.5$, to identify those likely to have originated from a b -quark. The DL1 algorithm described in Ref. [63] is used, with a 77% efficiency working point.

Finally, Section 6.4 will introduce a set of p_T^{miss} working points. Each places a different selection on the jets entering the p_T^{miss} calculation, which should be considered in addition to the selections described here.

5 Event selection

Several event topologies are considered in this paper. For most studies, a $Z \rightarrow \ell\ell$ selection is used, but $t\bar{t}$, $W \rightarrow \mu\nu$ and VBF $H \rightarrow WW$ selections are also considered to inspect events with more hadronic activity, real $p_{\text{T}}^{\text{miss}}$ and activity in the forward region. Events are removed if they contain at least one jet failing to meet the BadLoose criteria defined in Ref. [64]. For all topologies, events require one lepton to match the fired single-lepton trigger, and said lepton is then required to have $p_{\text{T}} > 30$ GeV to ensure trigger efficiencies have plateaued. A summary of the event selections described below is also given in Table 2.

The $Z \rightarrow \ell\ell$ topology is ideal to study fake $p_{\text{T}}^{\text{miss}}$, since it contains no real sources of $p_{\text{T}}^{\text{miss}}$ and has a high production cross-section. For the $Z \rightarrow ee$ ($Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$) selection, the event must contain exactly two oppositely-charged electrons (muons) and zero muons (electrons) passing the object selection criteria in Section 4. The invariant mass of the two leptons in the event (m_{ll}) must be consistent with a decay from a Z boson by requiring $|m_{ll} - m_Z| < 15$ GeV. For the systematic uncertainty calculation this is loosened to $|m_{ll} - m_Z| < 20$ GeV to reduce statistical uncertainties.

To select $t\bar{t}$ events, a semileptonic $t\bar{t}$ decay (one top quark decays hadronically and the other to a muon and neutrino) is targeted to ensure there is real $p_{\text{T}}^{\text{miss}}$ in the final state in addition to substantial hadronic activity. To reduce backgrounds where jets are falsely reconstructed as electrons, which are hard to model with MC simulation, exactly one muon is required and zero electrons. Events are required to have at least one b -tagged jet, and at least four jets overall.

$W \rightarrow \mu\nu$ events are selected by requiring exactly one muon and zero electrons. The transverse mass³ of the muon and $p_{\text{T}}^{\text{miss}}$, which bounds the mass of the decaying W boson, is required to be at least 40 GeV.

The VBF $H \rightarrow WW$ selection targets a Higgs boson produced through vector-boson fusion (VBF), with each W boson decaying to a muon and neutrino to get a final state containing real $p_{\text{T}}^{\text{miss}}$. Events are required to contain exactly two oppositely-charged muons and zero electrons. To reduce Drell-Yan backgrounds, the invariant mass of the two muons must be at least 20 GeV, and $|m_{ll} - m_Z|$ must exceed 20 GeV. To reduce top backgrounds, events must have zero b -tagged jets. The event must contain two jets overall, with a rapidity separation ($\Delta Y(jj)$) of at least one to favour the VBF topology.

Table 2: Kinematic requirements defining the $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$, $Z \rightarrow ee$, $t\bar{t}$, $W \rightarrow \mu\nu$ and VBF $H \rightarrow WW$ event selections.

variable	$Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ ($Z \rightarrow ee$)	$t\bar{t}$	$W \rightarrow \mu\nu$	VBF $H \rightarrow WW$
electron multiplicity	0 (2)	0	0	0
muon multiplicity	2 (0)	1	1	2
triggering lepton p_{T} [GeV]	> 30	> 30	> 30	> 30
second lepton p_{T} [GeV]	> 20	-	-	> 20
$ m_{ll} - m_Z $ [GeV]	performance: < 15, systematics: < 20	-	-	> 20
m_{ll} [GeV]	-	-	-	> 20
m_{T} [GeV]	-	-	> 40	-
jet multiplicity	-	> 4	-	2
b -tagged jet multiplicity	-	≥ 1	-	0
$\Delta Y(jj)$	-	-	-	≥ 1

³ Transverse mass is defined as $m_{\text{T}} = \sqrt{2p_{\text{T}}^{\text{miss}}p_{\text{T}}^{\mu}(1 - \cos\phi)}$, with ϕ as the angle between the $p_{\text{T}}^{\text{miss}}$ and the muon, and taking the muon to be massless.

6 p_T^{miss} reconstruction

Missing transverse momentum reconstruction in ATLAS consists of two aspects. The first, p_T^{hard} , comprises *hard-event* signals in the form of reconstructed and calibrated ‘hard objects’: electrons, photons, τ -leptons, muons and jets. The second aspect comes from *soft-event* signals, and currently consists of reconstructed charged-particle tracks that are associated with the hard-scatter vertex but not associated with a hard object.

The procedures implemented by ATLAS to transform the set of detector signals for each event into each type of reconstructed hard object are independent. This implies that the same detector signals could be used multiple times in an event, for example the same calorimeter deposit could be used to reconstruct both an electron and a jet. When reconstructing p_T^{miss} , this can cause double counting of contributions to an event’s transverse momentum, leading to an artificial momentum imbalance and fake p_T^{miss} . This is resolved by the explicit *signal ambiguity resolution* in the object-based p_T^{miss} reconstruction introduced originally in Refs. [2], [3] and [4] and described in Section 6.3. Ultimately, the p_T^{miss} is built from a set of mutually exclusive detector signals.

6.1 p_T^{miss} introduction

The reconstruction of missing transverse momentum builds a set of observables from the 2-dimensional transverse momentum vectors ($\mathbf{p}_T = (p_x, p_y)$) of the various event constituents. The missing transverse momentum vector $\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss}} = (p_x^{\text{miss}}, p_y^{\text{miss}})$ is the first of these observables, and is given by:

$$\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss}} = - \left(\underbrace{\sum_{\text{selected electrons}} \mathbf{p}_T^e + \sum_{\text{accepted photons}} \mathbf{p}_T^\gamma + \sum_{\text{accepted } \tau\text{-leptons}} \mathbf{p}_T^\tau + \sum_{\text{selected } \mu} \mathbf{p}_T^\mu + \sum_{\text{accepted jets}} \mathbf{p}_T^{\text{jet}}}_{\text{hard term}} + \underbrace{\sum_{\text{unused tracks}} \mathbf{p}_T^{\text{track}}}_{\text{soft term}} \right). \quad (1)$$

The second is the scalar sum of all transverse momenta ($p_T = |\mathbf{p}_T|$) of the p_T^{miss} reconstruction constituent objects, which is given by

$$\sum p_T = \underbrace{\sum_{\text{selected electrons}} p_T^e + \sum_{\text{accepted photons}} p_T^\gamma + \sum_{\text{accepted } \tau\text{-leptons}} p_T^\tau + \sum_{\text{selected } \mu} p_T^\mu + \sum_{\text{accepted jets}} p_T^{\text{jet}}}_{\text{hard term}} + \underbrace{\sum_{\text{unused tracks}} p_T^{\text{track}}}_{\text{soft term}}. \quad (2)$$

This quantity is useful to calculate in addition to p_T^{miss} . It presents an overall scale for evaluating the hardness of a hard-scatter event in the transverse plane, thus providing a measure of the event activity in physics analyses and p_T^{miss} reconstruction performance studies.

In both the p_T^{miss} and $\sum p_T$ definitions, the selected hard objects are chosen by the user, and allow the interpretation of each event to be consistent in a given analysis. The object selections used specifically for the performance studies in this paper were described in Section 4. Each reconstructed particle and jet has its own dedicated calibration translating detector signals into a fully corrected four-momentum. Therefore, for example, rejecting certain electrons in a given analysis can change both the p_T^{miss} and $\sum p_T$, if the corresponding calorimeter signal is included and is calibrated as a jet or a significant part of a jet.

This also means that systematic uncertainties for the different particles can be consistently propagated into p_T^{miss} . In Eqs. (1) and (2), the term *selected*, only applicable to electrons and muons, means that the choice of reconstructed particles is given purely by a set of analysis-chosen criteria. On the other hand, *accepted* implies that the initially selected set of particles has been potentially modified by the signal ambiguity resolution procedure (described in Section 6.3) or added requirements placed on jets in a given p_T^{miss} ‘working point’ (see Section 6.4).

The phrase ‘unused tracks’ in Eqs. (1) and (2) refers to ID tracks associated with the hard-scatter vertex but not with any hard object added to the p_T^{miss} sum. These are used to calculate the soft-event signal, p_T^{soft} , as discussed in more detail in Section 6.5. As seen in the formulae, observables are also constructed individually for each ‘term’ of p_T^{miss} coming from each object type.

As part of the signal ambiguity resolution procedure, an ordered sequence is defined for prioritising adding contributions to the p_T^{miss} sum, following the order of terms in Eq. (1). This is explained in detail in Section 6.3.

Other observables reconstructed from $p_{x(y)}^{\text{miss}}$ include:

$$p_T^{\text{miss}} = |\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss}}| = \sqrt{(p_x^{\text{miss}})^2 + (p_y^{\text{miss}})^2}, \text{ and}$$

$$\phi^{\text{miss}} = \tan^{-1}(p_y^{\text{miss}}/p_x^{\text{miss}}).$$

The magnitude of the $\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss}}$ vector gives the amount of missing transverse momentum; its direction in the transverse plane, or azimuthal angle, is given by ϕ^{miss} .

Finally, the truth (generator level) p_T^{miss} in MC simulations, $p_T^{\text{miss, true}}$ (magnitude of the 2-dimensional vector $\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss, true}}$), is often used in performance studies. This is defined by the vector sum of transverse momenta of stable, invisible particles produced in the final state at generator (hadron) level.

6.2 Object association

The p_T^{miss} reconstruction sum and the signal ambiguity resolution procedure rely on knowing which hard objects each track, topo-cluster and particle-flow object in an event are associated with, in order to determine where there is overlap that must be resolved. Full details of this initial object association procedure, and the sophisticated software used to implement it, are detailed in Ref. [5]. Specifics of the ATLAS Run 2 workflow to initialise object associations for p_T^{miss} reconstruction before applying the signal ambiguity resolution procedure are given here.

The p_T^{miss} reconstruction algorithm considers the same original ID tracks to be associated with a muon as the muon reconstruction algorithm [59] (with the track momentum taken from the combination of the ID and MS tracks). Topo-clusters, or neutral particle-flow objects, are only considered to be associated with a muon if it is likely they are a result of the muon’s calorimeter energy-loss. A ‘muon cluster’ is defined from the calorimeter cells crossed by the muon track, and if the total energy this shares with a given topo-cluster exceeds 20%, then the topo-cluster is deemed to be associated with the muon. ID tracks associated with electrons and photons during their reconstruction [58] are again considered associated for p_T^{miss} reconstruction.

Clusters used in electron and photon reconstruction are not the same as the topo-clusters used for jet reconstruction. However, they are derived from them, and thus can be matched to them⁴. For topo-clusters within $\Delta R < 0.1$ of an electron/photon cluster, the subset of N topo-clusters best matching the electron/photon cluster energy are chosen, in order to avoid spurious matches. This ‘best-matching’ procedure is ordered in decreasing p_T topo-clusters, and considers topo-cluster i energy $E_{\text{topo},i}$ and electron/photon cluster energy $E_{e/\gamma}$. If $E_{\text{topo},i} < 1.5 \times E_{e/\gamma}$, and if $|\sum_{i=1}^n E_{\text{topo},i} - E_{e/\gamma}| < |\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} E_{\text{topo},i} - E_{e/\gamma}|$ for the $n \leq N$ topo-clusters so far considered, then topo-cluster i is associated with the electron/photon. If no topo-clusters have $E_{\text{topo},i} < 1.5 \times E_{e/\gamma}$ then only the topo-cluster with energy closest to the electron/photon is associated with it.

Neutral PFlow objects are associated with electrons and photons using the same procedure as topo-clusters. Charged PFlow objects are constructed from an ID track and inherit their associations from this track.

Hadronically-decaying τ -leptons are associated with topo-clusters and tracks when they are reconstructed (more detail can be found in Ref. [65]). If using particle flow for p_T^{miss} , the calibration of topo-clusters may be different to the τ -lepton reconstruction and so are considered associated with the τ -lepton if they are within $\Delta R < 0.2$ of the τ -lepton’s seeding-jet axis.

6.3 Signal ambiguity resolution

The previous section defined which tracks, topo-clusters and particle flow objects are initially associated with which hard objects. This section explains how that information is used to decide which objects to add to the p_T^{miss} sum in cases where a hard object shares one of these detector signals with another (they overlap).

Electrons enter p_T^{miss} reconstruction as the highest priority object, so are never modified from the analysis selection criteria. If lower-priority particles (γ then τ_{had}) share an ID track, topo-cluster or particle flow object with a higher-priority object that has already entered p_T^{miss} reconstruction, they are fully rejected from their term in the p_T^{miss} . In this case, their tracks can be used in the p_T^{soft} .

Muons experience energy loss in the calorimeters, but only non-isolated muons overlap with other objects, most probably jets or τ -leptons. In this case the muon calorimeter energy deposit cannot be separated from the overlapping jets with the required precision, and a more sophisticated treatment of when to reject a jet is needed. This is discussed in Section 6.3.1. As indicated by the ‘selected’ notation in Eq. (1), muons (like electrons) are never modified from the analysis selection criteria.

Jets can also be rejected if they overlap with other accepted higher-priority particles. In the case of partial or marginal overlap between jets and electrons or photons, signal losses are minimised by applying a more refined overlap removal strategy, as described in Section 6.3.2.

6.3.1 Muon overlap with jets

There are several scenarios leading to the signal overlap of reconstructed muons and jets. If a muon overlaps with a pile-up-originating jet, it can lead to the jet being falsely considered as a hard-scatter jet. This is because the muon’s ID track represents a significant amount of hard-scatter vertex p_T , thus increasing the

⁴ A topo-cluster associated with a jet is also associated with a given electron if its matched electron cluster is associated with said electron.

JVT value and making a pile-up jet more likely to satisfy any JVT requirements. In this case the pile-up jet p_T contributes to p_T^{miss} , where its stochastic nature degrades the p_T^{miss} response and resolution⁵.

Muon energy deposited in the calorimeter (E_{loss}) can also be reconstructed as a hard-scatter primary vertex jet, which will be found in close proximity to the muon's associated ID track. Because the muon E_{loss} is already corrected for in the muon p_T reconstruction, inclusion of such a jet to the p_T^{miss} reconstruction double-counts it. Rejection of pile-up jets and muon E_{loss} jets is achieved through consideration of the four selection criteria. First, the muon's track is 'ghost'-associated with the jet using the anti- k_t algorithm. Second, $p_T^{\mu\text{-ID}}/p_T^{\text{jet-ID}}$ is required to be larger than 0.8: the transverse momentum of the muon's track ($p_T^{\mu\text{-ID}}$) represents a significant fraction of the sum of transverse momenta of all hard-scatter primary vertex ID track associated with the jet ($p_T^{\text{jet-ID}}$). Third, the transverse momentum of the jet (p_T^{jet}) is less than twice the $p_T^{\mu\text{-ID}}$. Finally, the total number of hard-scatter primary vertex tracks associated with the jet ($N_{\text{track}}^{\text{PV}}$) is less than five. If a jet with an overlapping muon meets all of these criteria, it is considered to be either from pile-up or a catastrophic muon E_{loss} and is rejected from p_T^{miss} reconstruction.

Final state radiation (FSR) can also affect muon contributions to p_T^{miss} . Muons can radiate photons at small angles, typically too close to the muon ID track for the photon to be reconstructed. The mismatch between calorimeter energy and ID track momentum also prevents the FSR photon being reconstructed as an electron. Instead, the FSR's calorimeter signal is reconstructed as a jet with an associated muon ID track. The FSR photon's transverse momentum is not recovered in muon reconstruction, hence jets representing this photon must be included in the p_T^{miss} reconstruction. These jets are characterised by the following selections, which typically indicate photons.

- The muon's associated ID track is 'ghost'-associated with the jet using the anti- k_T algorithm;
- $N_{\text{track}}^{\text{PV}} < 3$ — the jet has a small number of tracks from the hard-scatter primary vertex;
- $f_{\text{EM}} = E_{\text{jet}}^{\text{EM}}/E_{\text{jet}} > 0.9$ — the jet energy E_{jet} is primarily deposited in the EM calorimeter, as expected for photons;
- $p_T^{\text{jet PS}} > 2.5 \text{ GeV}$ — an early starting point for the shower is selected by requiring a large transverse momentum contribution of the jet in the presampler (PS) calorimeter;
- $w_{\text{jet}} < 0.1$ — the jet width w_{jet} is comparable to a dense electromagnetic shower, where jet width is defined as:

$$w_{\text{jet}} = \frac{\sum_i \Delta R_i p_{T,i}}{\sum_i p_{T,i}},$$

the angular distance of topo-cluster i from the jet axis is $\Delta R = \sqrt{(\Delta\eta_i)^2 + (\Delta\phi_i)^2}$ and $p_{T,i}$ is the cluster's transverse momentum;

- $p_T^{\text{jet-ID}}/p_T^{\mu\text{-ID}} > 0.8$ — the transverse momentum of hard-scatter primary vertex tracks associated with the jet is close to the muon ID track transverse momentum.

If a jet meets all of the above criteria, it is deemed to be an FSR photon and is included in the p_T^{miss} reconstruction in the jet term. The energy scale of the jet is set to the EM scale to reflect its interpretation as a photon, and further scaled both to remove the fraction of the p_T overlapping with the reconstructed muon and the muon energy loss in the calorimeter.

⁵ Here response is defined as the deviation of the observed p_T^{miss} from its expected value. Resolution of p_T^{miss} considers the root-mean-squared (RMS) width of both the p_x^{miss} and p_y^{miss} .

6.3.2 Electron/Photon overlap with jets

In the case where electrons/photons overlap with a jet, two discriminating variables are used to establish whether the jet should be treated as real and enter the p_T^{miss} calculation. These use the energy and p_T of the jet and electron or photon, calibrated at the EM scale.

The first variable is the ratio f_{overlap} , the ratio of the electron (or γ or τ_{had}) energy $E_{e(\gamma,\tau)}^{\text{EM}}$ to the jet energy $E_{\text{jet}}^{\text{EM}}$:

$$f_{\text{overlap}} = \frac{E_{e(\gamma,\tau)}^{\text{EM}}}{E_{\text{jet}}^{\text{EM}}}.$$

The second variable represents the unique p_T of the jet, $\Delta p_T^{\text{EM},e(\gamma,\tau),\text{jet}}$, which is defined thus:

$$\Delta p_T^{\text{EM},e(\gamma,\tau),\text{jet}} = p_T^{\text{EM,jet}} - p_T^{\text{EM},e(\gamma,\tau)}.$$

In the scenario where a jet shares an ID track with a high momentum electron ($p_T > 90$ GeV), and carries a large amount of p_T from tracks not associated with other objects ($(\sum_{i=1}^n p_T^{\text{track},i} - \sum_{j=1}^m p_T^{\text{track},j}) < 10$ GeV for a jet with n associated tracks, m of which are non-overlapping) then it is likely that both the electron and jet are real and should be treated as such in the p_T^{miss} . These requirements can be encapsulated in a boolean variable `KeepJet`, which is always false for jet-photon overlaps since photons have no associated tracks.

To treat the jet as real and include it in the p_T^{miss} jet term along with the (higher priority) electron/photon, ($f_{\text{overlap}} < 1.0$ or `KeepJet`) and $\Delta p_T^{\text{EM},e(\gamma,\tau),\text{jet}} > 20$ GeV are required. To avoid any double-counting the jet p_T is scaled by $(1 - f_{\text{overlap}})$ if it is included in the p_T^{miss} jet term.

6.4 p_T^{miss} working points

When reconstructing p_T^{miss} , the requirements on jets entering the calculation have a large impact on performance. More stringency leads to a reduction in contamination from pile-up and jet mismeasurement, however it also leads to an increased likelihood of excluding real and well-measured jets. In different use cases, the optimal stringency can be different; thus ATLAS recommends several different working points for analysers to choose from.

The requirements placed on jets for a given p_T^{miss} working point act in addition to those chosen by the analysis. If jets are rejected from p_T^{hard} by working point requirements, their tracks are not added to the soft term because the jet is deemed to have originated from pile-up. Four working points are supported, as illustrated in Table 3 in order of increasing stringency. fJVT is the forward Jet Vertex Tagger (fJVT), described in Ref. [66], used to remove pile-up jets with $2.5 < |\eta| < 4.5$ and $20 < p_T < 50$ GeV. The fJVT uses the angular kinematics of other jets in the event to associate forward jets — which lack tracking information — to pile-up vertices by minimising the other vertices' reconstructed p_T^{miss} .

The main change in jet selection as the working point is tightened is increasing the p_T threshold for jets in the forward η region of the detector. In this region, pile-up jets (which tend to have a lower p_T than hard-scatter jets) are more commonly found. Different JVT selections are also used to remove pile-up jets. The `Tenacious` working point takes an aggressive approach, using a very tight JVT requirement for low p_T jets.

Table 3: Selections for the p_T^{miss} working points supported for PFlow jets.

Working point	p_T [GeV] for jets with:			Selections	fJVT for jets with $2.5 < \eta < 4.5$ & $p_T < 120$ GeV
	$ \eta < 2.4$	$2.4 < \eta < 4.5$	JVT for jets with $ \eta < 2.4$		
Loose	> 20	> 20	> 0.5 for $p_T < 60$ GeV		-
Tight	> 20	> 30	> 0.5 for $p_T < 60$ GeV		-
Tighter	> 20	> 35	> 0.5 for $p_T < 60$ GeV		-
Tenacious	> 20	> 35	> 0.91 for $20 < p_T < 40$ GeV > 0.59 for $40 < p_T < 60$ GeV > 0.11 for $60 < p_T < 120$ GeV		< 0.5

6.5 p_T^{miss} soft term

The current soft term reconstruction approach exclusively uses hard-scatter vertex ID-tracks, and so only includes the p_T from charged soft particles. However, this choice ensures that the soft term has a high resilience to pile-up contamination. The inclusion of the soft term into the p_T^{miss} improves the p_T^{miss} resolution and agreement with truth p_T^{miss} . It also improves the p_T^{miss} scale, which is defined in Section 6.6 and partly measures how well the p_T^{miss} accounts for the hadronic recoil in an event. The soft term particularly improves the scale in events with a low multiplicity of hard objects, by capturing components of the event that are not represented by reconstructed and calibrated objects and would thus otherwise be ignored.

Tracks are required to satisfy the requirements described in Section 4. If tracks are not associated with any hard object in the event, then they are used to build the p_T^{soft} . Contributions to p_T^{soft} also come from ID tracks associated with jets that have been rejected by the signal ambiguity resolution procedure, but not ID tracks associated with jets that were rejected by the working point cuts (since these are deemed to originate from pile-up). ID tracks are also vetoed from inclusion in the p_T^{soft} if any of the following signal-overlap resolution requirements are met: $\Delta R(\text{track}, e/\gamma \text{ cluster}) < 0.05$; $\Delta R(\text{track}, \tau - \text{lepton}) < 0.2$; the track is associated with a muon or is ghost-associated with contributing jet.

Alternative calorimeter-based soft term definitions have been used in the past [4]. These benefit from the inclusion of neutral soft particles, but are very susceptible to pile-up contamination. Due to the higher-pile-up conditions of Run 2, these aren't currently supported, as the track-based soft term was found to provide a better resolution and general agreement with truth. However, they may be revisited in the future.

6.6 p_T^{miss} scale

In $Z \rightarrow \ell\ell$ events, where there is no real p_T^{miss} , the transverse momentum of the Z (p_T^Z) can be used as a measure of the hardness of the interaction and provides a scale for the evaluation of the p_T^{miss} response. One can define an axis in the transverse plane from the \mathbf{p}_T of the Z which is constructed by using the \mathbf{p}_T of each of the leptons,

$$\hat{\mathbf{A}}_Z = \frac{\mathbf{p}_T^{\ell^+} + \mathbf{p}_T^{\ell^-}}{|\mathbf{p}_T^{\ell^+} + \mathbf{p}_T^{\ell^-}|} = \frac{\mathbf{p}_T^Z}{p_T^Z}.$$

With this reference axis the p_T^{miss} can be projected onto it with,

$$\mathcal{P}^Z = p_T^{\text{miss}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{A}}_Z.$$

This quantity — the scale \mathcal{P}^Z — is sensitive to any mis-reconstruction in the p_T^{miss} and provides an excellent way to gauge the performance of the p_T^{miss} reconstruction. It is particularly sensitive to the impact of the hadronic recoil against the Z boson. For a completely balanced reaction, where the Z boson is produced in perfect balance with the hadronic recoil, the expectation is $\mathcal{P}^Z = 0$. If $\mathcal{P}^Z < 0$ then there is not enough hadronic recoil to balance the momentum of the Z and when $\mathcal{P}^Z > 0$ there is too much reconstructed recoil. The hardness of the interaction (roughly the amount of p_T produced in the event) can be assessed by taking the average of the projection, $\langle \mathcal{P}^Z \rangle$, and binning it as a function of p_T^Z .

7 Modelling and performance of p_T^{miss}

7.1 p_T^{miss} modelling in MC simulation and data

To assess the modelling of p_T^{miss} , comparisons between data and MC simulation are made for several variables. Events must satisfy either a $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ or $Z \rightarrow ee$ selection, as defined in Section 5, using objects selected according to Section 4. By default, PFlow jets are used to build p_T^{miss} using the `Tight` working point. Unless otherwise stated, the $Z \rightarrow \ell\ell$ MC events are generated using `SHERPA`.

After looking at this default configuration, the modelling is studied when using different p_T^{miss} working points, jet collections, and $Z \rightarrow \ell\ell$ MC generators in turn. The uncertainty bands on the SM MC contributions are formed from a quadrature sum of the MC statistical uncertainty, luminosity uncertainty and relevant detector uncertainties. Detector uncertainties include those on the p_T^{miss} soft term (discussed in Section 8); lepton reconstruction efficiency, energy scale and resolution, and trigger efficiency differences between MC simulation and data [58, 59]; uncertainties in the jet-energy scale and resolution [67]; JVT efficiencies [62]; and uncertainties in the pile-up profile used for the MC events. It is emphasised that systematic uncertainties on the MC modelling and cross-sections are not included.

Figure 1 shows the overall p_T^{miss} distribution, the hard and soft terms, for $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ and $Z \rightarrow ee$ selections. The plots show a ‘jet inclusive’ selection, where no additional requirements are placed on the jets in the event beyond those described in previous sections. The p_T^{miss} and p_T^{hard} distributions show very good agreement between MC simulation and data within uncertainties. The dominant systematic uncertainties leading to the bump seen around 100 GeV comes from the jet energy scale and resolution. Particularly for the $Z \rightarrow ee$ selection in Figure 1(e), the soft term shows a slight excess in data in the tails, expected to be caused by the background of events containing non-prompt and fake electrons, which are not well-modelled in MC simulation.

Figure 2 shows the p_T^{miss} distributions for the `Loose`, `Tighter` and `Tenacious` working points. As the working point is tightened from `Loose` to `Tenacious`, the modelling improves, due primarily to the removal of low p_T forward jets. These have relatively large uncertainties in the jet energy resolution, stemming partly from large pile-up contamination. The error band decreases with the tightening working point, which is caused by a large reduction in the impact of jet energy resolution uncertainties.

Figure 3 shows the distributions for p_T^{miss} and the soft term, using `POWHEG+PYTHIA` to produce $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ events. `POWHEG+PYTHIA` performs well throughout the whole p_T^{miss} distribution, however when considering




Figure 1: Distributions of p_T^{miss} ((a) and (b)) and its constituent hard ((c) and (d)) and soft ((e) and (f)) terms in MC simulation and data. Events satisfy a $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ ((a), (c) and (e)) or $Z \rightarrow ee$ ((b), (d) and (f)) selection. PFlow jets are used with a jet inclusive selection, and the Tight p_T^{miss} working point. SHERPA is used to generate the $Z \rightarrow ee/Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ events. The error band includes MC statistical, luminosity and detector uncertainties.




Figure 2: Distributions of p_T^{miss} in MC simulation and data for different working points: Loose (a), Tighter (b) and Tenacious (c). Events satisfy a $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ selection and p_T^{miss} is built using PFlow jets. SHERPA is used to generate the $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ events. The error band includes MC statistical, luminosity and detector uncertainties.




Figure 3: Distributions of p_T^{miss} (a) and the p_T^{soft} (b) in MC simulation and data using the POWHEG +PYTHIA $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ generator. Events satisfy a jet inclusive $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ selection. PFlow jets are used with the Tight p_T^{miss} working point. The error band includes MC statistical, luminosity and detector uncertainties.

p_T^{soft} , POWHEG +PYTHIA models the data worse than SHERPA. For POWHEG +PYTHIA, extra jets in an event are produced at the parton shower level, where they are less well-modelled, in comparison to SHERPA where they are produced at matrix element level. The tail of the p_T^{soft} distribution will have a significant contribution from events with a high multiplicity of these poorly-modelled soft jets. Additionally, POWHEG +PYTHIA has a different representation of the underlying event, which can be a significant contribution to the soft momenta in the event.

7.2 p_T^{miss} performance

An important measure for the quality of p_T^{miss} reconstruction is the resolution. For $Z \rightarrow \ell\ell$ events, the p_x^{miss} and p_y^{miss} are approximately Gaussian-distributed about zero, except for events with very large $\sum p_T$ or noise. Non-Gaussian tails are expected, so to appropriately represent the distributions, the root-mean-square error (RMS) is used to measure the p_x^{miss} and p_y^{miss} resolution. For MC simulation, the truth p_x^{miss} and p_y^{miss} (defined in Section 4) are subtracted.

To understand the impact of pile-up on p_T^{miss} resolution, Figure 4 shows the p_x^{miss} and p_y^{miss} resolutions in MC simulations satisfying the $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ selection, binned in the variables introduced in Section 4 which parametrise the amount of pile-up present: N_{PV} and μ . For the jet inclusive selection, the resolution degrades as the amount of pile-up increases, as expected. The resolution improves dramatically as events containing jets are vetoed, until the pile-up dependence almost entirely disappears.

The intention of the various p_T^{miss} working points is to try to reduce fake p_T^{miss} contamination further. As can be seen for MC simulated events satisfying the $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ selection in Figures 4(c) and 4(d), the tighter working points have a reduced pile-up dependence and better resolution, indicating they are indeed less susceptible to fake p_T^{miss} generally, and specifically from pile-up contamination. In Figure 5, the working point resolution dependence is shown for MC simulations satisfying $t\bar{t}$, VBF $H \rightarrow WW$ or

$W \rightarrow \mu\nu$ selections. For the VBF $H \rightarrow WW$, and then $t\bar{t}$ processes, the amount of hadronic activity in the hard-scatter process increases substantially. At high pile-up, tighter working points improve the resolution for all topologies by removing more pile-up jets from the jet term. For the $t\bar{t}$ selection at low pile-up, the majority of reconstructed jets in the event come from the hard-scatter, so the tighter working points are more likely to remove jets originating from the hard-scatter, leading to a degradation in the resolution. For the VBF $H \rightarrow WW$ selection (characterised by jets in the forward region), the small improvement at high pile-up when changing from Tighter to Tenacious is primarily caused by the introduction the fJVT requirement, which will reduce pile-up-originating jets in the forward region. The performance for $W \rightarrow \mu\nu$ is very similar to $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$, suggesting that the working point performance is minimally effected by the amount of real p_T^{miss} in the event. The topology dependence in the choice of ‘best’ working point leads to the support of all of them for analysis use.

To confirm that the p_T^{miss} resolution in MC simulation represents data well, the p_x^{miss} and p_y^{miss} resolutions are shown in Figure 6 as a function of μ and N_{PV} in the default $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ configuration comparing MC simulation (including $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ as well as the background processes) and data. In this case the truth values are not subtracted from the MC simulation values. The resolutions agree within the error band which includes the MC statistical, luminosity and detector uncertainties.

Comparing the reconstructed and truth p_T^{miss} is a way to assess bias in events with real p_T^{miss} . Figure 7 shows the response ($p_T^{\text{miss}}/p_T^{\text{miss, true}}$) in each case as a function of truth p_T^{miss} , for all four working points, in events satisfying the $W \rightarrow \mu\nu$ and $t\bar{t}$ selections. Since the track-based soft term means soft neutral contributions to the event are ignored, it is expected that some bias from truth p_T^{miss} will be seen at low values where the p_T^{miss} is more dominated by the soft term. For $W \rightarrow \mu\nu$ events, tightening the working point slightly reduces the bias at low values, due to the removal of pile-up, which contributes to the bias. For $t\bar{t}$ events, the Tight performs slightly better at low values, consistent with the Loose working point leaving too much pile-up, and the tighter working points removing some of the hard-scatter jets.

Figure 8 shows the average value of \mathcal{P}^Z — defined in Section 6.6 — in bins of p_T^Z for data and MC simulation in a $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ selection. Overall there is an underestimation of the hadronic balance with the Z boson, caused by the missing component of neutral soft energy and finite detector acceptance, and an offset between data and prediction that is within uncertainties. The scale is worst at very low values of p_T^Z , where the missing neutral component of the soft term means much of the hadronic recoil is missed. At higher values the scale improves as jets are reconstructed allowing for better hadronic recoil determination. At very high values the event selection is dominated by the non- $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ processes. \mathcal{P}^Z can also be estimated in events with zero jets contributing to p_T^{miss} , as shown in Figure 8(b). In this case the projection becomes increasingly negative as p_T^Z increases, due to a larger portion of the hadronic recoil from the Z being included in the soft term of the p_T^{miss} .




Figure 4: The p_x^{miss} and p_y^{miss} resolution for different jet selections (sel.) ((a) and (b)) and different p_T^{miss} working points ((c) and (d)) as a function of μ ((a) and (c)) or N_{PV} ((b) and (d)). PFlow jets and the Tight p_T^{miss} working point are used, on SM MC simulations with a $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ selection applied and using SHERPA to generate the $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ events. The error bars include the MC statistical uncertainty. In the y-axis label of the lower panels, ‘incl.’ refers to the inclusive jet selection, ‘sel.’ to the alternate jet selection under consideration and ‘WP’ to the working point under consideration. ‘True’ refers to MC-generated quantities.




Figure 5: The p_x^{miss} and p_y^{miss} resolution for different p_T^{miss} working points as a function of μ ((a),(c),(e)) or N_{PV} ((b),(d),(f)). A $t\bar{t}$ selection is applied in (a) and (b), a VBF $H \rightarrow WW$ selection in (c) and (d), and a $W \rightarrow \mu\nu$ selection in (e) and (f). PFlow jets are used. The error bars include the MC statistical uncertainty. In the y-axis label of the lower panels, ‘incl.’ refers to the inclusive jet selection, ‘sel.’ to the alternate jet selection under consideration and ‘WP’ to the working point under consideration. ‘True’ refers to MC-generated quantities.




Figure 6: The p_x^{miss} and p_y^{miss} resolution in data and simulation with the Tight working point as a function of (a) μ or (b) NPV. A $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ selection is applied with SHERPA used to generate the $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ events. PFlow jets are used with an inclusive selection. The error band includes MC statistical, luminosity and detector uncertainties.




Figure 7: The p_T^{miss} response for different working points as a function of truth (generated) p_T^{miss} . SM MC simulation with an (a) $W \rightarrow \mu\nu$ or (b) $t\bar{t}$ selection applied is used. PFlow jets are used. The error bars include the MC statistical uncertainty.




Figure 8: The average \mathcal{P}^Z (projection of $\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss}}$ on to unit vector in the direction of the Z boson \mathbf{A}_Z) as a function of the Z boson's transverse momentum. Events satisfy a $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ selection with SHERPA used to generate the $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ events; PFlow jets and the Tight p_T^{miss} working point is used. In Figure (a) no additional requirements are placed on jets, whereas in Figure (b) the 0-jets selection is used. The error bars include statistical and detector uncertainties.

8 Systematic uncertainties

Uncertainties on the measurement of p_T^{miss} are calculated for the scale and resolution. These uncertainties depend on every object entering the p_T^{miss} reconstruction, and thus on both the soft term and the composition of the hard term. Since the hard term's composition is defined individually for any given analysis, the scale and resolution uncertainty of each of the hard objects must be extracted based on the object definitions used. This is done for each analysis, using the uncertainty recommendations provided for each object type. In propagating these uncertainties through p_T^{miss} reconstruction, correlations between systematic uncertainties for the same type of object are taken into account. However, the systematic uncertainties of each of the different types of object in the hard term are taken to be uncorrelated since independent reconstruction and calibration algorithms are applied to each. As seen in Section 7.1, for topologies dominated by fake p_T^{miss} the dominant uncertainty in the p_T^{miss} distribution can come from the uncertainties in the reconstruction of jets entering the hard term. For the case of the p_T^{miss} soft term, the scale and resolution uncertainties are calculated as described in the remainder of this section, and these are used for any analysis. It is expected that the soft term uncertainties only have a significant effect on the overall p_T^{miss} uncertainty when the soft term itself dominates the p_T^{miss} calculation, either because the topology contains few hard objects to contribute to the hard term or because it contains a relatively large amount of soft activity.

8.1 Methodology

The uncertainty in the soft term is assumed to be dominated by how well it is modelled by Monte Carlo simulation. This is best studied in events with no true p_T^{miss} , where $\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss}} = -\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{soft}} - \mathbf{p}_T^{\text{hard}} = 0$ if the soft term is perfectly reconstructed. In this case the soft term behaviour can be easily studied by comparing

the soft and hard terms. In practise, fake p_T^{miss} will spoil this balance. The $Z \rightarrow ee$ selection defined in Section 5 is used for this uncertainty derivation, and it is validated in a $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ selection.

The soft term's uncertainty is calculated by quantifying the balance between the hard and soft terms by considering the projection of the soft term onto the hard term. This leads to three variables used to parametrise the uncertainties, which can be defined with the help of Figure 9. These are:

- the parallel scale (Δ_L) — defined as the mean of the parallel projection of \vec{p}_T^{soft} along \vec{p}_T^{hard} , $\langle p_{\parallel}^{\text{soft}} \rangle$;
- the parallel resolution (σ_{\parallel}) — defined as the root-mean-square of $p_{\parallel}^{\text{soft}}$;
- and the perpendicular resolution (σ_{\perp}) — defined as the root-mean-square of the perpendicular projection of \vec{p}_T^{soft} along \vec{p}_T^{hard} , p_{\perp}^{soft} .

As expected, the perpendicular scale was found to be consistent with zero in both the Monte Carlo and data in Ref. [3], so is not of interest.




Figure 9: \vec{p}_T^{soft} projections along \vec{p}_T^{hard} , taken from Ref. [7].

The values of these variables are calculated in different bins of p_T^{hard} . Separate soft term uncertainties are calculated for p_T^{miss} built from EMTopo and PFlow jets, using the Tight p_T^{miss} working point, by considering the maximal difference between the data and the different Monte Carlo generators, and taking the maximum of these between both the jet inclusive and 0-jets selections. The three generators considered are POWHEG +PYTHIA, MADGRAPH +PYTHIA and SHERPA, which are all the standard options available for $Z + \text{jets}$ processes in ATLAS.

Up to a p_T^{hard} of 60 GeV, both the jet inclusive and 0-jets selections are considered. Due to decreased statistical precision, the 0-jets selection is not used $p_T^{\text{hard}} > 60$ GeV.

To account for contamination of non- $Z \rightarrow ee$ events passing the $Z \rightarrow ee$ selection in data, MC simulations of VV and $t\bar{t}$ processes were included in addition to the various $Z \rightarrow ee$ simulations. At the point in the p_T^{hard} distributions where these processes start to dominate, the crucial initial assumption of the $p_T^{\text{soft}}-p_T^{\text{hard}}$ balance breaks down. As was seen in Figure 1, this occurs at around 100 GeV, where the $Z \rightarrow ee$ events would require the Z boson to be increasingly off-shell. As a result, the measurement of the soft term uncertainty stops at $p_T^{\text{hard}} = 100$ GeV, and the value obtained in the final bin up to 100 GeV is used for any event with a higher p_T^{hard} .

8.2 Uncertainty values

Figure 10 shows the three variables for the jet inclusive and 0-jets selection using PFlow jets, in the same bins of p_T^{hard} used for the uncertainty calculation. The distributions are given for data and the different

Monte Carlo generators, with the uncertainty values (labelled as ‘TST syst. uncert.’, short for track soft systematic uncertainty) illustrated as a shaded band centered on the data.

In comparison to preliminary results presented in Figure 6 of Ref. [7], a reduction in the uncertainty values for scale and resolution is seen throughout the p_T^{hard} distribution, after the improvements described here. Scale uncertainties are reduced by up to 76% and resolution uncertainties are reduced by up to 51%. For a representative example considering the [30, 35] GeV bin of p_T^{hard} , the parallel scale uncertainty is reduced in comparison to the previous results by 52% (dropping from 0.97 GeV to 0.47 GeV), the parallel resolution uncertainty is reduced by 43% (dropping from 2.59 GeV to 1.47 GeV), and the perpendicular resolution uncertainty is reduced by 13% (dropping from 2.29 GeV to 2.00 GeV).

Below ~ 20 GeV, the uncertainties are dominated by the 0-jets selections where the p_T of the Z -boson directly balances the soft term. Above this, the jet inclusive selection starts to dominate, where the soft term consists mainly of diffuse radiation which hasn’t formed jets. The values of the soft term uncertainties calculated for PFlow, are shown in Figure 11. The PFlow uncertainties are generally smaller than EMTopo (shown in Figure 17 in Appendix B), attributed to better rejection of poorly modelled pile-up, which is consistent with the performance seen in the previous section.

The parallel resolution uncertainty, which relates largely to mismeasurement of the jets which recoil the Z and grow in p_T with the Z , increases with p_T^{hard} . The transverse resolution uncertainty relates to other effects and is less dependent on the p_T^{hard} . Thus, the σ_{\perp} uncertainty dominates (in terms of absolute uncertainty value) at low values and σ_{\parallel} dominated beyond around $p_T^{\text{hard}} = 60$ GeV. To validate the uncertainties for the Tight working point, they are applied to the three variables calculated for $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ events, and successfully cover $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ MC/data discrepancies. To validate the use of the uncertainties for other working points, they are applied to $Z \rightarrow ee$ events where p_T^{miss} is reconstructed using the Loose, Tighter, or Tenacious working points, Again the uncertainty band successfully covers MC/data differences.


To apply the calculated systematic resolution uncertainties in an ATLAS analysis, the soft term projection is smeared by a Gaussian function with a width corresponding to the resolution uncertainty in the relevant p_T^{hard} bin. It is conventional to symmetrise the variation of the soft-term to produce a \pm error band. The systematic uncertainty in the scale is applied by either adding or subtracting the scale uncertainty (Δ_L) for the appropriate p_T^{hard} bin to the value of the parallel component of the soft term, $p_{\parallel}^{\text{soft}}$.

9 p_T^{miss} significance


9.1 p_T^{miss} significance definitions

In association with p_T^{miss} , the concept of a p_T^{miss} ‘significance’ can be defined to quantify the belief that the reconstructed p_T^{miss} is real. As well as being useful to identify processes with neutrinos in the final state, such a variable is extremely useful in searches for new stable particles [9, 68], where typically a large amount of real p_T^{miss} is expected in the new-physics signal process but not in SM background processes. A p_T^{miss} significance variable can often effectively discriminate between the signal and backgrounds.


ATLAS initially used event-based p_T^{miss} significance approximations. Subsequently, the p_T^{miss} significance definition has adroitly evolved to follow a similar object-based approach to that used in calculating p_T^{miss} itself. This new object-based p_T^{miss} significance performs better at discriminating between real and fake p_T^{miss} . Both approaches are discussed here.




(a)




(b)




(c)



(d)



(e)



(f)

Figure 10: Parallel scale (Δ_L , (a) and (b)), parallel resolution squared (σ_{\parallel} , (c) and (d)) and transverse resolution squared (σ_{\perp} , (e) and (f)) plots for the p_T^{soft} (TST, track soft term) in bins of p_T^{hard} . Full Run 2 data and MC simulated samples are shown with a Z \rightarrow ee event selection applied using PFlow jets, in the jet inclusive ((a), (c) and (e)) or 0-jets selections ((b), (d) and (f)). Full Run 2 uncertainties are shown as a shaded band about the data.




Figure 11: A summary of the p_T^{soft} systematic uncertainties. The parallel scale (Δ_{\parallel}), parallel resolution (σ_{\parallel}) and transverse resolution (σ_{\perp}) of the p_T^{soft} projection onto the p_T^{hard} , binned in p_T^{hard} . Full Run 2 data and Monte Carlo samples are shown with a $Z \rightarrow ee$ event selection applied.

9.1.1 Event-based p_T^{miss} significance

As a first attempt at quantifying a measure of the ‘realness’ of p_T^{miss} , a heuristic definition was considered that approximated the resolution of p_T^{miss} using the square root of the scalar sum of all jet p_T

$$H_T = \sum_i p_{T,i},$$

where the index runs over the jets in an event. The approximation of p_T^{miss} significance (S), made possible because H_T scales with p_T^{miss} resolution, is written as

$$S_{H_T} = \frac{p_T^{\text{miss}}}{\sqrt{H_T}}.$$

Another approximation for the resolution was based on the sum of all the reconstructed objects in the detector defined in Eq. (2), $\sqrt{\sum p_T}$, and allowed the significance to be written as:

$$S_{\Sigma} = \frac{p_T^{\text{miss}}}{\sqrt{\sum p_T}}.$$

These definitions are formed from proxies for the resolution of p_T^{miss} and so are not true dimensionless significances. Both $\sqrt{H_T}$ and $\sqrt{\sum p_T}$ are event-by-event proxies for resolution that scale linearly with p_T^{miss} resolution under the assumption that only calorimeter signals are used to build p_T^{miss} . This is not the case when one wishes to use the tracker for its improved pile-up rejection and better p_T resolution at low momentum for charged particles.

9.1.2 Object-based p_T^{miss} significance

Section 6 introduced the concept of an object-based approach to p_T^{miss} , described in Eq. (1). An analogous approach using these objects and their detector resolutions can be used to define an improved, object-based, p_T^{miss} significance. This significance encodes the resolutions of all reconstructed objects⁶ and accounts

⁶ This considers the p_T and η dependence of objects’ detector resolution.

for the correlations between each object in an event. Appendix A provides a detailed derivation of this quantity; in this section a more concise overview is presented.

To determine if the observed missing transverse momentum is real or fake in origin, a hypothesis test can be performed. This compares the hypothesis with no momentum carried by invisible particles ($\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss, true}} = 0$) to that with there being genuine p_T carried by invisible particles ($\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss, true}} \neq 0$). The missing transverse momentum significance ($\mathcal{S}(p_T^{\text{miss}})$) definition,

$$\mathcal{S}^2 = 2 \ln \left(\frac{\max_{\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss, true}} \neq 0} \mathcal{L} \left(\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss}} | \mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss, true}} \right)}{\max_{\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss, true}} = 0} \mathcal{L} \left(\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss}} | \mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss, true}} \right)} \right), \quad (3)$$

is formed by this test, where \mathcal{L} is the likelihood (the ‘true’ label refers to MC generated quantities). This log likelihood ratio, based on the Neyman-Pearson lemma [69], assumes that each of the likelihoods depends on all the objects measured in an event; their multiplicities, types and kinematic properties.

In addition to the log likelihood ratio, the functional form of $\mathcal{L} \left(\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss}} | \mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss, true}} \right)$ is required to calculate $\mathcal{S}(p_T^{\text{miss}})$. This can be found following a few assumptions. Firstly, the p_T measurement for each object, $\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{Obj}}$, is assumed to be independent of all others (where $\text{Obj} \in \{e, \gamma, \tau, \mu, \text{jet}\}$). For all objects, $\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{Obj}}$ (given a true value of $\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{Object, true}}$) is taken to follow a Gaussian probability distribution of the form $\text{Gaus} \left(\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{Obj}} - \mathbf{p}_T^{\text{Object, true}} \right)$. The probability distribution for each object has a covariance matrix labelled \mathbf{V}^{Obj} , which is the sum of covariances quantifying the resolutions of each object, in p_T and ϕ , entering the $\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss}}$ calculation. Finally, conservation of momentum in the transverse plane means that if the true momentum of each measured particle were to be summed this would balance with the negative signed invisible particle momentum: $\sum_{\text{Objects}} \mathbf{p}_T^{\text{Object, true}} = -\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss, true}}$. With these assumptions made, the form of the likelihood is a two dimensional Gaussian distribution. Entering this into the maximised log likelihood ratio, Eq. (3), results in the cancellation of any preceding coefficients and leaves:

$$\mathcal{S}^2 = \left(\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss}} \right)^T \left(\sum_{\text{Objects}} \mathbf{v}^{\text{Obj}} \right)^{-1} \left(\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss}} \right). \quad (4)$$

This is now a sum of independent standard Gaussian-shaped variables in two dimensions, or more simply a χ^2 hypothesis test in two dimensions. Equation (4) links $\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss}}$ to all the object resolutions which are encoded in the covariance matrix summation.

In this format the results of the χ^2 test are easily interpreted with a single value that indicates how likely it is that the null hypothesis ($\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{Object, true}} = 0$) holds. Low values of \mathcal{S}^2 indicate that the $\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss}}$ comes from fake sources like mismeasurement or resolution effects while high values show that it is likely the $\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss}}$ comes from a real invisible particle leaving the detector without interactions. The covariance matrix for each object is defined with an axis along the measured transverse momentum vector of the object under consideration, $\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{Obj}}$.

After some matrix calculation covered in detail in Appendix A, one obtains the final definition of $\mathcal{S}(p_T^{\text{miss}})$:

$$\mathcal{S}(p_T^{\text{miss}}) = \frac{p_T^{\text{miss}}}{\sqrt{\sigma_L^2 (1 - \rho_{LT}^2)}}. \quad (5)$$

Here σ_L defines the resolution longitudinally to p_T^{miss} and ρ_{LT} is the correlation between the transverse and longitudinal resolutions relative to p_T^{miss} , calculated from the covariance matrix. This dimensionless variable contains the measured quantity in the numerator, along with a measure of its variance in the denominator.

9.2 p_T^{miss} significance modelling and performance

Figure 12(a) shows the original calorimeter dependent significance proxy, \mathcal{S}_Σ , for events that satisfy a $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ selection. The Tight and PFlow jets are used to build the p_T^{miss} , and the jet inclusive selection is applied. SHERPA is used to generate the $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ MC simulation events. The low values are dominated by events with an expected truth p_T^{miss} of zero, which have some fake p_T^{miss} . The high valued tails are more dominated by events from other processes that have a high energy neutrino produced and satisfy the $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ selection in data. Figure 12(b) shows a different event-based significance estimate, \mathcal{S}_{H_T} , which indicates a larger estimate of events which are likely to have real p_T^{miss} in them.

The object-based missing transverse momentum significance derived in Section 9 is presented in Figure 12(c). The $\mathcal{S}(p_T^{\text{miss}})$ distribution for the $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ events moves closer to the expected value of zero, whilst the other processes move to higher values. It shows good agreement between data and MC in the bulk where $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ events dominate and the MC simulations used in this paper are expected to be more representative of the data. The behaviour here is closer to that of Figure 12(a) than Figure 12(b) and reinforces the statement that $\sqrt{\sum p_T}$ is a good proxy for the resolution of p_T^{miss} .

One can also investigate how the resolution terms in the denominator impact the agreement between data and prediction by defining a directional p_T^{miss} significance (\mathcal{S}_{dir}) that only has the longitudinal resolution in Eq. (5) and so remove any input from σ_T . This is shown in Figure 12(d), which looks very similar to Figure 12(c) suggesting a small impact in this $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ event topology.

The performance of the various p_T^{miss} significance definitions at discriminating between processes with real and fake p_T^{miss} is assessed next. This is done by calculating ROC curves for each definition, to determine background rejection against signal efficiency, as shown in Figure 13. The comparison is made in the $t\bar{t}$ event selection, considering semileptonically decaying $t\bar{t}$ MC simulated events as the real p_T^{miss} signal, and MC simulated $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ events as the fake p_T^{miss} background which contaminates the event selection. In an ATLAS analysis, a common use of p_T^{miss} significance would be as a selection requirement on the events entering the analysis region, and ideally the signal efficiency and background rejection should both be maximised through a particular threshold on the significance value. The ROC curves demonstrate that discrimination power improves with the object-based significance measures in comparison to the event-based definitions. The directional significance \mathcal{S}_{dir} has a very similar definition to the object-based significance and shows a comparable, although marginally worse, performance.




Figure 12: Event-based proxies for p_T^{miss} significance ((a) and (b)), Object-based p_T^{miss} significance (c), and its directional form (d), in $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ events. p_T^{miss} is built using the Tight working point and PFlow jets. SHERPA is used to generate the $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ events. The error band includes MC statistical, luminosity and detector uncertainties.




Figure 13: Background rejection versus signal efficiency in simulated $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ and $t\bar{t}$ events. Both samples have a $t\bar{t}$ event selection applied. All events passing the selections are used to calculate background rejection and signal efficiency using the Tight and PFlow jets to build p_T^{miss} . The Area Under the Curve (AUC) value is shown beside each significance definition in the legend.

10 Conclusion

This paper presents the performance of missing transverse momentum and its significance in 140 fb^{-1} of proton-proton collisions recorded at a center-of-mass energy of 13 TeV, acquired by the ATLAS experiment between 2015 and 2018. A complete description of p_T^{miss} reconstruction is given, including the update to the particle flow jet collection, and the definitions of four working points to allow more stringent removal of pile-up contamination for analyses that require it. The state-of-the-art object-based p_T^{miss} significance is derived, in comparison to earlier event-based approximations. Comparisons of MC simulation and data are shown for various p_T^{miss} quantities, with a $Z \rightarrow \ell\ell$ selection applied. There is generally good agreement, particularly in the overall p_T^{miss} distribution for all p_T^{miss} working points, jet definitions and MC generators considered. The p_T^{miss} significance modelling is also satisfactory, and showed a better separation between topologies with real and fake p_T^{miss} in comparison to the event-based approximations.

Firstly, the dependence of the p_T^{miss} resolution on pile-up is shown by comparing different jet selections — demonstrating that almost all pile-up dependence originates from jets in the p_T^{miss} calculation, as expected. Secondly, p_T^{miss} working points are compared, demonstrating success at improving the otherwise degraded resolution at high pile-up by up to 30% as the working points are tightened from Loose to Tenacious. The resolution is considered for several processes to demonstrate that all working points are useful. The

comparison of reconstructed and truth p_T^{miss} is made for each working point, as a function of the truth p_T^{miss} . All working points behave similarly here, with reconstructed p_T^{miss} overestimating the truth p_T^{miss} for low values of truth p_T^{miss} , and estimating it well at higher values. Finally the p_T^{miss} scale is shown to be similar between data and MC simulation in $Z \rightarrow ee$ events, with both showing an underestimation of the hadronic recoil.

Systematic uncertainties in the p_T^{soft} scale and resolution are calculated using $Z \rightarrow ee$ events, by considering how well data and MC simulation meet the expectation of a perfect balance between p_T^{hard} and p_T^{soft} in events with zero real p_T^{miss} . The uncertainties are calculated as the maximal disagreement between data and MC simulation in three different $Z \rightarrow \ell\ell$ generators, in bins of p_T^{hard} . The uncertainty values are reduced throughout the p_T^{hard} distribution, by up for 76% for scale and up to 51% for resolution.

Run 2 p_T^{miss} reconstruction at ATLAS is observed to be resilient against rising pile-up, overall the modelling is good and the disagreement in the p_T^{soft} modelling is evaluated and taken into account with systematic uncertainties. As an important detector signature for ATLAS, p_T^{miss} will continue to be a robust component of many physics analyses to come.

Acknowledgements

We thank CERN for the very successful operation of the LHC, as well as the support staff from our institutions without whom ATLAS could not be operated efficiently.

We acknowledge the support of ANPCyT, Argentina; YerPhI, Armenia; ARC, Australia; BMWFW and FWF, Austria; ANAS, Azerbaijan; CNPq and FAPESP, Brazil; NSERC, NRC and CFI, Canada; CERN; ANID, Chile; CAS, MOST and NSFC, China; Minciencias, Colombia; MEYS CR, Czech Republic; DNRF and DNSRC, Denmark; IN2P3-CNRS and CEA-DRF/IRFU, France; SRNSFG, Georgia; BMBF, HGF and MPG, Germany; GSRI, Greece; RGC and Hong Kong SAR, China; ISF and Benoziyo Center, Israel; INFN, Italy; MEXT and JSPS, Japan; CNRST, Morocco; NWO, Netherlands; RCN, Norway; MEiN, Poland; FCT, Portugal; MNE/IFA, Romania; MESTD, Serbia; MSSR, Slovakia; ARRS and MIZŠ, Slovenia; DSI/NRF, South Africa; MICINN, Spain; SRC and Wallenberg Foundation, Sweden; SERI, SNSF and Cantons of Bern and Geneva, Switzerland; MOST, Taipei; TENMAK, Türkiye; STFC, United Kingdom; DOE and NSF, United States of America. In addition, individual groups and members have received support from BCKDF, CANARIE, CRC and DRAC, Canada; PRIMUS 21/SCI/017 and UNCE SCI/013, Czech Republic; COST, ERC, ERDF, Horizon 2020, ICSC-NextGenerationEU and Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions, European Union; Investissements d’Avenir Labex, Investissements d’Avenir Idex and ANR, France; DFG and AvH Foundation, Germany; Herakleitos, Thales and Aristeia programmes co-financed by EU-ESF and the Greek NSRF, Greece; BSF-NSF and MINERVA, Israel; Norwegian Financial Mechanism 2014-2021, Norway; NCN and NAWA, Poland; La Caixa Banking Foundation, CERCA Programme Generalitat de Catalunya and PROMETEO and GenT Programmes Generalitat Valenciana, Spain; Göran Gustafssons Stiftelse, Sweden; The Royal Society and Leverhulme Trust, United Kingdom.

The crucial computing support from all WLCG partners is acknowledged gratefully, in particular from CERN, the ATLAS Tier-1 facilities at TRIUMF/SFU (Canada), NDGF (Denmark, Norway, Sweden), CC-IN2P3 (France), KIT/GridKA (Germany), INFN-CNAF (Italy), NL-T1 (Netherlands), PIC (Spain), RAL (UK) and BNL (USA), the Tier-2 facilities worldwide and large non-WLCG resource providers. Major contributors of computing resources are listed in Ref. [70].

Appendix

A p_T^{miss} significance

Section 6 introduced the concept of an object-based approach to p_T^{miss} , described in Eq. (1). An analogous object-based approach can be used to define an improved, object-based, p_T^{miss} significance. This significance encodes the resolutions of all reconstructed objects while also accounting for the correlations between each object in an event.

The relative resolution of each hard object as a function of their p_T motivates the use of an object-based approach to the significance in Figure 14. The relative resolutions can vary by a large amount across the p_T range and even in what $|\eta|$ region the candidate object is in.




Figure 14: Each of the relative resolutions (σ/p_T) for the objects entering the p_T^{miss} , defined in Section 6. The lines are split by $|\eta|$ conditions and run with the p_T of the object in question. The muons are said to be combined (CB) meaning that they come from combined inner detector tracks and muon spectrometer hits. The photons are those which have not converted into an e^+e^- pair. The jet curves include the contribution from pile-up, which is binned in p_T , giving the sharp shape for $|\eta| = 4.5$. More detail on object definitions is found in Section 4.

With the objects and their respective resolutions used in Eq. (1) in mind, one can formulate a true significance. To determine if the observed missing transverse momentum, p_T^{miss} , is due to a real invisible particle, or instead caused by resolution effects and mismeasurement of detector objects, a hypothesis test between there being no momentum carried by invisible particles ($p_T^{\text{miss, true}} = 0$) against there being genuine p_T carried by invisible particles ($p_T^{\text{miss, true}} \neq 0$) is defined. This test forms the missing transverse momentum significance ($\mathcal{S}(p_T^{\text{miss}})$) definition,

$$\mathcal{S}^2 = 2 \ln \left(\frac{\max_{p_T^{\text{miss, true}} \neq 0} \mathcal{L} \left(p_T^{\text{miss}} | p_T^{\text{miss, true}} \right)}{\max_{p_T^{\text{miss, true}} = 0} \mathcal{L} \left(p_T^{\text{miss}} | p_T^{\text{miss, true}} \right)} \right).$$

This log likelihood ratio, based on the Neyman-Pearson lemma [69], assumes that each of the likelihoods depends on all the objects measured in an event, their multiplicities, types and kinematic properties. In

other words \mathcal{S} is an event-by-event evaluation of the p -value that the observed $\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss}}$, is consistent with the null hypothesis that there is no truth $\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss}}, \mathbf{p}_T^{\text{Object, true}} = 0$,

$$\mathcal{S}^2 = 2 \ln \left(\frac{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss}} | \mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss, true}})}{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss}} | 0)} \right). \quad (6)$$

In addition to this, the functional form of $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss}} | \mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss, true}})$ is required to calculate $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss}})$. This can be found following a few assumptions. Firstly, the p_T measurement for each object, $\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{Obj}}$, is assumed to be independent of all others (where $\text{Obj} \in \{e, \gamma, \tau, \mu, \text{jet}\}$). Each of the objects measuring $\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{Obj}}$ (given a true value of $\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{Object, true}}$) is taken to follow a particular probability distribution of the form $f(\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{Obj}} - \mathbf{p}_T^{\text{Object, true}})$. The probability distribution for each object is assumed to be Gaussian and has a covariance matrix labelled \mathbf{V}^{Obj} . This is the sum of covariances quantifying the resolutions of each object, in p_T and ϕ , entering the $\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss}}$ calculation. Finally, conservation of momentum in the transverse plane means that if the true momentum of each measured particle were to be summed this would balance with the negative signed invisible particle momentum: $\sum_{\text{Objects}} \mathbf{p}_T^{\text{Obj}} = -\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss, true}}$.

With these assumptions made, the form of the likelihood is

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss}} | \mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss, true}}) \propto \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss}} - \mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss, true}})^T \left(\sum_{\text{Objects}} \mathbf{V}^{\text{Obj}} \right)^{-1} (\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss}} - \mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss, true}}) \right],$$

which is a two dimensional Gaussian distribution. Entering this into the maximised log likelihood ratio, Eq. (6), results in the cancellation of any preceding coefficients and leaves:

$$\mathcal{S}^2 = (\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss}})^T \left(\sum_{\text{Objects}} \mathbf{V}^{\text{Obj}} \right)^{-1} (\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss}}). \quad (7)$$

This is now a sum of independent standard normal variables in two dimensions, or more simply a χ^2 hypothesis test in two dimensions. Equation (7) links $\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss}}$ to all the object resolutions which are encoded in the covariance matrix summation.

In this format the results of the χ^2 test are easily interpreted with a single value that indicates how likely it is that the null hypothesis ($\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss, true}} = 0$) holds. Low values of \mathcal{S}^2 indicate that the $\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss}}$ comes from fake sources like mismeasurement or resolution effects while high values show that it is likely the $\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{miss}}$ comes from a real invisible particle leaving the detector without interaction.

The covariance matrix for each object is defined with an axis along the measured transverse momentum vector of the object under consideration, $\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{Obj}}$. This allows each object's covariance matrix to be simply written in terms of the resolution of the magnitude of $\mathbf{p}_T^{\text{Obj}}$ and the resolution in the azimuthal angle,

$$\mathbf{V}^{\text{Obj}} = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{p_T}^2 & 0 \\ 0 & p_T^{\text{Obj}2} \sigma_{\phi}^2 \end{pmatrix},$$

under the condition that p_T^{Obj} and ϕ^{Obj} are independent measurements.

So far only the well defined hard objects have been considered but as was seen there is a soft term in Eq. (1) with its own resolution. The covariance matrix for the soft term is defined in a similar fashion to the objects in Eq. (A) and allows the complete covariance matrix to be written as:

$$\mathbf{V} = \sum_{\text{Objects}} \mathbf{V}^{\text{Obj}} + \mathbf{V}^{\text{Soft}}.$$

The soft term is included in the Obj set with the other hard objects. The total covariance matrix can be rotated using the two dimensional rotation matrix $R(\phi^{\text{Obj}})$ in the azimuthal plane,

$$\mathbf{V}_{xy} = \sum_{\text{Objects}} R^{-1}(\phi^{\text{Obj}}) \mathbf{V}^{\text{Obj}} R(\phi^{\text{Obj}}) = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_x^2 & \sigma_{xy}^2 \\ \sigma_{xy}^2 & \sigma_y^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Here the σ terms are now the combined resolutions of p_T^{miss} in x and y . To simplify the situation even further it is prudent to again rotate the system to the frame of p_T^{miss} . In this frame there are two components to the total p_T^{miss} resolutions; one longitudinal (or parallel) ‘‘L’’ and another transverse (or perpendicular) to p_T^{miss} ‘‘T’’. To do this another two dimensional rotation matrix is applied, $R(\phi(p_T^{\text{miss}}))$, to end up with:

$$\mathbf{V}_{\text{LT}} = R(\phi(p_T^{\text{miss}})) \mathbf{V}_{xy} R^{-1}(\phi(p_T^{\text{miss}})) = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_L^2 & \rho_{\text{LT}} \sigma_L \sigma_T \\ \rho_{\text{LT}} \sigma_L \sigma_T & \sigma_T^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The longitudinal variance is σ_L , the transverse variance is σ_T and ρ_{LT} represents the covariance between measurements in the longitudinal and transverse directions. Equation (7) takes the inverse of \mathbf{V} , this can be retrieved using the following relation for a two-by-two matrix,

$$\mathbf{V}^{-1} = \frac{1}{\det \mathbf{V}} [(\text{tr} \mathbf{V}) \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{V}].$$

Which gives,

$$\mathbf{V}_{\text{LT}}^{-1} = \frac{1}{\sigma_L^2 \sigma_T^2 - \rho_{\text{LT}}^2 \sigma_L^2 \sigma_T^2} \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_T^2 & -\rho_{\text{LT}} \sigma_L \sigma_T \\ -\rho_{\text{LT}} \sigma_L \sigma_T & \sigma_L^2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (8)$$

This can finally be substituted into a slightly more expanded version (for clarity) of Eq. (7) with the total covariance matrix in the ‘‘LT’’ frame, as defined above,

$$\mathcal{S}^2 = (p_T^{\text{miss}}, 0) \mathbf{V}_{\text{LT}}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} p_T^{\text{miss}} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Finally entering Eq. (8) and multiplying out the matrix one ends up with the much simpler definition of $\mathcal{S}(p_T^{\text{miss}})$:

$$\mathcal{S}^2 = \frac{|p_T^{\text{miss}}|^2}{\sigma_L^2 (1 - \rho_{\text{LT}}^2)}$$

or

$$\mathcal{S}(p_T^{\text{miss}}) = \frac{p_T^{\text{miss}}}{\sqrt{\sigma_L^2 (1 - \rho_{\text{LT}}^2)}}.$$

Equation (A) is the final object-based missing transverse momentum significance and is a true significance. This variable contains the measured quantity in the numerator along with information on the variance of its measurement in the denominator in a dimensionless way.

B p_T^{miss} with EMTopo jets

EMTopo jets are reconstructed from topo-clusters, using the anti- k_t algorithm with $R = 0.4$. The topo-clusters are calibrated at the EM energy scale, and fully calibrated [67]. Requirements of $p_T > 20$ GeV and $|\eta| < 4.5$ are made on the calibrated EMTopo jets. Tracks are matched to jets using ghost-association [71]. This consists of repeating the jet clustering process with the addition of ‘ghost’ versions of tracks with the same direction but infinitesimal p_T . A track is ghost-associated if it is contained within the re-clustered jet. After full calibration, EMTopo jets are subject to JVT requirements that are the same as those for EMPFlow jets, except that $\text{JVT} > 0.59$ is used to achieve the same efficiency.

The reconstruction of p_T^{miss} when EMTopo jets are used follows the procedure defined in Section 6. Similar to PFlow-based p_T^{miss} (illustrated in Table 3), four working points are supported, and shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Selections for the p_T^{miss} working points supported for EMTopo jets.

Working point	p_T [GeV] for jets with:		Selections	fJVT for jets with
	$ \eta < 2.4$	$2.4 < \eta < 4.5$	JVT for jets with $ \eta < 2.4$	$2.5 < \eta < 4.5$ & $p_T < 120$ GeV
Loose	> 20	> 20	> 0.59 for $p_T < 60$ GeV	-
Tight	> 20	> 30	> 0.59 for $p_T < 60$ GeV	< 0.4
Tighter	> 20	> 35	> 0.59 for $p_T < 60$ GeV	-
Tenacious	> 20	> 35	> 0.91 for $20 < p_T < 40$ GeV > 0.59 for $40 < p_T < 60$ GeV > 0.11 for $60 < p_T < 120$ GeV	< 0.5




Figure 15: Distributions of p_T^{miss} (a) and its constituent soft (b) terms in MC and data. Events satisfy a $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ selection. EMTopo jets are used with a jet inclusive selection and the Tight p_T^{miss} working point. SHERPA is used to generate the $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ events. The error band includes MC statistical, luminosity and detector uncertainties.

Figure 15 shows the p_T^{miss} and p_T^{soft} distributions, for p_T^{miss} built from EMTopo jets satisfying a $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ selection. These show a similar level of agreement between data and Monte-Carlo simulation in comparison to the PFlow-based distributions shown in Figure 1. The soft term has a smaller tail when PFlow jets are




Figure 16: The p_x^{miss} and p_y^{miss} resolution for different jet selections (sel.) (a) and different p_T^{miss} working points (b) as a function of μ . The Tight p_T^{miss} working point is used and SM MC with a $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ selection applied. EMTopo jets are used. The error bars include the MC statistical uncertainty. In the y-axis label of the lower panels, ‘incl.’ refers to the inclusive jet selection, ‘sel.’ to the alternate jet selection under consideration and ‘WP’ to the working point under consideration.

used to build p_T^{miss} compared to using EMTopo jets, attributed to the particle flow algorithm’s improved ability to reject pile-up.

The values of the soft term uncertainties calculated for EMTopo, are given Figure 17. The EMTopo uncertainties are generally larger than for PFlow (shown in Figure 11), attributed to PFlow’s better rejection of poorly modelled pile-up.




Figure 17: A summary of the p_T^{soft} systematic uncertainties for p_T^{miss} built with EMTopo jets. The parallel scale (Δ_L), parallel resolution (σ_{\parallel}) and transverse resolution (σ_{\perp}) of the p_T^{soft} projection onto the p_T^{hard} , binned in p_T^{hard} . Full Run 2 data and Monte Carlo samples are shown with a $Z \rightarrow ee$ event selection applied.

References

- [1] ATLAS Collaboration, *The ATLAS Experiment at the CERN Large Hadron Collider*, *JINST* **3** (2008) S08003.
- [2] ATLAS Collaboration, *Performance of missing transverse momentum reconstruction in proton–proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV with ATLAS*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **72** (2012) 1844, arXiv: [1108.5602 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [3] ATLAS Collaboration, *Performance of algorithms that reconstruct missing transverse momentum in $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV proton–proton collisions in the ATLAS detector*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77** (2017) 241, arXiv: [1609.09324 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [4] ATLAS Collaboration, *Performance of missing transverse momentum reconstruction with the ATLAS detector using proton–proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **78** (2018) 903, arXiv: [1802.08168 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [5] W. Balunas et al., *A Flexible and Efficient Approach to Missing Transverse Momentum Reconstruction*, *Comput. Softw. Big Sci.* **8** (2024) 2, arXiv: [2308.15290 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [6] ATLAS Collaboration, *Jet reconstruction and performance using particle flow with the ATLAS Detector*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77** (2017) 466, arXiv: [1703.10485 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [7] ATLAS Collaboration, *E_T^{miss} performance in the ATLAS detector using 2015–2016 LHC pp collisions*, ATLAS-CONF-2018-023, 2018, URL: <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2625233>.
- [8] ATLAS Collaboration, *A search for an unexpected asymmetry in the production of $e^+\mu^-$ and $e^-\mu^+$ pairs in proton–proton collisions recorded by the ATLAS detector at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV*, *Phys. Lett. B* **830** (2022) 137106, arXiv: [2112.08090 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [9] ATLAS Collaboration, *Search for new phenomena in final states with large jet multiplicities and missing transverse momentum using $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV proton–proton collisions recorded by ATLAS in Run 2 of the LHC*, *JHEP* **10** (2020) 062, arXiv: [2008.06032 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [10] ATLAS Collaboration, *The ATLAS Collaboration Software and Firmware*, ATL-SOFT-PUB-2021-001, 2021, URL: <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2767187>.
- [11] ATLAS Collaboration, *Luminosity determination in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV using the ATLAS detector at the LHC*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83** (2023) 982, arXiv: [2212.09379 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [12] G. Avoni et al., *The new LUCID-2 detector for luminosity measurement and monitoring in ATLAS*, *JINST* **13** (2018) P07017.
- [13] ATLAS Collaboration, *Performance of electron and photon triggers in ATLAS during LHC Run 2*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80** (2020) 47, arXiv: [1909.00761 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [14] ATLAS Collaboration, *Performance of the ATLAS muon triggers in Run 2*, *JINST* **15** (2020) P09015, arXiv: [2004.13447 \[physics.ins-det\]](#).
- [15] ATLAS Collaboration, *Performance of the ATLAS trigger system in 2015*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77** (2017) 317, arXiv: [1611.09661 \[hep-ex\]](#).

- [16] ATLAS Collaboration, *The ATLAS Simulation Infrastructure*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **70** (2010) 823, arXiv: [1005.4568 \[physics.ins-det\]](#).
- [17] S. Agostinelli et al., *GEANT4 – a simulation toolkit*, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **506** (2003) 250.
- [18] ATLAS Collaboration, *Improvements in $t\bar{t}$ modelling using NLO+PS Monte Carlo generators for Run 2*, ATL-PHYS-PUB-2018-009, 2018, URL: <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2630327>.
- [19] ATLAS Collaboration, *Simulation of top-quark production for the ATLAS experiment at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV*, ATL-PHYS-PUB-2016-004, 2016, URL: <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2120417>.
- [20] ATLAS Collaboration, *Multi-Boson Simulation for 13 TeV ATLAS Analyses*, ATL-PHYS-PUB-2017-005, 2017, URL: <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2261933>.
- [21] ATLAS Collaboration, *ATLAS simulation of boson plus jets processes in Run 2*, ATL-PHYS-PUB-2017-006, 2017, URL: <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2261937>.
- [22] ATLAS Collaboration, *Modelling and computational improvements to the simulation of single vector-boson plus jet processes for the ATLAS experiment*, *JHEP* **08** (2022) 089, arXiv: [2112.09588 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [23] ATLAS Collaboration, *Studies of Monte Carlo generators in Higgs boson production for ATLAS Run 2*, ATL-PHYS-PUB-2014-022, 2014, URL: <https://cds.cern.ch/record/1978192>.
- [24] T. Sjöstrand, S. Mrenna and P. Skands, *A brief introduction to PYTHIA 8.1*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **178** (2008) 852, arXiv: [0710.3820 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [25] NNPDF Collaboration, R. D. Ball et al., *Parton distributions with LHC data*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **867** (2013) 244, arXiv: [1207.1303 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [26] ATLAS Collaboration, *The Pythia 8 A3 tune description of ATLAS minimum bias and inelastic measurements incorporating the Donnachie–Landshoff diffractive model*, ATL-PHYS-PUB-2016-017, 2016, URL: <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2206965>.
- [27] E. Re, *Single-top Wt -channel production matched with parton showers using the POWHEG method*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **71** (2011) 1547, arXiv: [1009.2450 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [28] P. Nason, *A new method for combining NLO QCD with shower Monte Carlo algorithms*, *JHEP* **11** (2004) 040, arXiv: [hep-ph/0409146](#).
- [29] S. Frixione, P. Nason and C. Oleari, *Matching NLO QCD computations with parton shower simulations: the POWHEG method*, *JHEP* **11** (2007) 070, arXiv: [0709.2092 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [30] S. Alioli, P. Nason, C. Oleari and E. Re, *A general framework for implementing NLO calculations in shower Monte Carlo programs: the POWHEG BOX*, *JHEP* **06** (2010) 043, arXiv: [1002.2581 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [31] T. Sjöstrand et al., *An introduction to PYTHIA 8.2*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **191** (2015) 159, arXiv: [1410.3012 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [32] M. Czakon and A. Mitov, *Top++: A program for the calculation of the top-pair cross-section at hadron colliders*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **185** (2014) 2930, arXiv: [1112.5675 \[hep-ph\]](#).

- [33] ATLAS Collaboration, *ATLAS Pythia 8 tunes to 7 TeV data*, ATL-PHYS-PUB-2014-021, 2014, URL: <https://cds.cern.ch/record/1966419>.
- [34] NNPDF Collaboration, R. D. Ball et al., *Parton distributions for the LHC run II*, *JHEP* **04** (2015) 040, arXiv: [1410.8849](https://arxiv.org/abs/1410.8849) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [35] M. Aliev et al., *HATHOR – HAdronic Top and Heavy quarks crOss section calculator*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **182** (2011) 1034, arXiv: [1007.1327](https://arxiv.org/abs/1007.1327) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [36] P. Kant et al., *HatHor for single top-quark production: Updated predictions and uncertainty estimates for single top-quark production in hadronic collisions*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **191** (2015) 74, arXiv: [1406.4403](https://arxiv.org/abs/1406.4403) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [37] E. Bothmann et al., *Event generation with Sherpa 2.2*, *SciPost Phys.* **7** (2019) 034, arXiv: [1905.09127](https://arxiv.org/abs/1905.09127) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [38] T. Gleisberg and S. Höche, *Comix, a new matrix element generator*, *JHEP* **12** (2008) 039, arXiv: [0808.3674](https://arxiv.org/abs/0808.3674) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [39] R. Gavin, Y. Li, F. Petriello and S. Quackenbush, *FEWZ 2.0: A code for hadronic Z production at next-to-next-to-leading order*, (2010) 2388, arXiv: [1011.3540](https://arxiv.org/abs/1011.3540) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [40] ATLAS Collaboration, *Monte Carlo Generators for the Production of a W or Z/ γ^* Boson in Association with Jets at ATLAS in Run 2*, ATL-PHYS-PUB-2016-003, 2016, URL: <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2120133>.
- [41] S. Alioli, P. Nason, C. Oleari and E. Re, *NLO vector-boson production matched with shower in POWHEG*, *JHEP* **07** (2008) 060, arXiv: [0805.4802](https://arxiv.org/abs/0805.4802) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [42] T. Melia, P. Nason, R. Rontsch and G. Zanderighi, *W^+W^- , WZ and ZZ production in the POWHEG BOX*, *JHEP* **11** (2011) 078, arXiv: [1107.5051](https://arxiv.org/abs/1107.5051) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [43] P. Nason and G. Zanderighi, *W^+W^- , WZ and ZZ production in the POWHEG-BOX-V2*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74** (2014) 2702, arXiv: [1311.1365](https://arxiv.org/abs/1311.1365) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [44] ATLAS Collaboration, *Measurement of the Z/ γ^* boson transverse momentum distribution in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV with the ATLAS detector*, *JHEP* **09** (2014) 145, arXiv: [1406.3660](https://arxiv.org/abs/1406.3660) [[hep-ex](#)].
- [45] H.-L. Lai et al., *New parton distributions for collider physics*, *Phys. Rev. D* **82** (2010) 074024, arXiv: [1007.2241](https://arxiv.org/abs/1007.2241) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [46] J. Pumplin et al., *New Generation of Parton Distributions with Uncertainties from Global QCD Analysis*, *JHEP* **07** (2002) 012, arXiv: [hep-ph/0201195](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0201195).
- [47] J. Alwall et al., *The automated computation of tree-level and next-to-leading order differential cross sections, and their matching to parton shower simulations*, *JHEP* **07** (2014) 079, arXiv: [1405.0301](https://arxiv.org/abs/1405.0301) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [48] C. Anastasiou, L. Dixon, K. Melnikov and F. Petriello, *High-precision QCD at hadron colliders: Electroweak gauge boson rapidity distributions at next-to-next-to leading order*, *Phys. Rev. D* **69** (2004) 094008, arXiv: [hep-ph/0312266](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0312266).

- [49] M. L. Ciccolini, S. Dittmaier and M. Krämer,
Electroweak radiative corrections to associated WH and ZH production at hadron colliders,
Phys. Rev. D **68** (2003) 073003, arXiv: [hep-ph/0306234](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [50] O. Brein, A. Djouadi and R. Harlander,
NNLO QCD corrections to the Higgs-strahlung processes at hadron colliders,
Phys. Lett. B **579** (2004) 149, arXiv: [hep-ph/0307206](#).
- [51] O. Brein, R. V. Harlander, M. Wiesemann and T. Zirke,
Top-quark mediated effects in hadronic Higgs-Strahlung, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **72** (2012) 1868,
arXiv: [1111.0761](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [52] L. Altenkamp, S. Dittmaier, R. V. Harlander, H. Rzehak and T. J. E. Zirke,
Gluon-induced Higgs-strahlung at next-to-leading order QCD, *JHEP* **02** (2013) 078,
arXiv: [1211.5015](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [53] A. Denner, S. Dittmaier, S. Kallweit and A. Mück, *HAWK 2.0: A Monte Carlo program for Higgs production in vector-boson fusion and Higgs strahlung at hadron colliders*,
Comput. Phys. Commun. **195** (2015) 161, arXiv: [1412.5390](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [54] O. Brein, R. V. Harlander and T. J. E. Zirke, *vh@nnlo – Higgs Strahlung at hadron colliders*,
Comput. Phys. Commun. **184** (2013) 998, arXiv: [1210.5347](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [55] R. V. Harlander, A. Kulesza, V. Theeuwes and T. Zirke,
Soft gluon resummation for gluon-induced Higgs Strahlung, *JHEP* **11** (2014) 082,
arXiv: [1410.0217](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [56] J. Butterworth et al., *PDF4LHC recommendations for LHC Run II*, *J. Phys. G* **43** (2016) 023001,
arXiv: [1510.03865](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [57] ATLAS Collaboration,
Performance of the ATLAS track reconstruction algorithms in dense environments in LHC Run 2,
Eur. Phys. J. C **77** (2017) 673, arXiv: [1704.07983](#) [[hep-ex](#)].
- [58] ATLAS Collaboration, *Electron and photon performance measurements with the ATLAS detector using the 2015–2017 LHC proton–proton collision data*, *JINST* **14** (2019) P12006,
arXiv: [1908.00005](#) [[hep-ex](#)].
- [59] ATLAS Collaboration, *Muon reconstruction and identification efficiency in ATLAS using the full Run 2 pp collision data set at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81** (2021) 578,
arXiv: [2012.00578](#) [[hep-ex](#)].
- [60] ATLAS Collaboration,
Topological cell clustering in the ATLAS calorimeters and its performance in LHC Run 1,
Eur. Phys. J. C **77** (2017) 490, arXiv: [1603.02934](#) [[hep-ex](#)].
- [61] M. Cacciari, G. P. Salam and G. Soyez, *The anti- k_t jet clustering algorithm*, *JHEP* **04** (2008) 063,
arXiv: [0802.1189](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [62] ATLAS Collaboration, *Performance of pile-up mitigation techniques for jets in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV using the ATLAS detector*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76** (2016) 581,
arXiv: [1510.03823](#) [[hep-ex](#)].
- [63] ATLAS Collaboration, *ATLAS b-jet identification performance and efficiency measurement with $t\bar{t}$ events in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79** (2019) 970,
arXiv: [1907.05120](#) [[hep-ex](#)].

- [64] ATLAS Collaboration, *Selection of jets produced in 13 TeV proton–proton collisions with the ATLAS detector*, ATLAS-CONF-2015-029, 2015, URL: <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2037702>.
- [65] ATLAS Collaboration, *Measurement of the tau lepton reconstruction and identification performance in the ATLAS experiment using pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV*, ATLAS-CONF-2017-029, 2017, URL: <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2261772>.
- [66] ATLAS Collaboration, *Identification and rejection of pile-up jets at high pseudorapidity with the ATLAS detector*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77** (2017) 580, arXiv: [1705.02211](https://arxiv.org/abs/1705.02211) [[hep-ex](#)],
Erratum: *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77** (2017) 712.
- [67] ATLAS Collaboration, *Jet energy scale and resolution measured in proton–proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81** (2021) 689, arXiv: [2007.02645](https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.02645) [[hep-ex](#)].
- [68] ATLAS Collaboration, *Search for electroweak production of charginos and sleptons decaying into final states with two leptons and missing transverse momentum in $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV pp collisions using the ATLAS detector*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80** (2020) 123, arXiv: [1908.08215](https://arxiv.org/abs/1908.08215) [[hep-ex](#)].
- [69] J. Neyman and E. S. Pearson, *On the Problem of the Most Efficient Tests of Statistical Hypotheses*, *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. Lond. A* **231** (1933) 289.
- [70] ATLAS Collaboration, *ATLAS Computing Acknowledgements*, ATL-SOFT-PUB-2023-001, 2023, URL: <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2869272>.
- [71] ATLAS Collaboration, *Identification of high transverse momentum top quarks in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV with the ATLAS detector*, *JHEP* **06** (2016) 093, arXiv: [1603.03127](https://arxiv.org/abs/1603.03127) [[hep-ex](#)].

The ATLAS Collaboration

G. Aad ¹⁰², E. Aakvaag ¹⁶, B. Abbott ¹²⁰, K. Abeling ⁵⁵, N.J. Abicht ⁴⁹, S.H. Abidi ²⁹, A. Aboulhorma ^{35e}, H. Abramowicz ¹⁵¹, H. Abreu ¹⁵⁰, Y. Abulaiti ¹¹⁷, B.S. Acharya ^{69a,69b,m}, C. Adam Bourdarios ⁴, L. Adamczyk ^{86a}, S.V. Addepalli ²⁶, M.J. Addison ¹⁰¹, J. Adelman ¹¹⁵, A. Adiguzel ^{21c}, T. Adye ¹³⁴, A.A. Affolder ¹³⁶, Y. Afik ³⁹, M.N. Agaras ¹³, J. Agarwala ^{73a,73b}, A. Aggarwal ¹⁰⁰, C. Agheorghiesei ^{27c}, A. Ahmad ³⁶, F. Ahmadov ^{38,z}, W.S. Ahmed ¹⁰⁴, S. Ahuja ⁹⁵, X. Ai ^{62e}, G. Aielli ^{76a,76b}, A. Aikot ¹⁶³, M. Ait Tamlihat ^{35e}, B. Aitbenchikh ^{35a}, I. Aizenberg ¹⁶⁹, M. Akbiyik ¹⁰⁰, T.P.A. Åkesson ⁹⁸, A.V. Akimov ³⁷, D. Akiyama ¹⁶⁸, N.N. Akolkar ²⁴, S. Aktas ^{21a}, K. Al Houry ⁴¹, G.L. Alberghi ^{23b}, J. Albert ¹⁶⁵, P. Albicocco ⁵³, G.L. Albouy ⁶⁰, S. Alderweireldt ⁵², Z.L. Alegria ¹²¹, M. Aleksa ³⁶, I.N. Aleksandrov ³⁸, C. Alexa ^{27b}, T. Alexopoulos ¹⁰, F. Alfonsi ^{23b}, M. Algren ⁵⁶, M. Alhroob ¹⁴¹, B. Ali ¹³², H.M.J. Ali ⁹¹, S. Ali ¹⁴⁸, S.W. Alibocus ⁹², M. Aliev ^{33c}, G. Alimonti ^{71a}, W. Alkakhri ⁵⁵, C. Allaire ⁶⁶, B.M.M. Allbrooke ¹⁴⁶, J.F. Allen ⁵², C.A. Allendes Flores ^{137f}, P.P. Allport ²⁰, A. Aloisio ^{72a,72b}, F. Alonso ⁹⁰, C. Alpigiani ¹³⁸, M. Alvarez Estevez ⁹⁹, A. Alvarez Fernandez ¹⁰⁰, M. Alves Cardoso ⁵⁶, M.G. Alviggi ^{72a,72b}, M. Aly ¹⁰¹, Y. Amaral Coutinho ^{83b}, A. Ambler ¹⁰⁴, C. Amelung ³⁶, M. Amerl ¹⁰¹, C.G. Ames ¹⁰⁹, D. Amidei ¹⁰⁶, S.P. Amor Dos Santos ^{130a}, K.R. Amos ¹⁶³, V. Ananiev ¹²⁵, C. Anastopoulos ¹³⁹, T. Andeen ¹¹, J.K. Anders ³⁶, S.Y. Andreato ^{47a,47b}, A. Andreatta ^{71a,71b}, S. Angelidakis ⁹, A. Angerami ^{41,ac}, A.V. Anisenkov ³⁷, A. Annovi ^{74a}, C. Antel ⁵⁶, M.T. Anthony ¹³⁹, E. Antipov ¹⁴⁵, M. Antonelli ⁵³, F. Anulli ^{75a}, M. Aoki ⁸⁴, T. Aoki ¹⁵³, J.A. Aparisi Pozo ¹⁶³, M.A. Aparo ¹⁴⁶, L. Aperio Bella ⁴⁸, C. Appelt ¹⁸, A. Apyan ²⁶, S.J. Arbiol Val ⁸⁷, C. Arcangeletti ⁵³, A.T.H. Arce ⁵¹, E. Arena ⁹², J-F. Arguin ¹⁰⁸, S. Argyropoulos ⁵⁴, J.-H. Arling ⁴⁸, O. Arnaez ⁴, H. Arnold ¹¹⁴, G. Artoni ^{75a,75b}, H. Asada ¹¹¹, K. Asai ¹¹⁸, S. Asai ¹⁵³, N.A. Asbah ³⁶, K. Assamagan ²⁹, R. Astalos ^{28a}, S. Atashi ¹⁵⁹, R.J. Atkin ^{33a}, M. Atkinson ¹⁶², H. Atmani ^{35f}, P.A. Atlasiddha ¹²⁸, K. Augsten ¹³², S. Auricchio ^{72a,72b}, A.D. Auriol ²⁰, V.A. Austrup ¹⁰¹, G. Avolio ³⁶, K. Axiotis ⁵⁶, G. Azuelos ^{108,ag}, D. Babal ^{28b}, H. Bachacou ¹³⁵, K. Bachas ^{152,q}, A. Bachi ³⁴, F. Backman ^{47a,47b}, A. Badea ³⁹, T.M. Baer ¹⁰⁶, P. Bagnaia ^{75a,75b}, M. Bahmani ¹⁸, D. Bahner ⁵⁴, K. Bai ¹²³, A.J. Bailey ¹⁶³, V.R. Bailey ¹⁶², J.T. Baines ¹³⁴, L. Baines ⁹⁴, O.K. Baker ¹⁷², E. Bakos ¹⁵, D. Bakshi Gupta ⁸, V. Balakrishnan ¹²⁰, R. Balasubramanian ¹¹⁴, E.M. Baldin ³⁷, P. Balek ^{86a}, E. Ballabene ^{23b,23a}, F. Balli ¹³⁵, L.M. Baltes ^{63a}, W.K. Balunas ³², J. Balz ¹⁰⁰, E. Banas ⁸⁷, M. Bandieramonte ¹²⁹, A. Bandyopadhyay ²⁴, S. Bansal ²⁴, L. Barak ¹⁵¹, M. Barakat ⁴⁸, E.L. Barberio ¹⁰⁵, D. Barberis ^{57b,57a}, M. Barbero ¹⁰², M.Z. Barel ¹¹⁴, K.N. Barends ^{33a}, T. Barillari ¹¹⁰, M-S. Barisits ³⁶, T. Barklow ¹⁴³, P. Baron ¹²², D.A. Baron Moreno ¹⁰¹, A. Baroncelli ^{62a}, G. Barone ²⁹, A.J. Barr ¹²⁶, J.D. Barr ⁹⁶, F. Barreiro ⁹⁹, J. Barreiro Guimarães da Costa ^{14a}, U. Barron ¹⁵¹, M.G. Barros Teixeira ^{130a}, S. Barsov ³⁷, F. Bartels ^{63a}, R. Bartoldus ¹⁴³, A.E. Barton ⁹¹, P. Bartos ^{28a}, A. Basan ¹⁰⁰, M. Baselga ⁴⁹, A. Bassalat ^{66,b}, M.J. Basso ^{156a}, C.R. Basson ¹⁰¹, R.L. Bates ⁵⁹, S. Batlamous ^{35e}, B. Batool ¹⁴¹, M. Battaglia ¹³⁶, D. Battulga ¹⁸, M. Baunce ^{75a,75b}, M. Bauer ³⁶, P. Bauer ²⁴, L.T. Bazzano Hurrell ³⁰, J.B. Beacham ⁵¹, T. Beau ¹²⁷, J.Y. Beauchamp ⁹⁰, P.H. Beauchemin ¹⁵⁸, P. Bechtel ²⁴, H.P. Beck ^{19,p}, K. Becker ¹⁶⁷, A.J. Beddall ⁸², V.A. Bednyakov ³⁸, C.P. Bee ¹⁴⁵, L.J. Beemster ¹⁵, T.A. Beermann ³⁶, M. Begalli ^{83d}, M. Biegel ²⁹, A. Behera ¹⁴⁵, J.K. Behr ⁴⁸, J.F. Beirer ³⁶, F. Beisiegel ²⁴, M. Belfkir ^{116b}, G. Bella ¹⁵¹, L. Bellagamba ^{23b}, A. Bellerive ³⁴, P. Bellos ²⁰, K. Beloborodov ³⁷, D. Benchechroun ^{35a}, F. Bendebba ^{35a}, Y. Benhammou ¹⁵¹, K.C. Benkendorfer ⁶¹, L. Beresford ⁴⁸, M. Beretta ⁵³, E. Bergeas Kuutmann ¹⁶¹, N. Berger ⁴,

B. Bergmann [ID132](#), J. Beringer [ID17a](#), G. Bernardi [ID5](#), C. Bernius [ID143](#), F.U. Bernlochner [ID24](#),
 F. Bernon [ID36,102](#), A. Berrocal Guardia [ID13](#), T. Berry [ID95](#), P. Berta [ID133](#), A. Berthold [ID50](#), S. Bethke [ID110](#),
 A. Betti [ID75a,75b](#), A.J. Bevan [ID94](#), N.K. Bhalla [ID54](#), M. Bhamjee [ID33c](#), S. Bhatta [ID145](#),
 D.S. Bhattacharya [ID166](#), P. Bhattarai [ID143](#), K.D. Bhide [ID54](#), V.S. Bhopatkar [ID121](#), R.M. Bianchi [ID129](#),
 G. Bianco [ID23b,23a](#), O. Biebel [ID109](#), R. Bielski [ID123](#), M. Biglietti [ID77a](#), C.S. Billingsley [ID44](#), M. Bindi [ID55](#),
 A. Bingul [ID21b](#), C. Bini [ID75a,75b](#), A. Biondini [ID92](#), C.J. Birch-sykes [ID101](#), G.A. Bird [ID32](#), M. Birman [ID169](#),
 M. Biros [ID133](#), S. Biryukov [ID146](#), T. Bisanz [ID49](#), E. Bisceglie [ID43b,43a](#), J.P. Biswal [ID134](#), D. Biswas [ID141](#),
 K. Bjørke [ID125](#), I. Bloch [ID48](#), A. Blue [ID59](#), U. Blumenschein [ID94](#), J. Blumenthal [ID100](#),
 V.S. Bobrovnikov [ID37](#), M. Boehler [ID54](#), B. Boehm [ID166](#), D. Bogavac [ID36](#), A.G. Bogdanchikov [ID37](#),
 C. Bohm [ID47a](#), V. Boisvert [ID95](#), P. Bokan [ID36](#), T. Bold [ID86a](#), M. Bomben [ID5](#), M. Bona [ID94](#),
 M. Boonekamp [ID135](#), C.D. Booth [ID95](#), A.G. Borbély [ID59](#), I.S. Bordulev [ID37](#), H.M. Borecka-Bielska [ID108](#),
 G. Borissov [ID91](#), D. Bortoletto [ID126](#), D. Boscherini [ID23b](#), M. Bosman [ID13](#), J.D. Bossio Sola [ID36](#),
 K. Bouaouda [ID35a](#), N. Bouchhar [ID163](#), J. Boudreau [ID129](#), E.V. Bouhova-Thacker [ID91](#), D. Boumediene [ID40](#),
 R. Bouquet [ID57b,57a](#), A. Boveia [ID119](#), J. Boyd [ID36](#), D. Boye [ID29](#), I.R. Boyko [ID38](#), J. Bracinik [ID20](#),
 N. Brahim [ID4](#), G. Brandt [ID171](#), O. Brandt [ID32](#), F. Braren [ID48](#), B. Brau [ID103](#), J.E. Brau [ID123](#),
 R. Brenner [ID169](#), L. Brenner [ID114](#), R. Brenner [ID161](#), S. Bressler [ID169](#), D. Britton [ID59](#), D. Britzger [ID110](#),
 I. Brock [ID24](#), G. Brooijmans [ID41](#), E. Brost [ID29](#), L.M. Brown [ID165](#), L.E. Bruce [ID61](#), T.L. Bruckler [ID126](#),
 P.A. Bruckman de Renstrom [ID87](#), B. Brüers [ID48](#), A. Bruni [ID23b](#), G. Bruni [ID23b](#), M. Bruschi [ID23b](#),
 N. Bruscin [ID75a,75b](#), T. Buanes [ID16](#), Q. Buat [ID138](#), D. Buchin [ID110](#), A.G. Buckley [ID59](#), O. Bulekov [ID37](#),
 B.A. Bullard [ID143](#), S. Burdin [ID92](#), C.D. Burgard [ID49](#), A.M. Burger [ID36](#), B. Burghgrave [ID8](#),
 O. Burlayenko [ID54](#), J.T.P. Burr [ID32](#), C.D. Burton [ID11](#), J.C. Burzynski [ID142](#), E.L. Busch [ID41](#),
 V. Büscher [ID100](#), P.J. Bussey [ID59](#), J.M. Butler [ID25](#), C.M. Buttar [ID59](#), J.M. Butterworth [ID96](#),
 W. Buttinger [ID134](#), C.J. Buxo Vazquez [ID107](#), A.R. Buzykaev [ID37](#), S. Cabrera Urbán [ID163](#),
 L. Cadamuro [ID66](#), D. Caforio [ID58](#), H. Cai [ID129](#), Y. Cai [ID14a,14e](#), Y. Cai [ID14c](#), V.M.M. Cairo [ID36](#),
 O. Cakir [ID3a](#), N. Calace [ID36](#), P. Calafura [ID17a](#), G. Calderini [ID127](#), P. Calfayan [ID68](#), G. Callea [ID59](#),
 L.P. Caloba [ID83b](#), D. Calvet [ID40](#), S. Calvet [ID40](#), M. Calvetti [ID74a,74b](#), R. Camacho Toro [ID127](#),
 S. Camarda [ID36](#), D. Camarero Munoz [ID26](#), P. Camarri [ID76a,76b](#), M.T. Camerlingo [ID72a,72b](#),
 D. Cameron [ID36](#), C. Camincher [ID165](#), M. Campanelli [ID96](#), A. Camplani [ID42](#), V. Canale [ID72a,72b](#),
 A.C. Canbay [ID3a](#), J. Cantero [ID163](#), Y. Cao [ID162](#), F. Capocasa [ID26](#), M. Capua [ID43b,43a](#), A. Carbone [ID71a,71b](#),
 R. Cardarelli [ID76a](#), J.C.J. Cardenas [ID8](#), F. Cardillo [ID163](#), G. Carducci [ID43b,43a](#), T. Carli [ID36](#),
 G. Carlino [ID72a](#), J.I. Carlotto [ID13](#), B.T. Carlson [ID129,r](#), E.M. Carlson [ID165,156a](#), L. Carminati [ID71a,71b](#),
 A. Carnelli [ID135](#), M. Carnesale [ID75a,75b](#), S. Caron [ID113](#), E. Carquin [ID137f](#), S. Carrá [ID71a](#),
 G. Carratta [ID23b,23a](#), A.M. Carroll [ID123](#), T.M. Carter [ID52](#), M.P. Casado [ID13,i](#), M. Caspar [ID48](#),
 F.L. Castillo [ID4](#), L. Castillo Garcia [ID13](#), V. Castillo Gimenez [ID163](#), N.F. Castro [ID130a,130e](#),
 A. Catinaccio [ID36](#), J.R. Catmore [ID125](#), T. Cavaliere [ID4](#), V. Cavaliere [ID29](#), N. Cavalli [ID23b,23a](#),
 Y.C. Cekmecelioglu [ID48](#), E. Celebi [ID21a](#), F. Celli [ID126](#), M.S. Centonze [ID70a,70b](#), V. Cepaitis [ID56](#),
 K. Cerny [ID122](#), A.S. Cerqueira [ID83a](#), A. Cerri [ID146](#), L. Cerrito [ID76a,76b](#), F. Cerutti [ID17a](#), B. Cervato [ID141](#),
 A. Cervelli [ID23b](#), G. Cesarini [ID53](#), S.A. Cetin [ID82](#), D. Chakraborty [ID115](#), J. Chan [ID170](#), W.Y. Chan [ID153](#),
 J.D. Chapman [ID32](#), E. Chapon [ID135](#), B. Chargeishvili [ID149b](#), D.G. Charlton [ID20](#), M. Chatterjee [ID19](#),
 C. Chauhan [ID133](#), Y. Che [ID14c](#), S. Chekanov [ID6](#), S.V. Chekulaev [ID156a](#), G.A. Chelkov [ID38,a](#),
 A. Chen [ID106](#), B. Chen [ID151](#), B. Chen [ID165](#), H. Chen [ID14c](#), H. Chen [ID29](#), J. Chen [ID62c](#), J. Chen [ID142](#),
 M. Chen [ID126](#), S. Chen [ID153](#), S.J. Chen [ID14c](#), X. Chen [ID62c,135](#), X. Chen [ID14b,af](#), Y. Chen [ID62a](#),
 C.L. Cheng [ID170](#), H.C. Cheng [ID64a](#), S. Cheong [ID143](#), A. Cheplakov [ID38](#), E. Cheremushkina [ID48](#),
 E. Cherepanova [ID114](#), R. Cherkaoui El Moursli [ID35e](#), E. Cheu [ID7](#), K. Cheung [ID65](#), L. Chevalier [ID135](#),
 V. Chiarella [ID53](#), G. Chiarelli [ID74a](#), N. Chiedde [ID102](#), G. Chiodini [ID70a](#), A.S. Chisholm [ID20](#),
 A. Chitan [ID27b](#), M. Chitishvili [ID163](#), M.V. Chizhov [ID38](#), K. Choi [ID11](#), Y. Chou [ID138](#), E.Y.S. Chow [ID113](#),
 K.L. Chu [ID169](#), M.C. Chu [ID64a](#), X. Chu [ID14a,14e](#), J. Chudoba [ID131](#), J.J. Chwastowski [ID87](#), D. Cieri [ID110](#),

K.M. Ciesla [id^{86a}](#), V. Cindro [id⁹³](#), A. Ciocio [id^{17a}](#), F. Cirotto [id^{72a,72b}](#), Z.H. Citron [id^{169,k}](#), M. Citterio [id^{71a}](#),
 D.A. Ciubotaru [id^{27b}](#), A. Clark [id⁵⁶](#), P.J. Clark [id⁵²](#), C. Clarry [id¹⁵⁵](#), J.M. Clavijo Columbie [id⁴⁸](#),
 S.E. Clawson [id⁴⁸](#), C. Clement [id^{47a,47b}](#), J. Clercx [id⁴⁸](#), Y. Coadou [id¹⁰²](#), M. Cobal [id^{69a,69c}](#),
 A. Coccaro [id^{57b}](#), R.F. Coelho Barrue [id^{130a}](#), R. Coelho Lopes De Sa [id¹⁰³](#), S. Coelli [id^{71a}](#), B. Cole [id⁴¹](#),
 J. Collot [id⁶⁰](#), P. Conde Muiño [id^{130a,130g}](#), M.P. Connell [id^{33c}](#), S.H. Connell [id^{33c}](#), E.I. Conroy [id¹²⁶](#),
 F. Conventi [id^{72a,ah}](#), H.G. Cooke [id²⁰](#), A.M. Cooper-Sarkar [id¹²⁶](#), A. Cordeiro Oudot Choi [id¹²⁷](#),
 L.D. Corpe [id⁴⁰](#), M. Corradi [id^{75a,75b}](#), F. Corriveau [id^{104,x}](#), A. Cortes-Gonzalez [id¹⁸](#), M.J. Costa [id¹⁶³](#),
 F. Costanza [id⁴](#), D. Costanzo [id¹³⁹](#), B.M. Cote [id¹¹⁹](#), G. Cowan [id⁹⁵](#), K. Cranmer [id¹⁷⁰](#),
 D. Cremonini [id^{23b,23a}](#), S. Crépe-Renaudin [id⁶⁰](#), F. Crescioli [id¹²⁷](#), M. Cristinziani [id¹⁴¹](#),
 M. Cristoforetti [id^{78a,78b}](#), V. Croft [id¹¹⁴](#), J.E. Crosby [id¹²¹](#), G. Crosetti [id^{43b,43a}](#), A. Cueto [id⁹⁹](#),
 T. Cuhadar Donszelmann [id¹⁵⁹](#), H. Cui [id^{14a,14e}](#), Z. Cui [id⁷](#), W.R. Cunningham [id⁵⁹](#), F. Curcio [id^{43b,43a}](#),
 P. Czodrowski [id³⁶](#), M.M. Czurylo [id^{63b}](#), M.J. Da Cunha Sargedas De Sousa [id^{57b,57a}](#),
 J.V. Da Fonseca Pinto [id^{83b}](#), C. Da Via [id¹⁰¹](#), W. Dabrowski [id^{86a}](#), T. Dado [id⁴⁹](#), S. Dahbi [id^{33g}](#),
 T. Dai [id¹⁰⁶](#), D. Dal Santo [id¹⁹](#), C. Dallapiccola [id¹⁰³](#), M. Dam [id⁴²](#), G. D'amen [id²⁹](#), V. D'Amico [id¹⁰⁹](#),
 J. Damp [id¹⁰⁰](#), J.R. Dandoy [id³⁴](#), M. Danninger [id¹⁴²](#), V. Dao [id³⁶](#), G. Darbo [id^{57b}](#), S. Darmora [id⁶](#),
 S.J. Das [id^{29,ai}](#), S. D'Auria [id^{71a,71b}](#), A. D'avanzo [id^{130a}](#), C. David [id^{33a}](#), T. Davidek [id¹³³](#),
 B. Davis-Purcell [id³⁴](#), I. Dawson [id⁹⁴](#), H.A. Day-hall [id¹³²](#), K. De [id⁸](#), R. De Asmundis [id^{72a}](#),
 N. De Biase [id⁴⁸](#), S. De Castro [id^{23b,23a}](#), N. De Groot [id¹¹³](#), P. de Jong [id¹¹⁴](#), H. De la Torre [id¹¹⁵](#),
 A. De Maria [id^{14c}](#), A. De Salvo [id^{75a}](#), U. De Sanctis [id^{76a,76b}](#), F. De Santis [id^{70a,70b}](#), A. De Santo [id¹⁴⁶](#),
 J.B. De Vivie De Regie [id⁶⁰](#), D.V. Dedovich [id³⁸](#), J. Degens [id¹¹⁴](#), A.M. Deiana [id⁴⁴](#), F. Del Corso [id^{23b,23a}](#),
 J. Del Peso [id⁹⁹](#), F. Del Rio [id^{63a}](#), L. Delagrangé [id¹²⁷](#), F. Deliot [id¹³⁵](#), C.M. Delitzsch [id⁴⁹](#),
 M. Della Pietra [id^{72a,72b}](#), D. Della Volpe [id⁵⁶](#), A. Dell'Acqua [id³⁶](#), L. Dell'Asta [id^{71a,71b}](#), M. Delmastro [id⁴](#),
 P.A. Delsart [id⁶⁰](#), S. Demers [id¹⁷²](#), M. Demichev [id³⁸](#), S.P. Denisov [id³⁷](#), L. D'Eramo [id⁴⁰](#),
 D. Derendarz [id⁸⁷](#), F. Derue [id¹²⁷](#), P. Dervan [id⁹²](#), K. Desch [id²⁴](#), C. Deutsch [id²⁴](#), F.A. Di Bello [id^{57b,57a}](#),
 A. Di Ciaccio [id^{76a,76b}](#), L. Di Ciaccio [id⁴](#), A. Di Domenico [id^{75a,75b}](#), C. Di Donato [id^{72a,72b}](#),
 A. Di Girolamo [id³⁶](#), G. Di Gregorio [id³⁶](#), A. Di Luca [id^{78a,78b}](#), B. Di Micco [id^{77a,77b}](#), R. Di Nardo [id^{77a,77b}](#),
 M. Diamantopoulou [id³⁴](#), F.A. Dias [id¹¹⁴](#), T. Dias Do Vale [id¹⁴²](#), M.A. Diaz [id^{137a,137b}](#),
 F.G. Diaz Capriles [id²⁴](#), M. Didenko [id¹⁶³](#), E.B. Diehl [id¹⁰⁶](#), S. Díez Cornell [id⁴⁸](#), C. Diez Pardos [id¹⁴¹](#),
 C. Dimitriadi [id^{161,24}](#), A. Dimitrievska [id^{17a}](#), J. Dingfelder [id²⁴](#), I-M. Dinu [id^{27b}](#), S.J. Dittmeier [id^{63b}](#),
 F. Dittus [id³⁶](#), F. Djama [id¹⁰²](#), T. Djobava [id^{149b}](#), C. Doglioni [id^{101,98}](#), A. Dohnalova [id^{28a}](#), J. Dolejsi [id¹³³](#),
 Z. Dolezal [id¹³³](#), K.M. Dona [id³⁹](#), M. Donadelli [id^{83c}](#), B. Dong [id¹⁰⁷](#), J. Donini [id⁴⁰](#), A. D'Onofrio [id^{72a,72b}](#),
 M. D'Onofrio [id⁹²](#), J. Dopke [id¹³⁴](#), A. Doria [id^{72a}](#), N. Dos Santos Fernandes [id^{130a}](#), P. Dougan [id¹⁰¹](#),
 M.T. Dova [id⁹⁰](#), A.T. Doyle [id⁵⁹](#), M.A. Draguet [id¹²⁶](#), E. Dreyer [id¹⁶⁹](#), I. Drivas-koulouris [id¹⁰](#),
 M. Drnevich [id¹¹⁷](#), M. Drozdova [id⁵⁶](#), D. Du [id^{62a}](#), T.A. du Pree [id¹¹⁴](#), F. Dubinin [id³⁷](#), M. Dubovsky [id^{28a}](#),
 E. Duchovni [id¹⁶⁹](#), G. Duckeck [id¹⁰⁹](#), O.A. Ducu [id^{27b}](#), D. Duda [id⁵²](#), A. Dudarev [id³⁶](#), E.R. Duden [id²⁶](#),
 M. D'uffizi [id¹⁰¹](#), L. Dufлот [id⁶⁶](#), M. Dührssen [id³⁶](#), A.E. Dumitriu [id^{27b}](#), M. Dunford [id^{63a}](#), S. Dungs [id⁴⁹](#),
 K. Dunne [id^{47a,47b}](#), A. Duperrin [id¹⁰²](#), H. Duran Yildiz [id^{3a}](#), M. Düren [id⁵⁸](#), A. Durglishvili [id^{149b}](#),
 B.L. Dwyer [id¹¹⁵](#), G.I. Dyckes [id^{17a}](#), M. Dyndal [id^{86a}](#), B.S. Dziedzic [id⁸⁷](#), Z.O. Earnshaw [id¹⁴⁶](#),
 G.H. Eberwein [id¹²⁶](#), B. Eckerova [id^{28a}](#), S. Eggebrecht [id⁵⁵](#), E. Egidio Purcino De Souza [id¹²⁷](#),
 L.F. Ehrke [id⁵⁶](#), G. Eigen [id¹⁶](#), K. Einsweiler [id^{17a}](#), T. Ekelof [id¹⁶¹](#), P.A. Ekman [id⁹⁸](#), S. El Farkh [id^{35b}](#),
 Y. El Ghazali [id^{35b}](#), H. El Jarrari [id³⁶](#), A. El Moussaouy [id¹⁰⁸](#), V. Ellajosyula [id¹⁶¹](#), M. Ellert [id¹⁶¹](#),
 F. Ellinghaus [id¹⁷¹](#), N. Ellis [id³⁶](#), J. Elmsheuser [id²⁹](#), M. Elsing [id³⁶](#), D. Emeliyanov [id¹³⁴](#), Y. Enari [id¹⁵³](#),
 I. Ene [id^{17a}](#), S. Epari [id¹³](#), P.A. Erland [id⁸⁷](#), M. Errenst [id¹⁷¹](#), M. Escalier [id⁶⁶](#), C. Escobar [id¹⁶³](#),
 E. Etzion [id¹⁵¹](#), G. Evans [id^{130a}](#), H. Evans [id⁶⁸](#), L.S. Evans [id⁹⁵](#), A. Ezhilov [id³⁷](#), S. Ezzarqtouni [id^{35a}](#),
 F. Fabbri [id^{23b,23a}](#), L. Fabbri [id^{23b,23a}](#), G. Facini [id⁹⁶](#), V. Fadeyev [id¹³⁶](#), R.M. Fakhrutdinov [id³⁷](#),
 D. Fakoudis [id¹⁰⁰](#), S. Falciano [id^{75a}](#), L.F. Falda Ulhoa Coelho [id³⁶](#), P.J. Falke [id²⁴](#), J. Faltova [id¹³³](#),
 C. Fan [id¹⁶²](#), Y. Fan [id^{14a}](#), Y. Fang [id^{14a,14e}](#), M. Fanti [id^{71a,71b}](#), M. Faraj [id^{69a,69b}](#), Z. Farazpay [id⁹⁷](#),

A. Farbin ⁸, A. Farilla ^{77a}, T. Farooque ¹⁰⁷, S.M. Farrington ⁵², F. Fassi ^{35e}, D. Fassouliotis ⁹,
 M. Faucci Giannelli ^{76a,76b}, W.J. Fawcett ³², L. Fayard ⁶⁶, P. Federic ¹³³, P. Federicova ¹³¹,
 O.L. Fedin ^{37,a}, M. Feickert ¹⁷⁰, L. Feligioni ¹⁰², D.E. Fellers ¹²³, C. Feng ^{62b}, M. Feng ^{14b},
 Z. Feng ¹¹⁴, M.J. Fenton ¹⁵⁹, L. Ferencz ⁴⁸, R.A.M. Ferguson ⁹¹, S.I. Fernandez Luengo ^{137f},
 P. Fernandez Martinez ¹³, M.J.V. Fernoux ¹⁰², J. Ferrando ⁹¹, A. Ferrari ¹⁶¹, P. Ferrari ^{114,113},
 R. Ferrari ^{73a}, D. Ferrere ⁵⁶, C. Ferretti ¹⁰⁶, F. Fiedler ¹⁰⁰, P. Fiedler ¹³², A. Filipčič ⁹³,
 E.K. Filmer ¹, F. Filthaut ¹¹³, M.C.N. Fiolhais ^{130a,130c,c}, L. Fiorini ¹⁶³, W.C. Fisher ¹⁰⁷,
 T. Fitschen ¹⁰¹, P.M. Fitzhugh ¹³⁵, I. Fleck ¹⁴¹, P. Fleischmann ¹⁰⁶, T. Flick ¹⁷¹, M. Flores ^{33d,ad},
 L.R. Flores Castillo ^{64a}, L. Flores Sanz De Acedo ³⁶, F.M. Follega ^{78a,78b}, N. Fomin ¹⁶,
 J.H. Foo ¹⁵⁵, A. Formica ¹³⁵, A.C. Forti ¹⁰¹, E. Fortin ³⁶, A.W. Fortman ^{17a}, M.G. Foti ^{17a},
 L. Fountas ^{9j}, D. Fournier ⁶⁶, H. Fox ⁹¹, P. Francavilla ^{74a,74b}, S. Francescato ⁶¹,
 S. Franchellucci ⁵⁶, M. Franchini ^{23b,23a}, S. Franchino ^{63a}, D. Francis ³⁶, L. Franco ¹¹³,
 V. Franco Lima ³⁶, L. Franconi ⁴⁸, M. Franklin ⁶¹, G. Frattari ²⁶, W.S. Freund ^{83b}, Y.Y. Frid ¹⁵¹,
 J. Friend ⁵⁹, N. Fritzsche ⁵⁰, A. Froch ⁵⁴, D. Froidevaux ³⁶, J.A. Frost ¹²⁶, Y. Fu ^{62a},
 S. Fuenzalida Garrido ^{137f}, M. Fujimoto ¹⁰², K.Y. Fung ^{64a}, E. Furtado De Simas Filho ^{83b},
 M. Furukawa ¹⁵³, J. Fuster ¹⁶³, A. Gabrielli ^{23b,23a}, A. Gabrielli ¹⁵⁵, P. Gadow ³⁶,
 G. Gagliardi ^{57b,57a}, L.G. Gagnon ^{17a}, S. Galantzan ¹⁵¹, E.J. Gallas ¹²⁶, B.J. Gallop ¹³⁴,
 K.K. Gan ¹¹⁹, S. Ganguly ¹⁵³, Y. Gao ⁵², F.M. Garay Walls ^{137a,137b}, B. Garcia ²⁹, C. García ¹⁶³,
 A. Garcia Alonso ¹¹⁴, A.G. Garcia Caffaro ¹⁷², J.E. García Navarro ¹⁶³, M. Garcia-Sciveres ^{17a},
 G.L. Gardner ¹²⁸, R.W. Gardner ³⁹, N. Garelli ¹⁵⁸, D. Garg ⁸⁰, R.B. Garg ^{143,n}, J.M. Gargan ⁵²,
 C.A. Garner ¹⁵⁵, C.M. Garvey ^{33a}, P. Gaspar ^{83b}, V.K. Gassmann ¹⁵⁸, G. Gaudio ^{73a}, V. Gautam ¹³,
 P. Gauzzi ^{75a,75b}, I.L. Gavrilenko ³⁷, A. Gavrilyuk ³⁷, C. Gay ¹⁶⁴, G. Gaycken ⁴⁸, E.N. Gazis ¹⁰,
 A.A. Geanta ^{27b}, C.M. Gee ¹³⁶, A. Gekow ¹¹⁹, C. Gemme ^{57b}, M.H. Genest ⁶⁰, A.D. Gentry ¹¹²,
 S. George ⁹⁵, W.F. George ²⁰, T. Gerialis ⁴⁶, P. Gessinger-Befurt ³⁶, M.E. Geyik ¹⁷¹,
 M. Ghani ¹⁶⁷, M. Ghneimat ¹⁴¹, K. Ghorbanian ⁹⁴, A. Ghosal ¹⁴¹, A. Ghosh ¹⁵⁹, A. Ghosh ⁷,
 B. Giacobbe ^{23b}, S. Giagu ^{75a,75b}, T. Giani ¹¹⁴, P. Giannetti ^{74a}, A. Giannini ^{62a}, S.M. Gibson ⁹⁵,
 M. Gignac ¹³⁶, D.T. Gil ^{86b}, A.K. Gilbert ^{86a}, B.J. Gilbert ⁴¹, D. Gillberg ³⁴, G. Gilles ¹¹⁴,
 L. Ginabat ¹²⁷, D.M. Gingrich ^{2,ag}, M.P. Giordani ^{69a,69c}, P.F. Giraud ¹³⁵, G. Giugliarelli ^{69a,69c},
 D. Giugni ^{71a}, F. Giuli ³⁶, I. Gkialas ^{9j}, L.K. Gladilin ³⁷, C. Glasman ⁹⁹, G.R. Gledhill ¹²³,
 G. Glemža ⁴⁸, M. Glisic ¹²³, I. Gnesi ^{43b,f}, Y. Go ²⁹, M. Goblirsch-Kolb ³⁶, B. Gocke ⁴⁹,
 D. Godin ¹⁰⁸, B. Gokturk ^{21a}, S. Goldfarb ¹⁰⁵, T. Golling ⁵⁶, M.G.D. Gololo ^{33g}, D. Golubkov ³⁷,
 J.P. Gombas ¹⁰⁷, A. Gomes ^{130a,130b}, G. Gomes Da Silva ¹⁴¹, A.J. Gomez Delegido ¹⁶³,
 R. Gonçalves ^{130a,130c}, L. Gonella ²⁰, A. Gongadze ^{149c}, F. Gonnella ²⁰, J.L. Gonski ¹⁴³,
 R.Y. González Andana ⁵², S. González de la Hoz ¹⁶³, R. Gonzalez Lopez ⁹²,
 C. Gonzalez Renteria ^{17a}, M.V. Gonzalez Rodrigues ⁴⁸, R. Gonzalez Suarez ¹⁶¹,
 S. Gonzalez-Sevilla ⁵⁶, G.R. Gonzalvo Rodriguez ¹⁶³, L. Goossens ³⁶, B. Gorini ³⁶,
 E. Gorini ^{70a,70b}, A. Gorišek ⁹³, T.C. Gosart ¹²⁸, A.T. Goshaw ⁵¹, M.I. Gostkin ³⁸,
 S. Goswami ¹²¹, C.A. Gottardo ³⁶, S.A. Gotz ¹⁰⁹, M. Goughri ^{35b}, V. Goumarre ⁴⁸,
 A.G. Goussiou ¹³⁸, N. Govender ^{33c}, I. Grabowska-Bold ^{86a}, K. Graham ³⁴, E. Gramstad ¹²⁵,
 S. Grancagnolo ^{70a,70b}, C.M. Grant ^{1,135}, P.M. Gravila ^{27f}, F.G. Gravili ^{70a,70b}, H.M. Gray ^{17a},
 M. Greco ^{70a,70b}, C. Grefe ²⁴, I.M. Gregor ⁴⁸, P. Grenier ¹⁴³, S.G. Grewe ¹¹⁰, A.A. Grillo ¹³⁶,
 K. Grimm ³¹, S. Grinstein ^{13,t}, J.-F. Grivaz ⁵⁶, E. Gross ¹⁶⁹, J. Grosse-Knetter ⁵⁵,
 J.C. Grundy ¹²⁶, L. Guan ¹⁰⁶, C. Gubbels ¹⁶⁴, J.G.R. Guerrero Rojas ¹⁶³, G. Guerrieri ^{69a,69c},
 F. Guescini ¹¹⁰, R. Gugel ¹⁰⁰, J.A.M. Guhit ¹⁰⁶, A. Guida ¹⁸, E. Guilloton ^{167,134},
 S. Guindon ³⁶, F. Guo ^{14a,14e}, J. Guo ^{62c}, L. Guo ⁴⁸, Y. Guo ¹⁰⁶, R. Gupta ⁴⁸, R. Gupta ¹²⁹,
 S. Gurbuz ²⁴, S.S. Gurdasani ⁵⁴, G. Gustavino ³⁶, M. Guth ⁵⁶, P. Gutierrez ¹²⁰,
 L.F. Gutierrez Zagazeta ¹²⁸, M. Gutsche ⁵⁰, C. Gutschow ⁹⁶, C. Gwenlan ¹²⁶, C.B. Gwilliam ⁹²,

E.S. Haaland ¹²⁵, A. Haas ¹¹⁷, M. Habedank ⁴⁸, C. Haber ^{17a}, H.K. Hadavand ⁸, A. Hadeif ⁵⁰,
 S. Hadzic ¹¹⁰, A.I. Hagan ⁹¹, J.J. Hahn ¹⁴¹, E.H. Haines ⁹⁶, M. Haleem ¹⁶⁶, J. Haley ¹²¹,
 J.J. Hall ¹³⁹, G.D. Hallowell ¹⁰², L. Halser ¹⁹, K. Hamano ¹⁶⁵, M. Hamer ²⁴, G.N. Hamity ⁵²,
 E.J. Hampshire ⁹⁵, J. Han ^{62b}, K. Han ^{62a}, L. Han ^{14c}, L. Han ^{62a}, S. Han ^{17a}, Y.F. Han ¹⁵⁵,
 K. Hanagaki ⁸⁴, M. Hance ¹³⁶, D.A. Hangal ⁴¹, H. Hanif ¹⁴², M.D. Hank ¹²⁸, J.B. Hansen ⁴²,
 P.H. Hansen ⁴², K. Hara ¹⁵⁷, D. Harada ⁵⁶, T. Harenberg ¹⁷¹, S. Harkusha ³⁷, M.L. Harris ¹⁰³,
 Y.T. Harris ¹²⁶, J. Harrison ¹³, N.M. Harrison ¹¹⁹, P.F. Harrison ¹⁶⁷, N.M. Hartman ¹¹⁰,
 N.M. Hartmann ¹⁰⁹, Y. Hasegawa ¹⁴⁰, R. Hauser ¹⁰⁷, C.M. Hawkes ²⁰, R.J. Hawkings ³⁶,
 Y. Hayashi ¹⁵³, S. Hayashida ¹¹¹, D. Hayden ¹⁰⁷, C. Hayes ¹⁰⁶, R.L. Hayes ¹¹⁴, C.P. Hays ¹²⁶,
 J.M. Hays ⁹⁴, H.S. Hayward ⁹², F. He ^{62a}, M. He ^{14a,14e}, Y. He ¹⁵⁴, Y. He ⁴⁸, Y. He ⁹⁶,
 N.B. Heatley ⁹⁴, V. Hedberg ⁹⁸, A.L. Heggelund ¹²⁵, N.D. Hehir ^{94,*}, C. Heidegger ⁵⁴,
 K.K. Heidegger ⁵⁴, W.D. Heidorn ⁸¹, J. Heilman ³⁴, S. Heim ⁴⁸, T. Heim ^{17a}, J.G. Heinlein ¹²⁸,
 J.J. Heinrich ¹²³, L. Heinrich ^{110,ae}, J. Hejbal ¹³¹, A. Held ¹⁷⁰, S. Hellesund ¹⁶,
 C.M. Helling ¹⁶⁴, S. Hellman ^{47a,47b}, R.C.W. Henderson ⁹¹, L. Henkelmann ³²,
 A.M. Henriques Correia ³⁶, H. Herde ⁹⁸, Y. Hernández Jiménez ¹⁴⁵, L.M. Herrmann ²⁴,
 T. Herrmann ⁵⁰, G. Herten ⁵⁴, R. Hertenberger ¹⁰⁹, L. Hervas ³⁶, M.E. Hesping ¹⁰⁰,
 N.P. Hessey ^{156a}, E. Hill ¹⁵⁵, S.J. Hillier ²⁰, J.R. Hinds ¹⁰⁷, F. Hinterkeuser ²⁴, M. Hirose ¹²⁴,
 S. Hirose ¹⁵⁷, D. Hirschbuehl ¹⁷¹, T.G. Hitchings ¹⁰¹, B. Hiti ⁹³, J. Hobbs ¹⁴⁵, R. Hobincu ^{27e},
 N. Hod ¹⁶⁹, M.C. Hodgkinson ¹³⁹, B.H. Hodgkinson ¹²⁶, A. Hoecker ³⁶, D.D. Hofer ¹⁰⁶,
 J. Hofer ⁴⁸, T. Holm ²⁴, M. Holzbock ¹¹⁰, L.B.A.H. Hommels ³², B.P. Honan ¹⁰¹, J. Hong ^{62c},
 T.M. Hong ¹²⁹, B.H. Hooberman ¹⁶², W.H. Hopkins ⁶, Y. Horii ¹¹¹, S. Hou ¹⁴⁸, A.S. Howard ⁹³,
 J. Howarth ⁵⁹, J. Hoya ⁶, M. Hrabovsky ¹²², A. Hrynevich ⁴⁸, T. Hryn'ova ⁴, P.J. Hsu ⁶⁵,
 S.-C. Hsu ¹³⁸, Q. Hu ^{62a}, S. Huang ^{64b}, X. Huang ^{14c}, X. Huang ^{14a,14e}, Y. Huang ¹³⁹,
 Y. Huang ^{14a}, Z. Huang ¹⁰¹, Z. Hubacek ¹³², M. Huebner ²⁴, F. Huegging ²⁴, T.B. Huffman ¹²⁶,
 C.A. Hugli ⁴⁸, M. Huhtinen ³⁶, S.K. Huiberts ¹⁶, R. Hulsken ¹⁰⁴, N. Huseynov ¹², J. Huston ¹⁰⁷,
 J. Huth ⁶¹, R. Hyneman ¹⁴³, G. Iacobucci ⁵⁶, G. Iakovidis ²⁹, I. Ibragimov ¹⁴¹,
 L. Iconomidou-Fayard ⁶⁶, J.P. Iddon ³⁶, P. Iengo ^{72a,72b}, R. Iguchi ¹⁵³, T. Iizawa ¹²⁶,
 Y. Ikegami ⁸⁴, N. Ilic ¹⁵⁵, H. Imam ^{35a}, M. Ince Lezki ⁵⁶, T. Ingebretsen Carlson ^{47a,47b},
 G. Introzzi ^{73a,73b}, M. Iodice ^{77a}, V. Ippolito ^{75a,75b}, R.K. Irwin ⁹², M. Ishino ¹⁵³, W. Islam ¹⁷⁰,
 C. Issever ^{18,48}, S. Istin ^{21a,ak}, H. Ito ¹⁶⁸, R. Iuppa ^{78a,78b}, A. Ivina ¹⁶⁹, J.M. Izen ⁴⁵,
 V. Izzo ^{72a}, P. Jacka ^{131,132}, P. Jackson ¹, B.P. Jaeger ¹⁴², C.S. Jagfeld ¹⁰⁹, G. Jain ^{156a},
 P. Jain ⁵⁴, K. Jakobs ⁵⁴, T. Jakoubek ¹⁶⁹, J. Jamieson ⁵⁹, K.W. Janas ^{86a}, M. Javurkova ¹⁰³,
 L. Jeanty ¹²³, J. Jejelava ^{149a,aa}, P. Jenni ^{54,g}, C.E. Jessiman ³⁴, C. Jia ^{62b}, J. Jia ¹⁴⁵, X. Jia ⁶¹,
 X. Jia ^{14a,14e}, Z. Jia ^{14c}, S. Jiggins ⁴⁸, J. Jimenez Pena ¹³, S. Jin ^{14c}, A. Jinaru ^{27b},
 O. Jinnouchi ¹⁵⁴, P. Johansson ¹³⁹, K.A. Johns ⁷, J.W. Johnson ¹³⁶, D.M. Jones ³², E. Jones ⁴⁸,
 P. Jones ³², R.W.L. Jones ⁹¹, T.J. Jones ⁹², H.L. Joos ^{55,36}, R. Joshi ¹¹⁹, J. Jovicevic ¹⁵,
 X. Ju ^{17a}, J.J. Junggeburth ¹⁰³, T. Junkermann ^{63a}, A. Juste Rozas ^{13,t}, M.K. Juzek ⁸⁷,
 S. Kabana ^{137e}, A. Kaczmarska ⁸⁷, M. Kado ¹¹⁰, H. Kagan ¹¹⁹, M. Kagan ¹⁴³, A. Kahn ⁴¹,
 A. Kahn ¹²⁸, C. Kahra ¹⁰⁰, T. Kaji ¹⁵³, E. Kajomovitz ¹⁵⁰, N. Kakati ¹⁶⁹, I. Kalaitzidou ⁵⁴,
 C.W. Kalderon ²⁹, N.J. Kang ¹³⁶, D. Kar ^{33g}, K. Karava ¹²⁶, M.J. Kareem ^{156b}, E. Karentzos ⁵⁴,
 I. Karknias ¹⁵², O. Karkout ¹¹⁴, S.N. Karpov ³⁸, Z.M. Karpova ³⁸, V. Kartvelishvili ⁹¹,
 A.N. Karyukhin ³⁷, E. Kasimi ¹⁵², J. Katzy ⁴⁸, S. Kaur ³⁴, K. Kawade ¹⁴⁰, M.P. Kawale ¹²⁰,
 C. Kawamoto ⁸⁸, T. Kawamoto ^{62a}, E.F. Kay ³⁶, F.I. Kaya ¹⁵⁸, S. Kazakos ¹⁰⁷, V.F. Kazanin ³⁷,
 Y. Ke ¹⁴⁵, J.M. Keaveney ^{33a}, R. Keeler ¹⁶⁵, G.V. Kehris ⁶¹, J.S. Keller ³⁴, A.S. Kelly ⁹⁶,
 J.J. Kempster ¹⁴⁶, P.D. Kennedy ¹⁰⁰, O. Kepka ¹³¹, B.P. Kerridge ¹³⁴, S. Kersten ¹⁷¹,
 B.P. Kerševan ⁹³, S. Keshri ⁶⁶, L. Keszeghova ^{28a}, S. Ketabchi Haghighat ¹⁵⁵, R.A. Khan ¹²⁹,
 A. Khanov ¹²¹, A.G. Kharlamov ³⁷, T. Kharlamova ³⁷, E.E. Khoda ¹³⁸, M. Kholodenko ³⁷,

T.J. Khoo ¹⁸, G. Khorauli ¹⁶⁶, J. Khubua ^{149b}, Y.A.R. Khwaira ⁶⁶, B. Kibirige ^{33g},
A. Kilgallon ¹²³, D.W. Kim ^{47a,47b}, Y.K. Kim ³⁹, N. Kimura ⁹⁶, M.K. Kingston ⁵⁵,
A. Kirchhoff ⁵⁵, C. Kirfel ²⁴, F. Kirfel ²⁴, J. Kirk ¹³⁴, A.E. Kiryunin ¹¹⁰, C. Kitsaki ¹⁰,
O. Kivernyk ²⁴, M. Klassen ^{63a}, C. Klein ³⁴, L. Klein ¹⁶⁶, M.H. Klein ⁴⁴, S.B. Klein ⁵⁶,
U. Klein ⁹², P. Klimek ³⁶, A. Klimentov ²⁹, T. Klioutchnikova ³⁶, P. Kluit ¹¹⁴, S. Kluth ¹¹⁰,
E. Kneringer ⁷⁹, T.M. Knight ¹⁵⁵, A. Knue ⁴⁹, R. Kobayashi ⁸⁸, D. Kobylanskii ¹⁶⁹,
S.F. Koch ¹²⁶, M. Kocian ¹⁴³, P. Kodyš ¹³³, D.M. Koeck ¹²³, P.T. Koenig ²⁴, T. Koffas ³⁴,
O. Kolay ⁵⁰, I. Koletsou ⁴, T. Komarek ¹²², K. Köneke ⁵⁴, A.X.Y. Kong ¹, T. Kono ¹¹⁸,
N. Konstantinidis ⁹⁶, P. Kontaxakis ⁵⁶, B. Konya ⁹⁸, R. Kopeliansky ⁶⁸, S. Koperny ^{86a},
K. Korcyl ⁸⁷, K. Kordas ^{152,e}, A. Korn ⁹⁶, S. Korn ⁵⁵, I. Korolkov ¹³, N. Korotkova ³⁷,
B. Kortman ¹¹⁴, O. Kortner ¹¹⁰, S. Kortner ¹¹⁰, W.H. Kostecka ¹¹⁵, V.V. Kostyukhin ¹⁴¹,
A. Kotsokechagia ¹³⁵, A. Kotwal ⁵¹, A. Koulouris ³⁶, A. Kourkoumeli-Charalampidi ^{73a,73b},
C. Kourkoumelis ⁹, E. Kourlitis ^{110,ae}, O. Kovanda ¹²³, R. Kowalewski ¹⁶⁵, W. Kozanecki ¹³⁵,
A.S. Kozhin ³⁷, V.A. Kramarenko ³⁷, G. Kramberger ⁹³, P. Kramer ¹⁰⁰, M.W. Krasny ¹²⁷,
A. Krasznahorkay ³⁶, J.W. Kraus ¹⁷¹, J.A. Kremer ⁴⁸, T. Kresse ⁵⁰, J. Kretschmar ⁹²,
K. Kreul ¹⁸, P. Krieger ¹⁵⁵, S. Krishnamurthy ¹⁰³, M. Krivos ¹³³, K. Krizka ²⁰,
K. Kroeninger ⁴⁹, H. Kroha ¹¹⁰, J. Kroll ¹³¹, J. Kroll ¹²⁸, K.S. Krowpman ¹⁰⁷, U. Kruchonak ³⁸,
H. Krüger ²⁴, N. Krumnack ⁸¹, M.C. Kruse ⁵¹, O. Kuchinskaia ³⁷, S. Kuday ^{3a}, S. Kuehn ³⁶,
R. Kuesters ⁵⁴, T. Kuhl ⁴⁸, V. Kukhtin ³⁸, Y. Kulchitsky ^{37,a}, S. Kuleshov ^{137d,137b},
M. Kumar ^{33g}, N. Kumari ⁴⁸, P. Kumari ^{156b}, A. Kupco ¹³¹, T. Kupfer ⁴⁹, A. Kupich ³⁷,
O. Kuprash ⁵⁴, H. Kurashige ⁸⁵, L.L. Kurchaninov ^{156a}, O. Kurdysh ⁶⁶, Y.A. Kurochkin ³⁷,
A. Kurova ³⁷, M. Kuze ¹⁵⁴, A.K. Kvam ¹⁰³, J. Kvita ¹²², T. Kwan ¹⁰⁴, N.G. Kyriacou ¹⁰⁶,
L.A.O. Laatu ¹⁰², C. Lacasta ¹⁶³, F. Lacava ^{75a,75b}, H. Lacker ¹⁸, D. Lacour ¹²⁷, N.N. Lad ⁹⁶,
E. Ladygin ³⁸, B. Laforge ¹²⁷, T. Lagouri ^{27b}, F.Z. Lahbabi ^{35a}, S. Lai ⁵⁵, I.K. Lakomic ^{86a},
N. Lalloue ⁶⁰, J.E. Lambert ¹⁶⁵, S. Lammers ⁶⁸, W. Lampl ⁷, C. Lampoudis ^{152,e},
A.N. Lancaster ¹¹⁵, E. Lançon ²⁹, U. Landgraf ⁵⁴, M.P.J. Landon ⁹⁴, V.S. Lang ⁵⁴,
O.K.B. Langrekken ¹²⁵, A.J. Lankford ¹⁵⁹, F. Lanni ³⁶, K. Lantzsch ²⁴, A. Lanza ^{73a},
A. Lapertosa ^{57b,57a}, J.F. Laporte ¹³⁵, T. Lari ^{71a}, F. Lasagni Manghi ^{23b}, M. Lassnig ³⁶,
V. Latonova ¹³¹, A. Laudrain ¹⁰⁰, A. Laurier ¹⁵⁰, S.D. Lawlor ¹³⁹, Z. Lawrence ¹⁰¹,
R. Lazaridou ¹⁶⁷, M. Lazzaroni ^{71a,71b}, B. Le ¹⁰¹, E.M. Le Boulicaut ⁵¹, B. Leban ⁹³, A. Lebedev ⁸¹,
M. LeBlanc ¹⁰¹, F. Ledroit-Guillon ⁶⁰, A.C.A. Lee ⁹⁶, S.C. Lee ¹⁴⁸, S. Lee ^{47a,47b}, T.F. Lee ⁹²,
L.L. Leeuw ^{33c}, H.P. Lefebvre ⁹⁵, M. Lefebvre ¹⁶⁵, C. Leggett ^{17a}, G. Lehmann Miotto ³⁶,
M. Leigh ⁵⁶, W.A. Leight ¹⁰³, W. Leinonen ¹¹³, A. Leisos ^{152,s}, M.A.L. Leite ^{83c},
C.E. Leitgeb ¹⁸, R. Leitner ¹³³, K.J.C. Leney ⁴⁴, T. Lenz ²⁴, S. Leone ^{74a}, C. Leonidopoulos ⁵²,
A. Leopold ¹⁴⁴, C. Leroy ¹⁰⁸, R. Les ¹⁰⁷, C.G. Lester ³², M. Levchenko ³⁷, J. Levêque ⁴,
L.J. Levinson ¹⁶⁹, G. Levrimi ^{23b,23a}, M.P. Lewicki ⁸⁷, D.J. Lewis ⁴, A. Li ⁵, B. Li ^{62b}, C. Li ^{62a},
C-Q. Li ¹¹⁰, H. Li ^{62a}, H. Li ^{62b}, H. Li ^{14c}, H. Li ^{14b}, H. Li ^{62b}, J. Li ^{62c}, K. Li ¹³⁸,
L. Li ^{62c}, M. Li ^{14a,14e}, Q.Y. Li ^{62a}, S. Li ^{14a,14e}, S. Li ^{62d,62c,d}, T. Li ⁵, X. Li ¹⁰⁴, Z. Li ¹²⁶,
Z. Li ¹⁰⁴, Z. Li ^{14a,14e}, S. Liang ^{14a,14e}, Z. Liang ^{14a}, M. Liberatore ¹³⁵, B. Liberti ^{76a}, K. Lie ^{64c},
J. Lieber Marin ^{83b}, H. Lien ⁶⁸, K. Lin ¹⁰⁷, R.E. Lindley ⁷, J.H. Lindon ², E. Lipeles ¹²⁸,
A. Lipniacka ¹⁶, A. Lister ¹⁶⁴, J.D. Little ⁴, B. Liu ^{14a}, B.X. Liu ¹⁴², D. Liu ^{62d,62c},
J.B. Liu ^{62a}, J.K.K. Liu ³², K. Liu ^{62d,62c}, M. Liu ^{62a}, M.Y. Liu ^{62a}, P. Liu ^{14a},
Q. Liu ^{62d,138,62c}, X. Liu ^{62a}, X. Liu ^{62b}, Y. Liu ^{14d,14e}, Y.L. Liu ^{62b}, Y.W. Liu ^{62a},
J. Llorente Merino ¹⁴², S.L. Lloyd ⁹⁴, E.M. Lobodzinska ⁴⁸, P. Loch ⁷, T. Lohse ¹⁸,
K. Lohwasser ¹³⁹, E. Loiacono ⁴⁸, M. Lokajicek ^{131,*}, J.D. Lomas ²⁰, J.D. Long ¹⁶²,
I. Longarini ¹⁵⁹, L. Longo ^{70a,70b}, R. Longo ¹⁶², I. Lopez Paz ⁶⁷, A. Lopez Solis ⁴⁸,
J. Lorenz ¹⁰⁹, N. Lorenzo Martinez ⁴, A.M. Lory ¹⁰⁹, G. Löschcke Centeno ¹⁴⁶, O. Loseva ³⁷,
















X. Lou ^{47a,47b}, X. Lou ^{14a,14e}, A. Lounis ⁶⁶, P.A. Love ⁹¹, G. Lu ^{14a,14e}, M. Lu ⁸⁰, S. Lu ¹²⁸, Y.J. Lu ⁶⁵, H.J. Lubatti ¹³⁸, C. Luci ^{75a,75b}, F.L. Lucio Alves ^{14c}, F. Luehring ⁶⁸, I. Luise ¹⁴⁵, O. Lukianchuk ⁶⁶, O. Lundberg ¹⁴⁴, B. Lund-Jensen ¹⁴⁴, N.A. Luongo ⁶, M.S. Lutz ³⁶, A.B. Lux ²⁵, D. Lynn ²⁹, R. Lysak ¹³¹, E. Lytken ⁹⁸, V. Lyubushkin ³⁸, T. Lyubushkina ³⁸, M.M. Lyukova ¹⁴⁵, H. Ma ²⁹, K. Ma ^{62a}, L.L. Ma ^{62b}, W. Ma ^{62a}, Y. Ma ¹²¹, D.M. Mac Donell ¹⁶⁵, G. Maccarrone ⁵³, J.C. MacDonald ¹⁰⁰, P.C. Machado De Abreu Farias ^{83b}, R. Madar ⁴⁰, W.F. Mader ⁵⁰, T. Madula ⁹⁶, J. Maeda ⁸⁵, T. Maeno ²⁹, H. Maguire ¹³⁹, V. Maiboroda ¹³⁵, A. Maio ^{130a,130b,130d}, K. Maj ^{86a}, O. Majersky ⁴⁸, S. Majewski ¹²³, N. Makovec ⁶⁶, V. Maksimovic ¹⁵, B. Malaescu ¹²⁷, Pa. Malecki ⁸⁷, V.P. Maleev ³⁷, F. Malek ^{60,o}, M. Mali ⁹³, D. Malito ⁹⁵, U. Mallik ⁸⁰, S. Maltezos ¹⁰, S. Malyukov ³⁸, J. Mamuzic ¹³, G. Mancini ⁵³, M.N. Mancini ²⁶, G. Manco ^{73a,73b}, J.P. Mandalia ⁹⁴, I. Mandić ⁹³, L. Manhaes de Andrade Filho ^{83a}, I.M. Maniatis ¹⁶⁹, J. Manjarres Ramos ^{102,ab}, D.C. Mankad ¹⁶⁹, A. Mann ¹⁰⁹, S. Manzoni ³⁶, L. Mao ^{62c}, X. Mapekula ^{33c}, A. Marantis ^{152,s}, G. Marchiori ⁵, M. Marcisovsky ¹³¹, C. Marcon ^{71a}, M. Marinescu ²⁰, S. Marium ⁴⁸, M. Marjanovic ¹²⁰, E.J. Marshall ⁹¹, Z. Marshall ^{17a}, S. Marti-Garcia ¹⁶³, T.A. Martin ¹⁶⁷, V.J. Martin ⁵², B. Martin dit Latour ¹⁶, L. Martinelli ^{75a,75b}, M. Martinez ^{13,t}, P. Martinez Agullo ¹⁶³, V.I. Martinez Outschoorn ¹⁰³, P. Martinez Suarez ¹³, S. Martin-Haugh ¹³⁴, V.S. Martoiu ^{27b}, A.C. Martyniuk ⁹⁶, A. Marzin ³⁶, D. Mascione ^{78a,78b}, L. Masetti ¹⁰⁰, T. Mashimo ¹⁵³, J. Masik ¹⁰¹, A.L. Maslennikov ³⁷, P. Massarotti ^{72a,72b}, P. Mastrandrea ^{74a,74b}, A. Mastroberardino ^{43b,43a}, T. Masubuchi ¹⁵³, T. Mathisen ¹⁶¹, J. Matousek ¹³³, N. Matsuzawa ¹⁵³, J. Maurer ^{27b}, B. Maček ⁹³, D.A. Maximov ³⁷, R. Mazini ¹⁴⁸, I. Maznas ¹¹⁵, M. Mazza ¹⁰⁷, S.M. Mazza ¹³⁶, E. Mazzeo ^{71a,71b}, C. Mc Ginn ²⁹, J.P. Mc Gowan ¹⁰⁴, S.P. Mc Kee ¹⁰⁶, C.C. McCracken ¹⁶⁴, E.F. McDonald ¹⁰⁵, A.E. McDougall ¹¹⁴, J.A. Mcfayden ¹⁴⁶, R.P. McGovern ¹²⁸, G. Mchedlidze ^{149b}, R.P. Mckenzie ^{33g}, T.C. McLachlan ⁴⁸, D.J. McLaughlin ⁹⁶, S.J. McMahon ¹³⁴, C.M. Mcpartland ⁹², R.A. McPherson ^{165,x}, S. Mehlhase ¹⁰⁹, A. Mehta ⁹², D. Melini ¹⁶³, B.R. Mellado Garcia ^{33g}, A.H. Melo ⁵⁵, F. Meloni ⁴⁸, A.M. Mendes Jacques Da Costa ¹⁰¹, H.Y. Meng ¹⁵⁵, L. Meng ⁹¹, S. Menke ¹¹⁰, M. Mentink ³⁶, E. Meoni ^{43b,43a}, G. Mercado ¹¹⁵, C. Merlassino ^{69a,69c}, L. Merola ^{72a,72b}, C. Meroni ^{71a,71b}, J. Metcalfe ⁶, A.S. Mete ⁶, C. Meyer ⁶⁸, J-P. Meyer ¹³⁵, R.P. Middleton ¹³⁴, L. Mijović ⁵², G. Mikenberg ¹⁶⁹, M. Mikestikova ¹³¹, M. Mikuž ⁹³, H. Mildner ¹⁰⁰, A. Milic ³⁶, D.W. Miller ³⁹, E.H. Miller ¹⁴³, L.S. Miller ³⁴, A. Milov ¹⁶⁹, D.A. Milstead ^{47a,47b}, T. Min ^{14c}, A.A. Minaenko ³⁷, I.A. Minashvili ^{149b}, L. Mince ⁵⁹, A.I. Mincer ¹¹⁷, B. Mindur ^{86a}, M. Mineev ³⁸, Y. Mino ⁸⁸, L.M. Mir ¹³, M. Miralles Lopez ⁵⁹, M. Mironova ^{17a}, A. Mishima ¹⁵³, M.C. Missio ¹¹³, A. Mitra ¹⁶⁷, V.A. Mitsou ¹⁶³, Y. Mitsumori ¹¹¹, O. Miu ¹⁵⁵, P.S. Miyagawa ⁹⁴, T. Mkrtychyan ^{63a}, M. Mlinarevic ⁹⁶, T. Mlinarevic ⁹⁶, M. Mlynarikova ³⁶, S. Mobius ¹⁹, P. Mogg ¹⁰⁹, M.H. Mohamed Farook ¹¹², A.F. Mohammed ^{14a,14e}, S. Mohapatra ⁴¹, G. Mokgatitswane ^{33g}, L. Moleri ¹⁶⁹, B. Mondal ¹⁴¹, S. Mondal ¹³², K. Mönig ⁴⁸, E. Monnier ¹⁰², L. Monsonis Romero ¹⁶³, J. Montejo Berlingen ¹³, M. Montella ¹¹⁹, F. Montekali ^{77a,77b}, F. Monticelli ⁹⁰, S. Monzani ^{69a,69c}, N. Morange ⁶⁶, A.L. Moreira De Carvalho ^{130a}, M. Moreno Llácer ¹⁶³, C. Moreno Martinez ⁵⁶, P. Morettini ^{57b}, S. Morgenstern ³⁶, M. Morii ⁶¹, M. Morinaga ¹⁵³, F. Morodei ^{75a,75b}, L. Morvaj ³⁶, P. Moschovakos ³⁶, B. Moser ³⁶, M. Mosidze ^{149b}, T. Moskalets ⁵⁴, P. Moskvitina ¹¹³, J. Moss ^{31,1}, E.J.W. Moyses ¹⁰³, O. Mtintsilana ^{33g}, S. Muanza ¹⁰², J. Mueller ¹²⁹, D. Muenstermann ⁹¹, R. Müller ¹⁹, G.A. Mullier ¹⁶¹, A.J. Mullin ³², J.J. Mullin ¹²⁸, D.P. Mungo ¹⁵⁵, D. Munoz Perez ¹⁶³, F.J. Munoz Sanchez ¹⁰¹, M. Murin ¹⁰¹, W.J. Murray ^{167,134}, M. Muškinja ⁹³, C. Mwewa ²⁹, A.G. Myagkov ^{37,a}, A.J. Myers ⁸, G. Myers ⁶⁸, M. Myska ¹³², B.P. Nachman ^{17a}, O. Nackenhorst ⁴⁹, K. Nagai ¹²⁶, K. Nagano ⁸⁴, J.L. Nagle ^{29,ai}, E. Nagy ¹⁰², A.M. Nairz ³⁶,

Y. Nakahama ⁸⁴, K. Nakamura ⁸⁴, K. Nakkalil ⁵, H. Nanjo ¹²⁴, R. Narayan ⁴⁴,
 E.A. Narayanan ¹¹², I. Naryshkin ³⁷, M. Naseri ³⁴, S. Nasri ^{116b}, C. Nass ²⁴, G. Navarro ^{22a},
 J. Navarro-Gonzalez ¹⁶³, R. Nayak ¹⁵¹, A. Nayaz ¹⁸, P.Y. Nechaeva ³⁷, F. Nechansky ⁴⁸,
 L. Nedic ¹²⁶, T.J. Neep ²⁰, A. Negri ^{73a,73b}, M. Negrini ^{23b}, C. Nellist ¹¹⁴, C. Nelson ¹⁰⁴,
 K. Nelson ¹⁰⁶, S. Nemecek ¹³¹, M. Nessi ^{36,h}, M.S. Neubauer ¹⁶², F. Neuhaus ¹⁰⁰,
 J. Neundorf ⁴⁸, R. Newhouse ¹⁶⁴, P.R. Newman ²⁰, C.W. Ng ¹²⁹, Y.W.Y. Ng ⁴⁸, B. Ngair ^{116a},
 H.D.N. Nguyen ¹⁰⁸, R.B. Nickerson ¹²⁶, R. Nicolaidou ¹³⁵, J. Nielsen ¹³⁶, M. Niemeyer ⁵⁵,
 J. Niermann ⁵⁵, N. Nikiforou ³⁶, V. Nikolaenko ^{37,a}, I. Nikolic-Audit ¹²⁷, K. Nikolopoulos ²⁰,
 P. Nilsson ²⁹, I. Ninca ⁴⁸, H.R. Nindhito ⁵⁶, G. Ninio ¹⁵¹, A. Nisati ^{75a}, N. Nishu ²,
 R. Nisius ¹¹⁰, J-E. Nitschke ⁵⁰, E.K. Nkadimeng ^{33g}, T. Nobe ¹⁵³, D.L. Noel ³²,
 T. Nommensen ¹⁴⁷, M.B. Norfolk ¹³⁹, R.R.B. Norisam ⁹⁶, B.J. Norman ³⁴, M. Noury ^{35a},
 J. Novak ⁹³, T. Novak ⁴⁸, L. Novotny ¹³², R. Novotny ¹¹², L. Nozka ¹²², K. Ntekas ¹⁵⁹,
 N.M.J. Nunes De Moura Junior ^{83b}, J. Ocariz ¹²⁷, A. Ochi ⁸⁵, I. Ochoa ^{130a}, S. Oerdek ^{48,u},
 J.T. Offermann ³⁹, A. Ogrodnik ¹³³, A. Oh ¹⁰¹, C.C. Ohm ¹⁴⁴, H. Oide ⁸⁴, R. Oishi ¹⁵³,
 M.L. Ojeda ⁴⁸, Y. Okumura ¹⁵³, L.F. Oleiro Seabra ^{130a}, S.A. Olivares Pino ^{137d},
 D. Oliveira Damazio ²⁹, D. Oliveira Goncalves ^{83a}, J.L. Oliver ¹⁵⁹, Ö.O. Öncel ⁵⁴,
 A.P. O'Neill ¹⁹, A. Onofre ^{130a,130e}, P.U.E. Onyisi ¹¹, M.J. Oreglia ³⁹, G.E. Orellana ⁹⁰,
 D. Orestano ^{77a,77b}, N. Orlando ¹³, R.S. Orr ¹⁵⁵, V. O'Shea ⁵⁹, L.M. Osojnak ¹²⁸,
 R. Ospanov ^{62a}, G. Otero y Garzon ³⁰, H. Otono ⁸⁹, P.S. Ott ^{63a}, G.J. Ottino ^{17a}, M. Ouchrif ^{35d},
 F. Ould-Saada ¹²⁵, M. Owen ⁵⁹, R.E. Owen ¹³⁴, K.Y. Oyulmaz ^{21a}, V.E. Ozcan ^{21a},
 F. Ozturk ⁸⁷, N. Ozturk ⁸, S. Ozturk ⁸², H.A. Pacey ¹²⁶, A. Pacheco Pages ¹³,
 C. Padilla Aranda ¹³, G. Padovano ^{75a,75b}, S. Pagan Griso ^{17a}, G. Palacino ⁶⁸, A. Palazzo ^{70a,70b},
 J. Pampel ²⁴, J. Pan ¹⁷², T. Pan ^{64a}, D.K. Panchal ¹¹, C.E. Pandini ¹¹⁴, J.G. Panduro Vazquez ⁹⁵,
 H.D. Pandya ¹, H. Pang ^{14b}, P. Pani ⁴⁸, G. Panizzo ^{69a,69c}, L. Panwar ¹²⁷, L. Paolozzi ⁵⁶,
 S. Parajuli ¹⁶², A. Paramonov ⁶, C. Paraskevopoulos ⁵³, D. Paredes Hernandez ^{64b},
 A. Paret ^{73a,73b}, K.R. Park ⁴¹, T.H. Park ¹⁵⁵, M.A. Parker ³², F. Parodi ^{57b,57a}, E.W. Parrish ¹¹⁵,
 V.A. Parrish ⁵², J.A. Parsons ⁴¹, U. Parzefall ⁵⁴, B. Pascual Dias ¹⁰⁸, L. Pascual Dominguez ¹⁵¹,
 E. Pasqualucci ^{75a}, S. Passaggio ^{57b}, F. Pastore ⁹⁵, P. Patel ⁸⁷, U.M. Patel ⁵¹, J.R. Pater ¹⁰¹,
 T. Pauly ³⁶, C.I. Pazos ¹⁵⁸, J. Pearkes ¹⁴³, M. Pedersen ¹²⁵, R. Pedro ^{130a}, S.V. Peleganchuk ³⁷,
 O. Penc ³⁶, E.A. Pender ⁵², G.D. Penn ¹⁷², K.E. Pensi ¹⁰⁹, M. Penzin ³⁷, B.S. Peralva ^{83d},
 A.P. Pereira Peixoto ⁶⁰, L. Pereira Sanchez ¹⁴³, D.V. Perepelitsa ^{29,ai}, E. Perez Codina ^{156a},
 M. Perganti ¹⁰, H. Pernegger ³⁶, O. Perrin ⁴⁰, K. Peters ⁴⁸, R.F.Y. Peters ¹⁰¹, B.A. Petersen ³⁶,
 T.C. Petersen ⁴², E. Petit ¹⁰², V. Petousis ¹³², C. Petridou ^{152,e}, A. Petrukhin ¹⁴¹, M. Pettee ^{17a},
 N.E. Pettersson ³⁶, A. Petukhov ³⁷, K. Petukhova ¹³³, R. Pezoa ^{137f}, L. Pezzotti ³⁶,
 G. Pezzullo ¹⁷², T.M. Pham ¹⁷⁰, T. Pham ¹⁰⁵, P.W. Phillips ¹³⁴, G. Piacquadio ¹⁴⁵,
 E. Pianori ^{17a}, F. Piazza ¹²³, R. Piegai ³⁰, D. Pietreanu ^{27b}, A.D. Pilkington ¹⁰¹,
 M. Pinamonti ^{69a,69c}, J.L. Pinfeld ², B.C. Pinheiro Pereira ^{130a}, A.E. Pinto Pinoargote ^{100,135},
 L. Pintucci ^{69a,69c}, K.M. Piper ¹⁴⁶, A. Pirttikoski ⁵⁶, D.A. Pizzi ³⁴, L. Pizzimento ^{64b},
 A. Pizzini ¹¹⁴, M.-A. Pleier ²⁹, V. Plesanovs ⁵⁴, V. Pleskot ¹³³, E. Plotnikova ³⁸, G. Poddar ⁴,
 R. Poettgen ⁹⁸, L. Poggioli ¹²⁷, I. Pokharel ⁵⁵, S. Polacek ¹³³, G. Polesello ^{73a}, A. Poley ^{142,156a},
 A. Polini ^{23b}, C.S. Pollard ¹⁶⁷, Z.B. Pollock ¹¹⁹, E. Pompa Pacchi ^{75a,75b}, D. Ponomarenko ¹¹³,
 L. Pontecorvo ³⁶, S. Popa ^{27a}, G.A. Popeneciu ^{27d}, A. Poreba ³⁶, D.M. Portillo Quintero ^{156a},
 S. Pospisil ¹³², M.A. Postill ¹³⁹, P. Postolache ^{27c}, K. Potamianos ¹⁶⁷, P.A. Potepa ^{86a},
 I.N. Potrap ³⁸, C.J. Potter ³², H. Potti ¹, T. Poulsen ⁴⁸, J. Poveda ¹⁶³, M.E. Pozo Astigarraga ³⁶,
 A. Prades Ibanez ¹⁶³, J. Pretel ⁵⁴, D. Price ¹⁰¹, M. Primavera ^{70a}, M.A. Principe Martin ⁹⁹,
 R. Privara ¹²², T. Procter ⁵⁹, M.L. Proffitt ¹³⁸, N. Proklova ¹²⁸, K. Prokofiev ^{64c}, G. Proto ¹¹⁰,
 J. Proudfoot ⁶, M. Przybycien ^{86a}, W.W. Przygoda ^{86b}, A. Psallidas ⁴⁶, J.E. Puddefoot ¹³⁹,

D. Pudzha ³⁷, D. Pyatiizbyantseva ³⁷, J. Qian ¹⁰⁶, D. Qichen ¹⁰¹, Y. Qin ¹⁰¹, T. Qiu ⁵²,
 A. Quadt ⁵⁵, M. Queitsch-Maitland ¹⁰¹, G. Quetant ⁵⁶, R.P. Quinn ¹⁶⁴, G. Rabanal Bolanos ⁶¹,
 D. Rafanoharana ⁵⁴, F. Ragusa ^{71a,71b}, J.L. Rainbolt ³⁹, J.A. Raine ⁵⁶, S. Rajagopalan ²⁹,
 E. Ramakoti ³⁷, I.A. Ramirez-Berend ³⁴, K. Ran ^{48,14e}, N.P. Rapheeha ^{33g}, H. Rasheed ^{27b},
 V. Raskina ¹²⁷, D.F. Rassloff ^{63a}, A. Rastogi ^{17a}, S. Rave ¹⁰⁰, B. Ravina ⁵⁵, I. Ravinovich ¹⁶⁹,
 M. Raymond ³⁶, A.L. Read ¹²⁵, N.P. Readioff ¹³⁹, D.M. Rebutzi ^{73a,73b}, G. Redlinger ²⁹,
 A.S. Reed ¹¹⁰, K. Reeves ²⁶, J.A. Reidelsturz ¹⁷¹, D. Reikher ¹⁵¹, A. Rej ⁴⁹, C. Rembser ³⁶,
 M. Renda ^{27b}, M.B. Rendel ¹¹⁰, F. Renner ⁴⁸, A.G. Rennie ¹⁵⁹, A.L. Rescia ⁴⁸, S. Resconi ^{71a},
 M. Ressegotti ^{57b,57a}, S. Rettie ³⁶, J.G. Reyes Rivera ¹⁰⁷, E. Reynolds ^{17a}, O.L. Rezanova ³⁷,
 P. Reznicek ¹³³, H. Riani ^{35d}, N. Ribaric ⁹¹, E. Ricci ^{78a,78b}, R. Richter ¹¹⁰, S. Richter ^{47a,47b},
 E. Richter-Was ^{86b}, M. Ridel ¹²⁷, S. Ridouani ^{35d}, P. Rieck ¹¹⁷, P. Riedler ³⁶, E.M. Riefel ^{47a,47b},
 J.O. Rieger ¹¹⁴, M. Rijssenbeek ¹⁴⁵, M. Rimoldi ³⁶, L. Rinaldi ^{23b,23a}, T.T. Rinn ²⁹,
 M.P. Rinnagel ¹⁰⁹, G. Ripellino ¹⁶¹, I. Riu ¹³, J.C. Rivera Vergara ¹⁶⁵, F. Rizatdinova ¹²¹,
 E. Rizvi ⁹⁴, B.R. Roberts ^{17a}, S.H. Robertson ^{104,x}, D. Robinson ³², C.M. Robles Gajardo ^{137f},
 M. Robles Manzano ¹⁰⁰, A. Robson ⁵⁹, A. Rocchi ^{76a,76b}, C. Roda ^{74a,74b}, S. Rodriguez Bosca ³⁶,
 Y. Rodriguez Garcia ^{22a}, A. Rodriguez Rodriguez ⁵⁴, A.M. Rodríguez Vera ^{156b}, S. Roe ³⁶,
 J.T. Roemer ¹⁵⁹, A.R. Roepe-Gier ¹³⁶, J. Roggel ¹⁷¹, O. Røhne ¹²⁵, R.A. Rojas ¹⁰³,
 C.P.A. Roland ¹²⁷, J. Roloff ²⁹, A. Romaniouk ³⁷, E. Romano ^{73a,73b}, M. Romano ^{23b},
 A.C. Romero Hernandez ¹⁶², N. Rompotis ⁹², L. Roos ¹²⁷, S. Rosati ^{75a}, B.J. Rosser ³⁹,
 E. Rossi ¹²⁶, E. Rossi ^{72a,72b}, L.P. Rossi ⁶¹, L. Rossini ⁵⁴, R. Rosten ¹¹⁹, M. Rotaru ^{27b},
 B. Rottler ⁵⁴, C. Rougier ¹⁰², D. Rousseau ⁶⁶, D. Rousso ³², A. Roy ¹⁶², S. Roy-Garand ¹⁵⁵,
 A. Rozanov ¹⁰², Z.M.A. Rozario ⁵⁹, Y. Rozen ¹⁵⁰, A. Rubio Jimenez ¹⁶³, A.J. Ruby ⁹²,
 V.H. Ruelas Rivera ¹⁸, T.A. Ruggeri ¹, A. Ruggiero ¹²⁶, A. Ruiz-Martinez ¹⁶³, A. Rummler ³⁶,
 Z. Rurikova ⁵⁴, N.A. Rusakovich ³⁸, H.L. Russell ¹⁶⁵, G. Russo ^{75a,75b}, J.P. Rutherford ⁷,
 S. Rutherford Colmenares ³², K. Rybacki ⁹¹, M. Rybar ¹³³, E.B. Rye ¹²⁵, A. Ryzhov ⁴⁴,
 J.A. Sabater Iglesias ⁵⁶, P. Sabatini ¹⁶³, H.F.W. Sadrozinski ¹³⁶, F. Safai Tehrani ^{75a},
 B. Safarzadeh Samani ¹³⁴, M. Safdari ¹⁴³, S. Saha ¹⁶⁵, M. Sahinsoy ¹¹⁰, A. Saibel ¹⁶³,
 M. Saimpert ¹³⁵, M. Saito ¹⁵³, T. Saito ¹⁵³, D. Salamani ³⁶, A. Salnikov ¹⁴³, J. Salt ¹⁶³,
 A. Salvador Salas ¹⁵¹, D. Salvatore ^{43b,43a}, F. Salvatore ¹⁴⁶, A. Salzburger ³⁶, D. Sammel ⁵⁴,
 D. Sampsonidis ^{152,e}, D. Sampsonidou ¹²³, J. Sánchez ¹⁶³, V. Sanchez Sebastian ¹⁶³,
 H. Sandaker ¹²⁵, C.O. Sander ⁴⁸, J.A. Sandesara ¹⁰³, M. Sandhoff ¹⁷¹, C. Sandoval ^{22b},
 D.P.C. Sankey ¹³⁴, T. Sano ⁸⁸, A. Sansoni ⁵³, L. Santi ^{75a,75b}, C. Santoni ⁴⁰, H. Santos ^{130a,130b},
 A. Santra ¹⁶⁹, K.A. Saoucha ¹⁶⁰, J.G. Saraiva ^{130a,130d}, J. Sardain ⁷, O. Sasaki ⁸⁴, K. Sato ¹⁵⁷,
 C. Sauer ^{63b}, F. Sauerburger ⁵⁴, E. Sauvan ⁴, P. Savard ^{155,ag}, R. Sawada ¹⁵³, C. Sawyer ¹³⁴,
 L. Sawyer ⁹⁷, I. Sayago Galvan ¹⁶³, C. Sbarra ^{23b}, A. Sbrizzi ^{23b,23a}, T. Scanlon ⁹⁶,
 J. Schaarschmidt ¹³⁸, D. Schaefer ³⁹, U. Schäfer ¹⁰⁰, A.C. Schaffer ^{66,44}, D. Schaile ¹⁰⁹,
 R.D. Schamberger ¹⁴⁵, C. Scharf ¹⁸, M.M. Schefer ¹⁹, V.A. Schegelsky ³⁷, D. Scheirich ¹³³,
 F. Schenck ¹⁸, M. Schernau ¹⁵⁹, C. Scheulen ⁵⁵, C. Schiavi ^{57b,57a}, M. Schioppa ^{43b,43a},
 B. Schlag ^{143,n}, K.E. Schleicher ⁵⁴, S. Schlenker ³⁶, J. Schmeing ¹⁷¹, M.A. Schmidt ¹⁷¹,
 K. Schmieden ¹⁰⁰, C. Schmitt ¹⁰⁰, N. Schmitt ¹⁰⁰, S. Schmitt ⁴⁸, L. Schoeffel ¹³⁵,
 A. Schoening ^{63b}, P.G. Scholer ³⁴, E. Schopf ¹²⁶, M. Schott ¹⁰⁰, J. Schovancova ³⁶,
 S. Schramm ⁵⁶, T. Schroer ⁵⁶, H-C. Schultz-Coulon ^{63a}, M. Schumacher ⁵⁴, B.A. Schumm ¹³⁶,
 Ph. Schune ¹³⁵, A.J. Schuy ¹³⁸, H.R. Schwartz ¹³⁶, A. Schwartzman ¹⁴³, T.A. Schwarz ¹⁰⁶,
 Ph. Schwemling ¹³⁵, R. Schwienhorst ¹⁰⁷, A. Sciandra ¹³⁶, G. Sciolla ²⁶, F. Scuri ^{74a},
 C.D. Sebastiani ⁹², K. Sedlaczek ¹¹⁵, P. Seema ¹⁸, S.C. Seidel ¹¹², A. Seiden ¹³⁶,
 B.D. Seidlitz ⁴¹, C. Seitz ⁴⁸, J.M. Seixas ^{83b}, G. Sekhniadze ^{72a}, L. Selem ⁶⁰,
 N. Semprini-Cesari ^{23b,23a}, D. Sengupta ⁵⁶, V. Senthilkumar ¹⁶³, L. Serin ⁶⁶, L. Serkin ^{69a,69b},

M. Sessa ^{76a,76b}, H. Severini ¹²⁰, F. Sforza ^{57b,57a}, A. Sfyrla ⁵⁶, Q. Sha ^{14a}, E. Shabalina ⁵⁵,
R. Shaheen ¹⁴⁴, J.D. Shahinian ¹²⁸, D. Shaked Renous ¹⁶⁹, L.Y. Shan ^{14a}, M. Shapiro ^{17a},
A. Sharma ³⁶, A.S. Sharma ¹⁶⁴, P. Sharma ⁸⁰, P.B. Shatalov ³⁷, K. Shaw ¹⁴⁶, S.M. Shaw ¹⁰¹,
A. Shcherbakova ³⁷, Q. Shen ^{62c,5}, D.J. Sheppard ¹⁴², P. Sherwood ⁹⁶, L. Shi ⁹⁶, X. Shi ^{14a},
C.O. Shimmin ¹⁷², J.D. Shinner ⁹⁵, I.P.J. Shipsey ¹²⁶, S. Shirabe ⁸⁹, M. Shiyakova ^{38,v},
J. Shlomi ¹⁶⁹, M.J. Shochet ³⁹, J. Shojaii ¹⁰⁵, D.R. Shope ¹²⁵, B. Shrestha ¹²⁰, S. Shrestha ^{119,aj},
E.M. Shrif ^{33g}, M.J. Shroff ¹⁶⁵, P. Sicho ¹³¹, A.M. Sickles ¹⁶², E. Sideras Haddad ^{33g},
A. Sidoti ^{23b}, F. Siegert ⁵⁰, Dj. Sijacki ¹⁵, F. Sili ⁹⁰, J.M. Silva ⁵², M.V. Silva Oliveira ²⁹,
S.B. Silverstein ^{47a}, S. Simion ⁶⁶, R. Simoniello ³⁶, E.L. Simpson ⁵⁹, H. Simpson ¹⁴⁶,
L.R. Simpson ¹⁰⁶, N.D. Simpson ⁹⁸, S. Simsek ⁸², S. Sindhu ⁵⁵, P. Sinervo ¹⁵⁵, S. Singh ¹⁵⁵,
S. Sinha ⁴⁸, S. Sinha ¹⁰¹, M. Sioli ^{23b,23a}, I. Siral ³⁶, E. Sitnikova ⁴⁸, J. Sjölin ^{47a,47b},
A. Skaf ⁵⁵, E. Skorda ²⁰, P. Skubic ¹²⁰, M. Slawinska ⁸⁷, V. Smakhtin ¹⁶⁹, B.H. Smart ¹³⁴,
S.Yu. Smirnov ³⁷, Y. Smirnov ³⁷, L.N. Smirnova ^{37,a}, O. Smirnova ⁹⁸, A.C. Smith ⁴¹,
E.A. Smith ³⁹, H.A. Smith ¹²⁶, J.L. Smith ⁹², R. Smith ¹⁴³, M. Smizanska ⁹¹, K. Smolek ¹³²,
A.A. Snesarev ³⁷, S.R. Snider ¹⁵⁵, H.L. Snoek ¹¹⁴, S. Snyder ²⁹, R. Sobie ^{165,x}, A. Soffer ¹⁵¹,
C.A. Solans Sanchez ³⁶, E.Yu. Soldatov ³⁷, U. Soldevila ¹⁶³, A.A. Solodkov ³⁷, S. Solomon ²⁶,
A. Soloshenko ³⁸, K. Solovieva ⁵⁴, O.V. Solovyanov ⁴⁰, V. Solovyev ³⁷, P. Sommer ³⁶,
A. Sonay ¹³, W.Y. Song ^{156b}, A. Sopczak ¹³², A.L. Soppio ⁹⁶, F. Sopkova ^{28b}, J.D. Sorenson ¹¹²,
I.R. Sotarriva Alvarez ¹⁵⁴, V. Sothilingam ^{63a}, O.J. Soto Sandoval ^{137c,137b}, S. Sottocornola ⁶⁸,
R. Soualah ¹⁶⁰, Z. Soumami ^{35e}, D. South ⁴⁸, N. Soybelman ¹⁶⁹, S. Spagnolo ^{70a,70b},
M. Spalla ¹¹⁰, D. Sperlich ⁵⁴, G. Spigo ³⁶, S. Spinali ⁹¹, D.P. Spiteri ⁵⁹, M. Spousta ¹³³,
E.J. Staats ³⁴, R. Stamen ^{63a}, A. Stampeki ²⁰, M. Standke ²⁴, E. Stanecka ⁸⁷, M.V. Stange ⁵⁰,
B. Stanislaus ^{17a}, M.M. Stanitzki ⁴⁸, B. Stapf ⁴⁸, E.A. Starchenko ³⁷, G.H. Stark ¹³⁶,
J. Stark ^{102,ab}, P. Staroba ¹³¹, P. Starovoitov ^{63a}, S. Stärz ¹⁰⁴, R. Staszewski ⁸⁷,
G. Stavropoulos ⁴⁶, J. Steentoft ¹⁶¹, P. Steinberg ²⁹, B. Stelzer ^{142,156a}, H.J. Stelzer ¹²⁹,
O. Stelzer-Chilton ^{156a}, H. Stenzel ⁵⁸, T.J. Stevenson ¹⁴⁶, G.A. Stewart ³⁶, J.R. Stewart ¹²¹,
M.C. Stockton ³⁶, G. Stoicea ^{27b}, M. Stolarski ^{130a}, S. Stonjek ¹¹⁰, A. Straessner ⁵⁰,
J. Strandberg ¹⁴⁴, S. Strandberg ^{47a,47b}, M. Stratmann ¹⁷¹, M. Strauss ¹²⁰, T. Strebler ¹⁰²,
P. Strizenc ^{28b}, R. Ströhmer ¹⁶⁶, D.M. Strom ¹²³, R. Stroynowski ⁴⁴, A. Strubig ^{47a,47b},
S.A. Stucci ²⁹, B. Stugu ¹⁶, J. Stupak ¹²⁰, N.A. Styles ⁴⁸, D. Su ¹⁴³, S. Su ^{62a}, W. Su ^{62d},
X. Su ^{62a}, K. Sugizaki ¹⁵³, V.V. Sulim ³⁷, M.J. Sullivan ⁹², D.M.S. Sultan ¹²⁶,
L. Sultanliyeva ³⁷, S. Sultansoy ^{3b}, T. Sumida ⁸⁸, S. Sun ¹⁰⁶, S. Sun ¹⁷⁰,
O. Sunneborn Gudnadottir ¹⁶¹, N. Sur ¹⁰², M.R. Sutton ¹⁴⁶, H. Suzuki ¹⁵⁷, M. Svatos ¹³¹,
M. Swiatlowski ^{156a}, T. Swirski ¹⁶⁶, I. Sykora ^{28a}, M. Sykora ¹³³, T. Sykora ¹³³, D. Ta ¹⁰⁰,
K. Tackmann ^{48,u}, A. Taffard ¹⁵⁹, R. Tafirout ^{156a}, J.S. Tafoya Vargas ⁶⁶, Y. Takubo ⁸⁴,
M. Talby ¹⁰², A.A. Talyshev ³⁷, K.C. Tam ^{64b}, N.M. Tamir ¹⁵¹, A. Tanaka ¹⁵³, J. Tanaka ¹⁵³,
R. Tanaka ⁶⁶, M. Tanasini ^{57b,57a}, Z. Tao ¹⁶⁴, S. Tapia Araya ^{137f}, S. Tapprogge ¹⁰⁰,
A. Tarek Abouelfadl Mohamed ¹⁰⁷, S. Tarem ¹⁵⁰, K. Tariq ^{14a}, G. Tarna ^{102,27b}, G.F. Tartarelli ^{71a},
P. Tas ¹³³, M. Tasevsky ¹³¹, E. Tassi ^{43b,43a}, A.C. Tate ¹⁶², G. Tateno ¹⁵³, Y. Tayalati ^{35e,w},
G.N. Taylor ¹⁰⁵, W. Taylor ^{156b}, A.S. Tee ¹⁷⁰, R. Teixeira De Lima ¹⁴³, P. Teixeira-Dias ⁹⁵,
J.J. Teoh ¹⁵⁵, K. Terashi ¹⁵³, J. Terron ⁹⁹, S. Terzo ¹³, M. Testa ⁵³, R.J. Teuscher ^{155,x},
A. Thaler ⁷⁹, O. Theiner ⁵⁶, N. Themistokleous ⁵², T. Thevenaux-Pelzer ¹⁰², O. Thielmann ¹⁷¹,
D.W. Thomas ⁹⁵, J.P. Thomas ²⁰, E.A. Thompson ^{17a}, P.D. Thompson ²⁰, E. Thomson ¹²⁸,
Y. Tian ⁵⁵, V. Tikhomirov ^{37,a}, Yu.A. Tikhonov ³⁷, S. Timoshenko ³⁷, D. Timoshyn ¹³³,
E.X.L. Ting ¹, P. Tipton ¹⁷², S.H. Tlou ^{33g}, A. Tnourji ⁴⁰, K. Todome ¹⁵⁴, S. Todorova-Nova ¹³³,
S. Todt ⁵⁰, M. Togawa ⁸⁴, J. Tojo ⁸⁹, S. Tokár ^{28a}, K. Tokushuku ⁸⁴, O. Toldaiev ⁶⁸, E. Tolley ¹¹⁹,
R. Tombs ³², M. Tomoto ^{84,111}, L. Tompkins ^{143,n}, K.W. Topolnicki ^{86b}, E. Torrence ¹²³,

H. Torres [ID102,ab](#), E. Torró Pastor [ID163](#), M. Toscani [ID30](#), C. Tosciri [ID39](#), M. Tost [ID11](#), D.R. Tovey [ID139](#),
 A. Traeet [ID16](#), I.S. Trandafir [ID27b](#), T. Trefzger [ID166](#), A. Tricoli [ID29](#), I.M. Trigger [ID156a](#),
 S. Trincaz-Duvoid [ID127](#), D.A. Trischuk [ID26](#), B. Trocmé [ID60](#), L. Truong [ID33c](#), M. Trzebinski [ID87](#),
 A. Trzupiek [ID87](#), F. Tsai [ID145](#), M. Tsai [ID106](#), A. Tsiamis [ID152,e](#), P.V. Tsiareshka [ID37](#), S. Tsigaridas [ID156a](#),
 A. Tsirigotis [ID152,s](#), V. Tsiskaridze [ID155](#), E.G. Tskhadadze [ID149a](#), M. Tsopoulou [ID152](#), Y. Tsujikawa [ID88](#),
 I.I. Tsukerman [ID37](#), V. Tsulaia [ID17a](#), S. Tsuno [ID84](#), K. Tsuru [ID118](#), D. Tsybychev [ID145](#), Y. Tu [ID64b](#),
 A. Tudorache [ID27b](#), V. Tudorache [ID27b](#), A.N. Tuna [ID61](#), S. Turchikhin [ID57b,57a](#), I. Turk Cakir [ID3a](#),
 R. Turra [ID71a](#), T. Turtuvshin [ID38,y](#), P.M. Tuts [ID41](#), S. Tzamarias [ID152,e](#), P. Tzanis [ID10](#), E. Tzovara [ID100](#),
 F. Ukegawa [ID157](#), P.A. Ulloa Poblete [ID137c,137b](#), E.N. Umaka [ID29](#), G. Unal [ID36](#), M. Unal [ID11](#),
 A. Undrus [ID29](#), G. Unel [ID159](#), J. Urban [ID28b](#), P. Urquijo [ID105](#), P. Urrejola [ID137a](#), G. Usai [ID8](#),
 R. Ushioda [ID154](#), M. Usman [ID108](#), Z. Uysal [ID82](#), V. Vacek [ID132](#), B. Vachon [ID104](#), K.O.H. Vadla [ID125](#),
 T. Vafeiadis [ID36](#), A. Vaitkus [ID96](#), C. Valderanis [ID109](#), E. Valdes Santurio [ID47a,47b](#), M. Valente [ID156a](#),
 S. Valentinetti [ID23b,23a](#), A. Valero [ID163](#), E. Valiente Moreno [ID163](#), A. Vallier [ID102,ab](#),
 J.A. Valls Ferrer [ID163](#), D.R. Van Arneman [ID114](#), T.R. Van Daalen [ID138](#), A. Van Der Graaf [ID49](#),
 P. Van Gemmeren [ID6](#), M. Van Rijnbach [ID125](#), S. Van Stroud [ID96](#), I. Van Vulpen [ID114](#),
 M. Vanadia [ID76a,76b](#), W. Vandelli [ID36](#), E.R. Vandewall [ID121](#), D. Vannicola [ID151](#), L. Vannoli [ID57b,57a](#),
 R. Vari [ID75a](#), E.W. Varnes [ID7](#), C. Varni [ID17b](#), T. Varol [ID148](#), D. Varouchas [ID66](#), L. Varriale [ID163](#),
 K.E. Varvell [ID147](#), M.E. Vasile [ID27b](#), L. Vaslin [ID84](#), G.A. Vasquez [ID165](#), A. Vasyukov [ID38](#), R. Vavricka [ID100](#),
 F. Vazeille [ID40](#), T. Vazquez Schroeder [ID36](#), J. Veatch [ID31](#), V. Vecchio [ID101](#), M.J. Veen [ID103](#),
 I. Veliscek [ID126](#), L.M. Veloce [ID155](#), F. Veloso [ID130a,130c](#), S. Veneziano [ID75a](#), A. Ventura [ID70a,70b](#),
 S. Ventura Gonzalez [ID135](#), A. Verbytskyi [ID110](#), M. Verducci [ID74a,74b](#), C. Vergis [ID24](#),
 M. Verissimo De Araujo [ID83b](#), W. Verkerke [ID114](#), J.C. Vermeulen [ID114](#), C. Vernieri [ID143](#),
 M. Vessella [ID103](#), M.C. Vetterli [ID142,ag](#), A. Vgenopoulos [ID152,e](#), N. Viaux Maira [ID137f](#), T. Vickey [ID139](#),
 O.E. Vickey Boeriu [ID139](#), G.H.A. Viehhauser [ID126](#), L. Vigani [ID63b](#), M. Villa [ID23b,23a](#),
 M. Villaplana Perez [ID163](#), E.M. Villhauer [ID52](#), E. Vilucchi [ID53](#), M.G. Vincter [ID34](#), G.S. Virdee [ID20](#),
 A. Vishwakarma [ID52](#), A. Visibile [ID114](#), C. Vittori [ID36](#), I. Vivarelli [ID23b,23a](#), E. Voevodina [ID110](#),
 F. Vogel [ID109](#), J.C. Voigt [ID50](#), P. Vokac [ID132](#), Yu. Volkotrub [ID86a](#), J. Von Ahnen [ID48](#), E. Von Toerne [ID24](#),
 B. Vormwald [ID36](#), V. Vorobel [ID133](#), K. Vorobev [ID37](#), M. Vos [ID163](#), K. Voss [ID141](#), M. Vozak [ID114](#),
 L. Vozdecky [ID120](#), N. Vranjes [ID15](#), M. Vranjes Milosavljevic [ID15](#), M. Vreeswijk [ID114](#), N.K. Vu [ID62d,62c](#),
 R. Vuillermet [ID36](#), O. Vujanovic [ID100](#), I. Vukotic [ID39](#), S. Wada [ID157](#), C. Wagner [ID103](#), J.M. Wagner [ID17a](#),
 W. Wagner [ID171](#), S. Wahdan [ID171](#), H. Wahlberg [ID90](#), M. Wakida [ID111](#), J. Walder [ID134](#), R. Walker [ID109](#),
 W. Walkowiak [ID141](#), A. Wall [ID128](#), T. Wamorkar [ID6](#), A.Z. Wang [ID136](#), C. Wang [ID100](#), C. Wang [ID11](#),
 H. Wang [ID17a](#), J. Wang [ID64c](#), R.-J. Wang [ID100](#), R. Wang [ID61](#), R. Wang [ID6](#), S.M. Wang [ID148](#),
 S. Wang [ID62b](#), T. Wang [ID62a](#), W.T. Wang [ID80](#), W. Wang [ID14a](#), X. Wang [ID14c](#), X. Wang [ID162](#),
 X. Wang [ID62c](#), Y. Wang [ID62d](#), Y. Wang [ID14c](#), Z. Wang [ID106](#), Z. Wang [ID62d,51,62c](#), Z. Wang [ID106](#),
 A. Warburton [ID104](#), R.J. Ward [ID20](#), N. Warrack [ID59](#), S. Waterhouse [ID95](#), A.T. Watson [ID20](#), H. Watson [ID59](#),
 M.F. Watson [ID20](#), E. Watton [ID59,134](#), G. Watts [ID138](#), B.M. Waugh [ID96](#), C. Weber [ID29](#), H.A. Weber [ID18](#),
 M.S. Weber [ID19](#), S.M. Weber [ID63a](#), C. Wei [ID62a](#), Y. Wei [ID126](#), A.R. Weidberg [ID126](#), E.J. Weik [ID117](#),
 J. Weingarten [ID49](#), M. Weirich [ID100](#), C. Weiser [ID54](#), C.J. Wells [ID48](#), T. Wenaus [ID29](#), B. Wendland [ID49](#),
 T. Wengler [ID36](#), N.S. Wenke [ID110](#), N. Wermes [ID24](#), M. Wessels [ID63a](#), A.M. Wharton [ID91](#), A.S. White [ID61](#),
 A. White [ID8](#), M.J. White [ID1](#), D. Whiteson [ID159](#), L. Wickremasinghe [ID124](#), W. Wiedenmann [ID170](#),
 M. Wielers [ID134](#), C. Wiglesworth [ID42](#), D.J. Wilbern [ID120](#), H.G. Wilkens [ID36](#), D.M. Williams [ID41](#),
 H.H. Williams [ID128](#), S. Williams [ID32](#), S. Willocq [ID103](#), B.J. Wilson [ID101](#), P.J. Windischhofer [ID39](#),
 F.I. Winkel [ID30](#), F. Winklmeier [ID123](#), B.T. Winter [ID54](#), J.K. Winter [ID101](#), M. Wittgen [ID143](#), M. Wobisch [ID97](#),
 Z. Wolffs [ID114](#), J. Wollrath [ID159](#), M.W. Wolter [ID87](#), H. Wolters [ID130a,130c](#), E.L. Woodward [ID41](#),
 S.D. Worm [ID48](#), B.K. Wosiek [ID87](#), K.W. Woźniak [ID87](#), S. Wozniowski [ID55](#), K. Wraight [ID59](#), C. Wu [ID20](#),
 M. Wu [ID14d](#), M. Wu [ID113](#), S.L. Wu [ID170](#), X. Wu [ID56](#), Y. Wu [ID62a](#), Z. Wu [ID135](#), J. Wuerzinger [ID110,ae](#),

T.R. Wyatt ¹⁰¹, B.M. Wynne ⁵², S. Xella ⁴², L. Xia ^{14c}, M. Xia ^{14b}, J. Xiang ^{64c}, M. Xie ^{62a}, X. Xie ^{62a}, S. Xin ^{14a,14e}, A. Xiong ¹²³, J. Xiong ^{17a}, D. Xu ^{14a}, H. Xu ^{62a}, L. Xu ^{62a}, R. Xu ¹²⁸, T. Xu ¹⁰⁶, Y. Xu ^{14b}, Z. Xu ⁵², Z. Xu ^{14c}, B. Yabsley ¹⁴⁷, S. Yacoob ^{33a}, Y. Yamaguchi ¹⁵⁴, E. Yamashita ¹⁵³, H. Yamauchi ¹⁵⁷, T. Yamazaki ^{17a}, Y. Yamazaki ⁸⁵, J. Yan ^{62c}, S. Yan ⁵⁹, Z. Yan ¹⁰³, H.J. Yang ^{62c,62d}, H.T. Yang ^{62a}, S. Yang ^{62a}, T. Yang ^{64c}, X. Yang ³⁶, X. Yang ^{14a}, Y. Yang ⁴⁴, Y. Yang ^{62a}, Z. Yang ^{62a}, W-M. Yao ^{17a}, H. Ye ^{14c}, H. Ye ⁵⁵, J. Ye ^{14a}, S. Ye ²⁹, X. Ye ^{62a}, Y. Yeh ⁹⁶, I. Yeletsikh ³⁸, B.K. Yeo ^{17b}, M.R. Yexley ⁹⁶, P. Yin ⁴¹, K. Yorita ¹⁶⁸, S. Younas ^{27b}, C.J.S. Young ³⁶, C. Young ¹⁴³, C. Yu ^{14a,14e}, Y. Yu ^{62a}, M. Yuan ¹⁰⁶, R. Yuan ^{62b}, L. Yue ⁹⁶, M. Zaazoua ^{62a}, B. Zabinski ⁸⁷, E. Zaid ⁵², Z.K. Zak ⁸⁷, T. Zakareishvili ¹⁶³, N. Zakharchuk ³⁴, S. Zambito ⁵⁶, J.A. Zamora Saa ^{137d,137b}, J. Zang ¹⁵³, D. Zanzi ⁵⁴, O. Zaplatilek ¹³², C. Zeitnitz ¹⁷¹, H. Zeng ^{14a}, J.C. Zeng ¹⁶², D.T. Zenger Jr ²⁶, O. Zenin ³⁷, T. Ženiš ^{28a}, S. Zenz ⁹⁴, S. Zerradi ^{35a}, D. Zerwas ⁶⁶, M. Zhai ^{14a,14e}, D.F. Zhang ¹³⁹, J. Zhang ^{62b}, J. Zhang ⁶, K. Zhang ^{14a,14e}, L. Zhang ^{14c}, P. Zhang ^{14a,14e}, R. Zhang ¹⁷⁰, S. Zhang ¹⁰⁶, S. Zhang ⁴⁴, T. Zhang ¹⁵³, X. Zhang ^{62c}, X. Zhang ^{62b}, Y. Zhang ^{62c,5}, Y. Zhang ⁹⁶, Y. Zhang ^{14c}, Z. Zhang ^{17a}, Z. Zhang ⁶⁶, H. Zhao ¹³⁸, T. Zhao ^{62b}, Y. Zhao ¹³⁶, Z. Zhao ^{62a}, A. Zhemchugov ³⁸, J. Zheng ^{14c}, K. Zheng ¹⁶², X. Zheng ^{62a}, Z. Zheng ¹⁴³, D. Zhong ¹⁶², B. Zhou ¹⁰⁶, H. Zhou ⁷, N. Zhou ^{62c}, Y. Zhou ^{14c}, Y. Zhou ⁷, C.G. Zhu ^{62b}, J. Zhu ¹⁰⁶, Y. Zhu ^{62c}, Y. Zhu ^{62a}, X. Zhuang ^{14a}, K. Zhukov ³⁷, N.I. Zimine ³⁸, J. Zinsser ^{63b}, M. Ziolkowski ¹⁴¹, L. Živković ¹⁵, A. Zoccoli ^{23b,23a}, K. Zoch ⁶¹, T.G. Zorbas ¹³⁹, O. Zormpa ⁴⁶, W. Zou ⁴¹, L. Zwalinski ³⁶.

¹Department of Physics, University of Adelaide, Adelaide; Australia.

²Department of Physics, University of Alberta, Edmonton AB; Canada.

³(^a)Department of Physics, Ankara University, Ankara; (^b)Division of Physics, TOBB University of Economics and Technology, Ankara; Türkiye.

⁴LAPP, Université Savoie Mont Blanc, CNRS/IN2P3, Annecy; France.

⁵APC, Université Paris Cité, CNRS/IN2P3, Paris; France.

⁶High Energy Physics Division, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne IL; United States of America.

⁷Department of Physics, University of Arizona, Tucson AZ; United States of America.

⁸Department of Physics, University of Texas at Arlington, Arlington TX; United States of America.

⁹Physics Department, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens; Greece.

¹⁰Physics Department, National Technical University of Athens, Zografou; Greece.

¹¹Department of Physics, University of Texas at Austin, Austin TX; United States of America.

¹²Institute of Physics, Azerbaijan Academy of Sciences, Baku; Azerbaijan.

¹³Institut de Física d'Altes Energies (IFAE), Barcelona Institute of Science and Technology, Barcelona; Spain.

¹⁴(^a)Institute of High Energy Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing; (^b)Physics Department, Tsinghua University, Beijing; (^c)Department of Physics, Nanjing University, Nanjing; (^d)School of Science, Shenzhen Campus of Sun Yat-sen University; (^e)University of Chinese Academy of Science (UCAS), Beijing; China.

¹⁵Institute of Physics, University of Belgrade, Belgrade; Serbia.

¹⁶Department for Physics and Technology, University of Bergen, Bergen; Norway.

¹⁷(^a)Physics Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley CA; (^b)University of California, Berkeley CA; United States of America.

¹⁸Institut für Physik, Humboldt Universität zu Berlin, Berlin; Germany.

¹⁹Albert Einstein Center for Fundamental Physics and Laboratory for High Energy Physics, University of Bern, Bern; Switzerland.

- ²⁰School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Birmingham, Birmingham; United Kingdom.
- ²¹(^a) Department of Physics, Bogazici University, Istanbul; (^b) Department of Physics Engineering, Gaziantep University, Gaziantep; (^c) Department of Physics, Istanbul University, Istanbul; Türkiye.
- ²²(^a) Facultad de Ciencias y Centro de Investigaciones, Universidad Antonio Nariño, Bogotá; (^b) Departamento de Física, Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Bogotá; Colombia.
- ²³(^a) Dipartimento di Fisica e Astronomia A. Righi, Università di Bologna, Bologna; (^b) INFN Sezione di Bologna; Italy.
- ²⁴Physikalisches Institut, Universität Bonn, Bonn; Germany.
- ²⁵Department of Physics, Boston University, Boston MA; United States of America.
- ²⁶Department of Physics, Brandeis University, Waltham MA; United States of America.
- ²⁷(^a) Transilvania University of Brasov, Brasov; (^b) Horia Hulubei National Institute of Physics and Nuclear Engineering, Bucharest; (^c) Department of Physics, Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi, Iasi; (^d) National Institute for Research and Development of Isotopic and Molecular Technologies, Physics Department, Cluj-Napoca; (^e) University Politehnica Bucharest, Bucharest; (^f) West University in Timisoara, Timisoara; (^g) Faculty of Physics, University of Bucharest, Bucharest; Romania.
- ²⁸(^a) Faculty of Mathematics, Physics and Informatics, Comenius University, Bratislava; (^b) Department of Subnuclear Physics, Institute of Experimental Physics of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, Kosice; Slovak Republic.
- ²⁹Physics Department, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton NY; United States of America.
- ³⁰Universidad de Buenos Aires, Facultad de Ciencias Exactas y Naturales, Departamento de Física, y CONICET, Instituto de Física de Buenos Aires (IFIBA), Buenos Aires; Argentina.
- ³¹California State University, CA; United States of America.
- ³²Cavendish Laboratory, University of Cambridge, Cambridge; United Kingdom.
- ³³(^a) Department of Physics, University of Cape Town, Cape Town; (^b) iThemba Labs, Western Cape; (^c) Department of Mechanical Engineering Science, University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg; (^d) National Institute of Physics, University of the Philippines Diliman (Philippines); (^e) University of South Africa, Department of Physics, Pretoria; (^f) University of Zululand, KwaDlangezwa; (^g) School of Physics, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg; South Africa.
- ³⁴Department of Physics, Carleton University, Ottawa ON; Canada.
- ³⁵(^a) Faculté des Sciences Ain Chock, Réseau Universitaire de Physique des Hautes Energies - Université Hassan II, Casablanca; (^b) Faculté des Sciences, Université Ibn-Tofail, Kénitra; (^c) Faculté des Sciences Semlalia, Université Cadi Ayyad, LPHEA-Marrakech; (^d) LPMR, Faculté des Sciences, Université Mohamed Premier, Oujda; (^e) Faculté des sciences, Université Mohammed V, Rabat; (^f) Institute of Applied Physics, Mohammed VI Polytechnic University, Ben Guerir; Morocco.
- ³⁶CERN, Geneva; Switzerland.
- ³⁷Affiliated with an institute covered by a cooperation agreement with CERN.
- ³⁸Affiliated with an international laboratory covered by a cooperation agreement with CERN.
- ³⁹Enrico Fermi Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago IL; United States of America.
- ⁴⁰LPC, Université Clermont Auvergne, CNRS/IN2P3, Clermont-Ferrand; France.
- ⁴¹Nevis Laboratory, Columbia University, Irvington NY; United States of America.
- ⁴²Niels Bohr Institute, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen; Denmark.
- ⁴³(^a) Dipartimento di Fisica, Università della Calabria, Rende; (^b) INFN Gruppo Collegato di Cosenza, Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati; Italy.
- ⁴⁴Physics Department, Southern Methodist University, Dallas TX; United States of America.
- ⁴⁵Physics Department, University of Texas at Dallas, Richardson TX; United States of America.
- ⁴⁶National Centre for Scientific Research "Demokritos", Agia Paraskevi; Greece.
- ⁴⁷(^a) Department of Physics, Stockholm University; (^b) Oskar Klein Centre, Stockholm; Sweden.

- ⁴⁸Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron DESY, Hamburg and Zeuthen; Germany.
- ⁴⁹Fakultät Physik , Technische Universität Dortmund, Dortmund; Germany.
- ⁵⁰Institut für Kern- und Teilchenphysik, Technische Universität Dresden, Dresden; Germany.
- ⁵¹Department of Physics, Duke University, Durham NC; United States of America.
- ⁵²SUPA - School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh; United Kingdom.
- ⁵³INFN e Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, Frascati; Italy.
- ⁵⁴Physikalisches Institut, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, Freiburg; Germany.
- ⁵⁵II. Physikalisches Institut, Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, Göttingen; Germany.
- ⁵⁶Département de Physique Nucléaire et Corpusculaire, Université de Genève, Genève; Switzerland.
- ⁵⁷(^a) Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Genova, Genova; (^b) INFN Sezione di Genova; Italy.
- ⁵⁸II. Physikalisches Institut, Justus-Liebig-Universität Giessen, Giessen; Germany.
- ⁵⁹SUPA - School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Glasgow, Glasgow; United Kingdom.
- ⁶⁰LPSC, Université Grenoble Alpes, CNRS/IN2P3, Grenoble INP, Grenoble; France.
- ⁶¹Laboratory for Particle Physics and Cosmology, Harvard University, Cambridge MA; United States of America.
- ⁶²(^a) Department of Modern Physics and State Key Laboratory of Particle Detection and Electronics, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei; (^b) Institute of Frontier and Interdisciplinary Science and Key Laboratory of Particle Physics and Particle Irradiation (MOE), Shandong University, Qingdao; (^c) School of Physics and Astronomy, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Key Laboratory for Particle Astrophysics and Cosmology (MOE), SKLPPC, Shanghai; (^d) Tsung-Dao Lee Institute, Shanghai; (^e) School of Physics and Microelectronics, Zhengzhou University; China.
- ⁶³(^a) Kirchoff-Institut für Physik, Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg, Heidelberg; (^b) Physikalisches Institut, Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg, Heidelberg; Germany.
- ⁶⁴(^a) Department of Physics, Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, N.T., Hong Kong; (^b) Department of Physics, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong; (^c) Department of Physics and Institute for Advanced Study, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Clear Water Bay, Kowloon, Hong Kong; China.
- ⁶⁵Department of Physics, National Tsing Hua University, Hsinchu; Taiwan.
- ⁶⁶IJCLab, Université Paris-Saclay, CNRS/IN2P3, 91405, Orsay; France.
- ⁶⁷Centro Nacional de Microelectrónica (IMB-CNM-CSIC), Barcelona; Spain.
- ⁶⁸Department of Physics, Indiana University, Bloomington IN; United States of America.
- ⁶⁹(^a) INFN Gruppo Collegato di Udine, Sezione di Trieste, Udine; (^b) ICTP, Trieste; (^c) Dipartimento Politecnico di Ingegneria e Architettura, Università di Udine, Udine; Italy.
- ⁷⁰(^a) INFN Sezione di Lecce; (^b) Dipartimento di Matematica e Fisica, Università del Salento, Lecce; Italy.
- ⁷¹(^a) INFN Sezione di Milano; (^b) Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Milano, Milano; Italy.
- ⁷²(^a) INFN Sezione di Napoli; (^b) Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Napoli, Napoli; Italy.
- ⁷³(^a) INFN Sezione di Pavia; (^b) Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Pavia, Pavia; Italy.
- ⁷⁴(^a) INFN Sezione di Pisa; (^b) Dipartimento di Fisica E. Fermi, Università di Pisa, Pisa; Italy.
- ⁷⁵(^a) INFN Sezione di Roma; (^b) Dipartimento di Fisica, Sapienza Università di Roma, Roma; Italy.
- ⁷⁶(^a) INFN Sezione di Roma Tor Vergata; (^b) Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Roma Tor Vergata, Roma; Italy.
- ⁷⁷(^a) INFN Sezione di Roma Tre; (^b) Dipartimento di Matematica e Fisica, Università Roma Tre, Roma; Italy.
- ⁷⁸(^a) INFN-TIFPA; (^b) Università degli Studi di Trento, Trento; Italy.
- ⁷⁹Universität Innsbruck, Department of Astro and Particle Physics, Innsbruck; Austria.
- ⁸⁰University of Iowa, Iowa City IA; United States of America.
- ⁸¹Department of Physics and Astronomy, Iowa State University, Ames IA; United States of America.
- ⁸²Istinye University, Sariyer, Istanbul; Türkiye.

- ⁸³(^a) Departamento de Engenharia Elétrica, Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora (UFJF), Juiz de Fora; (^b) Universidade Federal do Rio De Janeiro COPPE/EE/IF, Rio de Janeiro; (^c) Instituto de Física, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo; (^d) Rio de Janeiro State University, Rio de Janeiro; Brazil.
- ⁸⁴KEK, High Energy Accelerator Research Organization, Tsukuba; Japan.
- ⁸⁵Graduate School of Science, Kobe University, Kobe; Japan.
- ⁸⁶(^a) AGH University of Krakow, Faculty of Physics and Applied Computer Science, Krakow; (^b) Marian Smoluchowski Institute of Physics, Jagiellonian University, Krakow; Poland.
- ⁸⁷Institute of Nuclear Physics Polish Academy of Sciences, Krakow; Poland.
- ⁸⁸Faculty of Science, Kyoto University, Kyoto; Japan.
- ⁸⁹Research Center for Advanced Particle Physics and Department of Physics, Kyushu University, Fukuoka ; Japan.
- ⁹⁰Instituto de Física La Plata, Universidad Nacional de La Plata and CONICET, La Plata; Argentina.
- ⁹¹Physics Department, Lancaster University, Lancaster; United Kingdom.
- ⁹²Oliver Lodge Laboratory, University of Liverpool, Liverpool; United Kingdom.
- ⁹³Department of Experimental Particle Physics, Jožef Stefan Institute and Department of Physics, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana; Slovenia.
- ⁹⁴School of Physics and Astronomy, Queen Mary University of London, London; United Kingdom.
- ⁹⁵Department of Physics, Royal Holloway University of London, Egham; United Kingdom.
- ⁹⁶Department of Physics and Astronomy, University College London, London; United Kingdom.
- ⁹⁷Louisiana Tech University, Ruston LA; United States of America.
- ⁹⁸Fysiska institutionen, Lunds universitet, Lund; Sweden.
- ⁹⁹Departamento de Física Teórica C-15 and CIAFF, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid; Spain.
- ¹⁰⁰Institut für Physik, Universität Mainz, Mainz; Germany.
- ¹⁰¹School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Manchester, Manchester; United Kingdom.
- ¹⁰²CPPM, Aix-Marseille Université, CNRS/IN2P3, Marseille; France.
- ¹⁰³Department of Physics, University of Massachusetts, Amherst MA; United States of America.
- ¹⁰⁴Department of Physics, McGill University, Montreal QC; Canada.
- ¹⁰⁵School of Physics, University of Melbourne, Victoria; Australia.
- ¹⁰⁶Department of Physics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor MI; United States of America.
- ¹⁰⁷Department of Physics and Astronomy, Michigan State University, East Lansing MI; United States of America.
- ¹⁰⁸Group of Particle Physics, University of Montreal, Montreal QC; Canada.
- ¹⁰⁹Fakultät für Physik, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, München; Germany.
- ¹¹⁰Max-Planck-Institut für Physik (Werner-Heisenberg-Institut), München; Germany.
- ¹¹¹Graduate School of Science and Kobayashi-Maskawa Institute, Nagoya University, Nagoya; Japan.
- ¹¹²Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque NM; United States of America.
- ¹¹³Institute for Mathematics, Astrophysics and Particle Physics, Radboud University/Nikhef, Nijmegen; Netherlands.
- ¹¹⁴Nikhef National Institute for Subatomic Physics and University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam; Netherlands.
- ¹¹⁵Department of Physics, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb IL; United States of America.
- ¹¹⁶(^a) New York University Abu Dhabi, Abu Dhabi; (^b) United Arab Emirates University, Al Ain; United Arab Emirates.
- ¹¹⁷Department of Physics, New York University, New York NY; United States of America.
- ¹¹⁸Ochanomizu University, Otsuka, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo; Japan.
- ¹¹⁹Ohio State University, Columbus OH; United States of America.

- ¹²⁰Homer L. Dodge Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Oklahoma, Norman OK; United States of America.
- ¹²¹Department of Physics, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater OK; United States of America.
- ¹²²Palacký University, Joint Laboratory of Optics, Olomouc; Czech Republic.
- ¹²³Institute for Fundamental Science, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR; United States of America.
- ¹²⁴Graduate School of Science, Osaka University, Osaka; Japan.
- ¹²⁵Department of Physics, University of Oslo, Oslo; Norway.
- ¹²⁶Department of Physics, Oxford University, Oxford; United Kingdom.
- ¹²⁷LPNHE, Sorbonne Université, Université Paris Cité, CNRS/IN2P3, Paris; France.
- ¹²⁸Department of Physics, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia PA; United States of America.
- ¹²⁹Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh PA; United States of America.
- ¹³⁰(^a)Laboratório de Instrumentação e Física Experimental de Partículas - LIP, Lisboa; (^b)Departamento de Física, Faculdade de Ciências, Universidade de Lisboa, Lisboa; (^c)Departamento de Física, Universidade de Coimbra, Coimbra; (^d)Centro de Física Nuclear da Universidade de Lisboa, Lisboa; (^e)Departamento de Física, Universidade do Minho, Braga; (^f)Departamento de Física Teórica y del Cosmos, Universidad de Granada, Granada (Spain); (^g)Departamento de Física, Instituto Superior Técnico, Universidade de Lisboa, Lisboa; Portugal.
- ¹³¹Institute of Physics of the Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague; Czech Republic.
- ¹³²Czech Technical University in Prague, Prague; Czech Republic.
- ¹³³Charles University, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Prague; Czech Republic.
- ¹³⁴Particle Physics Department, Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot; United Kingdom.
- ¹³⁵IRFU, CEA, Université Paris-Saclay, Gif-sur-Yvette; France.
- ¹³⁶Santa Cruz Institute for Particle Physics, University of California Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz CA; United States of America.
- ¹³⁷(^a)Departamento de Física, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago; (^b)Millennium Institute for Subatomic physics at high energy frontier (SAPHIR), Santiago; (^c)Instituto de Investigación Multidisciplinario en Ciencia y Tecnología, y Departamento de Física, Universidad de La Serena; (^d)Universidad Andres Bello, Department of Physics, Santiago; (^e)Instituto de Alta Investigación, Universidad de Tarapacá, Arica; (^f)Departamento de Física, Universidad Técnica Federico Santa María, Valparaíso; Chile.
- ¹³⁸Department of Physics, University of Washington, Seattle WA; United States of America.
- ¹³⁹Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Sheffield, Sheffield; United Kingdom.
- ¹⁴⁰Department of Physics, Shinshu University, Nagano; Japan.
- ¹⁴¹Department Physik, Universität Siegen, Siegen; Germany.
- ¹⁴²Department of Physics, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby BC; Canada.
- ¹⁴³SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory, Stanford CA; United States of America.
- ¹⁴⁴Department of Physics, Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm; Sweden.
- ¹⁴⁵Departments of Physics and Astronomy, Stony Brook University, Stony Brook NY; United States of America.
- ¹⁴⁶Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Sussex, Brighton; United Kingdom.
- ¹⁴⁷School of Physics, University of Sydney, Sydney; Australia.
- ¹⁴⁸Institute of Physics, Academia Sinica, Taipei; Taiwan.
- ¹⁴⁹(^a)E. Andronikashvili Institute of Physics, Iv. Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi; (^b)High Energy Physics Institute, Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi; (^c)University of Georgia, Tbilisi; Georgia.
- ¹⁵⁰Department of Physics, Technion, Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa; Israel.
- ¹⁵¹Raymond and Beverly Sackler School of Physics and Astronomy, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv; Israel.

- ¹⁵²Department of Physics, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki; Greece.
- ¹⁵³International Center for Elementary Particle Physics and Department of Physics, University of Tokyo, Tokyo; Japan.
- ¹⁵⁴Department of Physics, Tokyo Institute of Technology, Tokyo; Japan.
- ¹⁵⁵Department of Physics, University of Toronto, Toronto ON; Canada.
- ¹⁵⁶(^a) TRIUMF, Vancouver BC; (^b) Department of Physics and Astronomy, York University, Toronto ON; Canada.
- ¹⁵⁷Division of Physics and Tomonaga Center for the History of the Universe, Faculty of Pure and Applied Sciences, University of Tsukuba, Tsukuba; Japan.
- ¹⁵⁸Department of Physics and Astronomy, Tufts University, Medford MA; United States of America.
- ¹⁵⁹Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of California Irvine, Irvine CA; United States of America.
- ¹⁶⁰University of Sharjah, Sharjah; United Arab Emirates.
- ¹⁶¹Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Uppsala, Uppsala; Sweden.
- ¹⁶²Department of Physics, University of Illinois, Urbana IL; United States of America.
- ¹⁶³Instituto de Física Corpuscular (IFIC), Centro Mixto Universidad de Valencia - CSIC, Valencia; Spain.
- ¹⁶⁴Department of Physics, University of British Columbia, Vancouver BC; Canada.
- ¹⁶⁵Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Victoria, Victoria BC; Canada.
- ¹⁶⁶Fakultät für Physik und Astronomie, Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg, Würzburg; Germany.
- ¹⁶⁷Department of Physics, University of Warwick, Coventry; United Kingdom.
- ¹⁶⁸Waseda University, Tokyo; Japan.
- ¹⁶⁹Department of Particle Physics and Astrophysics, Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot; Israel.
- ¹⁷⁰Department of Physics, University of Wisconsin, Madison WI; United States of America.
- ¹⁷¹Fakultät für Mathematik und Naturwissenschaften, Fachgruppe Physik, Bergische Universität Wuppertal, Wuppertal; Germany.
- ¹⁷²Department of Physics, Yale University, New Haven CT; United States of America.
- ^a Also Affiliated with an institute covered by a cooperation agreement with CERN.
- ^b Also at An-Najah National University, Nablus; Palestine.
- ^c Also at Borough of Manhattan Community College, City University of New York, New York NY; United States of America.
- ^d Also at Center for High Energy Physics, Peking University; China.
- ^e Also at Center for Interdisciplinary Research and Innovation (CIRI-AUTH), Thessaloniki; Greece.
- ^f Also at Centro Studi e Ricerche Enrico Fermi; Italy.
- ^g Also at CERN, Geneva; Switzerland.
- ^h Also at Département de Physique Nucléaire et Corpusculaire, Université de Genève, Genève; Switzerland.
- ⁱ Also at Departament de Física de la Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Barcelona; Spain.
- ^j Also at Department of Financial and Management Engineering, University of the Aegean, Chios; Greece.
- ^k Also at Department of Physics, Ben Gurion University of the Negev, Beer Sheva; Israel.
- ^l Also at Department of Physics, California State University, Sacramento; United States of America.
- ^m Also at Department of Physics, King's College London, London; United Kingdom.
- ⁿ Also at Department of Physics, Stanford University, Stanford CA; United States of America.
- ^o Also at Department of Physics, Stellenbosch University; South Africa.
- ^p Also at Department of Physics, University of Fribourg, Fribourg; Switzerland.
- ^q Also at Department of Physics, University of Thessaly; Greece.
- ^r Also at Department of Physics, Westmont College, Santa Barbara; United States of America.
- ^s Also at Hellenic Open University, Patras; Greece.

- ^t Also at Institutio Catalana de Recerca i Estudis Avancats, ICREA, Barcelona; Spain.
- ^u Also at Institut für Experimentalphysik, Universität Hamburg, Hamburg; Germany.
- ^v Also at Institute for Nuclear Research and Nuclear Energy (INRNE) of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia; Bulgaria.
- ^w Also at Institute of Applied Physics, Mohammed VI Polytechnic University, Ben Guerir; Morocco.
- ^x Also at Institute of Particle Physics (IPP); Canada.
- ^y Also at Institute of Physics and Technology, Mongolian Academy of Sciences, Ulaanbaatar; Mongolia.
- ^z Also at Institute of Physics, Azerbaijan Academy of Sciences, Baku; Azerbaijan.
- ^{aa} Also at Institute of Theoretical Physics, Ilia State University, Tbilisi; Georgia.
- ^{ab} Also at L2IT, Université de Toulouse, CNRS/IN2P3, UPS, Toulouse; France.
- ^{ac} Also at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore; United States of America.
- ^{ad} Also at National Institute of Physics, University of the Philippines Diliman (Philippines); Philippines.
- ^{ae} Also at Technical University of Munich, Munich; Germany.
- ^{af} Also at The Collaborative Innovation Center of Quantum Matter (CICQM), Beijing; China.
- ^{ag} Also at TRIUMF, Vancouver BC; Canada.
- ^{ah} Also at Università di Napoli Parthenope, Napoli; Italy.
- ^{ai} Also at University of Colorado Boulder, Department of Physics, Colorado; United States of America.
- ^{aj} Also at Washington College, Chestertown, MD; United States of America.
- ^{ak} Also at Yeditepe University, Physics Department, Istanbul; Türkiye.
- * Deceased