

First observation of forward $Z \rightarrow bb^{-}$ production in pp collisions at $s=8$ TeV

Aaij, R.; Adeva, B.; Adinolfi, M.; Ajaltouni, Z.; Akar, S.; Albrecht, J.; Alessio, F.; Alexander, M.; Alfonso Albero, A.; Ali, S.; Alkhazov, G.; Alvarez Cartelle, P.; Alves, A. A.; Amato, S.; Amerio, S.; Amhis, Y.; An, L.; Anderlini, L.; Andreassi, G.; Andreotti, M.

DOI:

[10.1016/j.physletb.2017.11.066](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2017.11.066)

License:

Creative Commons: Attribution (CC BY)

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Aaij, R, Adeva, B, Adinolfi, M, Ajaltouni, Z, Akar, S, Albrecht, J, Alessio, F, Alexander, M, Alfonso Albero, A, Ali, S, Alkhazov, G, Alvarez Cartelle, P, Alves, AA, Amato, S, Amerio, S, Amhis, Y, An, L, Anderlini, L, Andreassi, G, Andreotti, M, Andrews, JE, Appleby, RB, Archilli, F, d'Argent, P, Arnau Romeu, J, Artamonov, A, Artuso, M, Aslanides, E, Auriemma, G, Baalouch, M, Babuschkin, I, Bachmann, S, Back, JJ, Badalov, A, Baesso, C, Baker, S, Balagura, V, Baldini, W, Baranov, A, Bifani, S, Calladine, R, Chatzikonstantinidis, G, Farley, N, Lazzeroni, C, Mazurov, A, Sergi, A, Watson, NK, Williams, MP, Williams, T, Zarebski, KA & LHCb Collaboration 2018, 'First observation of forward $Z \rightarrow bb^{-}$ production in pp collisions at $s=8$ TeV', *Physics Letters, Section B: Nuclear, Elementary Particle and High-Energy Physics*, vol. 776, pp. 430-439.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2017.11.066>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

Publisher Rights Statement:

Published in *Physics Letters B* on 05/12/2017

DOI: 10.1016/j.physletb.2017.11.066

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.



First observation of forward $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ production in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV

LHCb Collaboration



ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 12 September 2017

Received in revised form 15 November 2017

Accepted 28 November 2017

Available online 5 December 2017

Editor: L. Rolandi

ABSTRACT

The decay $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ is reconstructed in pp collision data, corresponding to 2 fb^{-1} of integrated luminosity, collected by the LHCb experiment at a centre-of-mass energy of $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV. The product of the Z production cross-section and the $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ branching fraction is measured for candidates in the fiducial region defined by two particle-level b -quark jets with pseudorapidities in the range $2.2 < \eta < 4.2$, with transverse momenta $p_T > 20$ GeV and dijet invariant mass in the range $45 < m_{jj} < 165$ GeV. From a signal yield of 5462 ± 763 $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ events, where the uncertainty is statistical, a production cross-section times branching fraction of $332 \pm 46 \pm 59$ pb is obtained, where the first uncertainty is statistical and the second systematic. The measured significance of the signal yield is 6.0 standard deviations. This measurement represents the first observation of the $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ production in the forward region of pp collisions.

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

1. Introduction

Measurements of Z -boson production in pp collisions constitute an important test of the Standard Model (SM), since they allow the electroweak sector to be precisely probed [1–3]. The LHCb experiment can be used to measure the decay of the Z boson into a $b\bar{b}$ quark pair in the forward region that is inaccessible at other LHC experiments.

The decay $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ provides a standard candle for searches in final states with a $b\bar{b}$ quark pair. The inclusive search for the SM Higgs decay to two b quarks at the LHC is of great interest, since the measurement of the Higgs boson coupling to b quarks is an important test of the SM [4]. Several extensions of the SM predict that new heavy particles that decay to two energetic b quarks could be accessible at LHC collision energies [5–7]. A sizeable $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ event sample will enable the measurement of the $b\bar{b}$ forward-central asymmetry at the Z pole, which could be enhanced by the contributions from new physics processes [8]. The forward-central asymmetry in inclusive $b\bar{b}$ events has previously been measured by the LHCb collaboration [9].

The measurements of this decay can also be used to demonstrate that no biases are induced by the b -jet reconstruction procedure and that the reconstruction efficiencies are evaluated correctly. In addition, the $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ decay is important to determine the so-called b -jet energy scale. This is the factor that has to be applied to the reconstructed b -jet energy in simulated events in order to reproduce the actual detector response.

The reconstruction of the $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ decay is challenging at hadron colliders, due to the large QCD background. Many techniques to reconstruct the $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ decay channel have been developed by the CDF [10], ATLAS [11] and CMS [12] collaborations. The CDF collaboration reconstructed the $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ decay in $p\bar{p}$ collisions at 1.96 TeV and determined the b -jet energy scale, obtaining a relative uncertainty on the product of the cross-section and the branching fraction of 29%. The analysis of the ATLAS collaboration reconstructed boosted $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ candidates in the central region of pp collisions at 8 TeV, with pseudorapidity $|\eta| < 2.5$, and determined the cross-section with a relative uncertainty of 16%. The CMS collaboration made the first observation of the $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ decay in a single-jet topology in the same pseudorapidity region, with a significance of 5.1 standard deviations.

This Letter describes a new method to study the $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ decay, performed on pp collision data collected at a centre-of-mass energy of $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV, corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 2 fb^{-1} . The low trigger thresholds on the particle energies that are employed at LHCb and the excellent b -jet identification performance make it possible to select candidates within a large invariant mass range, including those with masses below the Z -boson pole. Events are selected requiring two b -jet candidates, referred to as a b dijet, and an additional jet that balances the transverse momentum of the $b\bar{b}$ system. The invariant mass distribution of the b dijet is used to determine the $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ yield and the b -jet energy scale. The invariant mass distribution of the QCD background is determined using a control region that is defined through observables related to the b -dijet system and to the associated balancing

jet. Simulated data are used to evaluate the reconstruction efficiency and the detector acceptance, enabling a measurement of the Z production cross-section multiplied by the $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ branching fraction.

2. The LHCb detector, trigger and simulation

The LHCb detector [13,14] is a single-arm forward spectrometer fully instrumented in the pseudorapidity range $2 < \eta < 5$, which is designed for the study of b and c hadrons. The detector includes a high-precision tracking system consisting of a silicon-strip vertex detector surrounding the pp interaction region, a silicon-strip detector located upstream of a dipole magnet with a bending power of about 4 Tm, and three stations of silicon-strip detectors and straw drift tubes placed downstream of the magnet. The tracking system provides a measurement of momentum, p , of charged particles with a relative uncertainty that varies from 0.5% at low momentum to 1.0% at 200 GeV.¹ The minimum distance of a track to a primary vertex, the impact parameter, is measured with a resolution of $(15 + 29/p_T) \mu\text{m}$, where p_T is the component of the momentum transverse to the beam, in GeV. Different types of charged hadrons are distinguished using information from two ring-imaging Cherenkov detectors. Photons, electrons and hadrons are identified by a calorimeter system consisting of scintillating-pad (SPD) and preshower detectors, an electromagnetic calorimeter and a hadronic calorimeter. Muons are identified by a system composed of alternating layers of iron and multiwire proportional chambers. The online event selection is performed by a trigger system, which consists of a hardware stage, based on information from the calorimeter and muon systems, followed by a software stage, which applies a full event reconstruction.

Events are required to satisfy at least one of the following hardware trigger requirements: contain a muon with $p_T > 1.86$ GeV, a hadron with transverse energy in the calorimeters $E_T > 3.7$ GeV, an electron with $E_T > 3$ GeV, a photon with $E_T > 3$ GeV or a pair of muons with $p_{T_1} \cdot p_{T_2} > 1.6$ GeV². A global event cut (GEC) on the number of hits in the SPD is applied in order to prevent high-multiplicity events from dominating the processing time. At the software trigger stage events are required to have a two-, three- or four-track secondary vertex (SV) with significant displacement from any primary vertex. A multivariate algorithm [15] is used for the identification of secondary vertices consistent with the decay of a b hadron, strongly suppressing the contamination from charmed hadrons.

Simulated events generated with PYTHIA [16], with a specific LHCb configuration [17], are used to model the properties of the signal $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ events and backgrounds such as $Z \rightarrow c\bar{c}$, $W \rightarrow qq'$ decays and $t\bar{t}$ events. Decays of hadronic particles are described by EVTGEN [18], where the final-state radiation is generated using PHOTOS [19]. The interaction of the generated particles with the detector, and its response, are implemented using the GEANT4 toolkit [20] as described in Ref. [21].

3. Candidate selection

Candidates are selected by requiring the presence of at least three jets, which are reconstructed as detailed in Refs. [22–25]. Jets are reconstructed using a particle flow algorithm [25] and are clustered with the anti- k_T algorithm [26] with a distance parameter 0.5, as implemented in the FASTJET software package [27]. A jet energy correction [25] determined from simulation is applied to recover the jet energy at particle level and jet quality requirements

are applied [25]. Jets are heavy-flavour tagged, *i.e.* as containing a b or c hadron, if a SV is found with a distance $\Delta R < 0.5$ from the jet axis, where ΔR is the distance in the (η, ϕ) plane and ϕ is the azimuthal angle between the jet axis and the vector that points from the pp interaction point to the SV. The details of the flavour-tagging algorithm are described in Ref. [28]. Two heavy-flavour tagged jets are required to form a $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ candidate. At least one of the two b -jet candidates must be tagged by a SV selected by the software trigger requirements. The two heavy-flavour jets are each required to have transverse momenta $p_T > 20$ GeV, pseudorapidities in the range $2.2 < \eta < 4.2$, and a combined invariant mass (m_{jj}) in the range $45 < m_{jj} < 165$ GeV. The fiducial region of the measurement within which the cross-section is determined is defined by the kinematical requirements described above applied to particle-level jets, which are jets reconstructed in the simulation from stable particles (*i.e.* particles with lifetime in excess of 10 ps, excluding neutrinos) using the default reconstruction algorithm.

In order to increase the signal-to-background ratio, the absolute azimuthal angle between the two b -jets is required to be greater than 2.5 radians. The presence of a balancing jet is required to help discriminate $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ events from the QCD multijet background. The Z + jet signal is predominantly produced via quark–gluon scattering, while the QCD multijet background is produced via gluon–gluon interactions [29]. The balancing jet is defined as that which minimises the total p_T of the Z boson and the jet. This jet is required to have $p_T > 10$ GeV and $2.2 < \eta < 4.2$. Given the SM cross-sections [30] and the selection efficiencies, which are evaluated using simulation, about 17×10^3 $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ candidates, 600 $Z \rightarrow c\bar{c}$ candidates, 200 $W \rightarrow qq'$ candidates and 50 $t\bar{t}$ candidates are expected after the application of the selection criteria. A sample of around 6×10^5 candidates is selected in data, dominated by the combinatorial background from the multijet QCD events.

A multivariate classifier is trained to discriminate $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ events from combinatorial QCD events. A uniform Gradient Boost Boosted Decision Tree technique [31] is adopted, in order to ensure a selection efficiency with a low dependence on the dijet invariant mass. The classifier is trained using four kinematical variables of the three-jet system, chosen for both their low correlation with the dijet invariant mass and for their discriminating power. The variables are the absolute pseudorapidity difference between the two heavy-flavour jets, the p_T of the balancing jet, the angle between the balancing-jet momentum and the Z -boson candidate momentum in the azimuthal plane with respect to the beam axis, and the polar angle between the balancing-jet momentum and the Z -boson flight direction in the Z -boson rest frame. The classifier is trained using 5% of the data sample to represent the combinatorial QCD background. This training sample has a negligible $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$, $Z \rightarrow c\bar{c}$, $W \rightarrow qq'$ and $t\bar{t}$ contamination and it is not used in the dijet invariant mass fit described below. The signal process is modelled using simulated $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ events. The distributions of the input observables related to the balancing-jet kinematics are validated by comparing the high purity $Z(\rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-) + \text{jet}$ data sample described in Ref. [24] with the corresponding simulation sample.

The output of the classifier (uGB) is shown in Fig. 1. Candidates are selected in two different regions of uGB: the signal region ($\text{uGB} > x_s$), which has enhanced $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ contribution, and a control region ($\text{uGB} < x_c$), which has a larger contribution from QCD combinatorial events. The two regions are fitted simultaneously to determine the $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ yield, and the values of x_s and x_c are chosen in order to achieve the best signal significance.

¹ In this Letter natural units where $\hbar = c = 1$ are used.




Fig. 1. Distribution of the multivariate classifier output for data and for simulated $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ decays, normalised to unity. The signal region is defined by $\text{uGB} > x_s$ and the control region by events with $\text{uGB} < x_c$.

4. Signal yield determination

A simultaneous fit to the b -dijet invariant mass distributions in the signal and control regions is performed to determine the $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ yield and the jet energy scale factor, k_{JES} . A triple-Gaussian model is used to describe the $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ dijet invariant mass distribution. The parameters of this model are obtained separately for the candidates in the signal and control regions using simulation, and are fixed in the fit to the data. The k_{JES} factor is also introduced in the $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ invariant mass distribution model in order to account for differences between simulation and data in the jet four-momentum. This is achieved by substituting m_{jj} with m_{jj}/k_{JES} in the model. The reconstructed invariant mass of dijets in $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ simulated events has a mean of 80 GeV, i.e. below the known Z -boson mass [30], and a resolution of 16%. The reduced mean is due to parton radiation outside the jet cone, missing energy, and residual biases in the reconstructed jet energy that are not recovered by the jet energy correction.

The invariant mass distribution of the combinatorial background is parametrized with a Pearson IV distribution, as is typical to describe the multijet combinatorial background [10]. The four parameters of the Pearson IV function are free to vary in the fit and they have approximately the same values in the signal and control regions, since the uGB is trained to be as uniform as possible with respect to the dijet invariant mass. To take into account the residual correlation with the dijet invariant mass, the Pearson IV distribution is multiplied in the signal (control) region by a linear transfer function $t^{s(c)}(m_{jj})$, defined as

$$t^{s(c)}(m_{jj}) = a^{s(c)} + b^{s(c)} \cdot m_{jj},$$

where the superscript s (c) indicates the signal (control) region, and $a^{s(c)}$ and $b^{s(c)}$ are parameters fixed in the invariant mass fit. The parameters $a^{s(c)}$ and $b^{s(c)}$ are determined by fitting the transfer function to the selection efficiency after the requirement that $\text{uGB} > x_s$ ($\text{uGB} < x_c$) as a function of the dijet invariant mass in the $45 < m_{jj} < 60$ GeV and $100 < m_{jj} < 165$ GeV intervals, where the $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ contribution is negligible. As a cross-check, data events with $\text{uGB} < x_c$ are fitted with only the QCD background model, ignoring the small $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ contribution, and a good fit quality is obtained.

The invariant mass model used to fit the signal region is

$$f^s(m_{jj}) = N_Q^s Q(m_{jj}) \cdot t^s(m_{jj}) + N_Z^s Z^s(m_{jj}; k_{\text{JES}}),$$

where N_Q^s and N_Z^s are the number of QCD events and the number of Z -boson events ($Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ plus $Z \rightarrow c\bar{c}$) in the signal region

respectively, and $Q(m_{jj})$, $t^s(m_{jj})$ and $Z^s(m_{jj})$ are the Pearson IV distribution, the transfer function and the Z -boson invariant mass distribution model in the signal region, respectively. The $Z \rightarrow c\bar{c}$ invariant mass distribution is assumed to be identical to that of $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ events. This assumption is verified using the simulation and the two components are therefore fitted together. Backgrounds other than $Z \rightarrow c\bar{c}$ and QCD multijet events are neglected in the fit. Since the $\text{uGB} > x_s$ requirement is applied, the expected value of N_Z^s is lower than the 17×10^3 $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ events expected before the uGB selection.

The invariant mass model that describes the control region is

$$f^c(m_{jj}) = N_Q^c Q(m_{jj}) \cdot t^c(m_{jj}) + R \cdot N_Z^s Z^c(m_{jj}; k_{\text{JES}}),$$

where N_Q^c is the number of QCD events in the control region and $Q(m_{jj})$, $t^c(m_{jj})$ and $Z^c(m_{jj})$ are the Pearson IV distribution, the transfer function and the Z -boson invariant mass distribution model in the control region. The parameter R is the ratio of the efficiency for Z -boson candidates selected with $\text{uGB} < x_c$ and $\text{uGB} > x_s$ and is determined from simulation and fixed in the fit. A simultaneous unbinned maximum likelihood fit is performed with the N_Q^s , N_Q^c , N_Z^s , k_{JES} and the Pearson IV parameters free to vary. Pseudoexperiments are used to verify that the fit is stable and estimate any bias. The parameter N_Z^s is determined with a bias of about 2% and the value returned by the fit is corrected accordingly in the cross-section determination.

The fit result is shown in Fig. 2 and the background-subtracted data and result of the fit are shown in Fig. 3. The Z -boson yield in the signal region is 5462 ± 763 and the jet energy scale factor is measured to be 1.009 ± 0.015 . Using Wilks' theorem [32], the $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ statistical significance is found to be 7.3 standard deviations.

As an additional cross-check to validate the technique, a fit to the dijet invariant mass distribution for candidates with $x_c < \text{uGB} < x_s$ is performed, with a model analogous to that used in the signal and control regions. In this case, the parameters of the QCD background are fixed to the values returned by the default fit, but the $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ yield in this region, N_Z^v , is left free. The goodness of this fit is acceptable and the ratio N_Z^v/N_Z^s is compatible with the expectation from simulation.

5. Cross-section determination and systematic uncertainties

The product of the Z -boson production cross-section and the $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ branching fraction is determined using

$$\sigma(pp \rightarrow Z)\mathcal{B}(Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}) = \frac{N_Z^s}{\mathcal{L} \cdot (1 - f_{\text{uGB}}) \cdot \epsilon_Z^s \cdot (1 + f_{Z \rightarrow c\bar{c}})}$$

where \mathcal{L} is the integrated luminosity, ϵ_Z^s is the efficiency of the selection requirements, including $\text{uGB} > x_s$, for events in the fiducial region, f_{uGB} is the fraction (5%) of data events removed for the multivariate classifier training and $1 + f_{Z \rightarrow c\bar{c}}$ is a factor applied to correct for the small $Z \rightarrow c\bar{c}$ contamination. The selection efficiency is obtained from simulation, but correction factors are applied to account for differences in the heavy-flavour tagging efficiencies between data and simulation [28]. By using a small sample with a looser trigger requirement and a technique similar to that described in Ref. [24], the GEC efficiency is also corrected for differences in data and simulation. The balancing-jet selection efficiency is corrected at Next-to-Leading-Order (NLO) using simulated $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ events produced with aMC@NLO [33] plus PYTHIA for parton showers. The $f_{Z \rightarrow c\bar{c}}$ fraction is obtained by multiplying the $Z \rightarrow c\bar{c}$ and $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ branching fraction ratio [30] by the acceptance and the efficiency ratios, both determined using simulation.

The sources of systematic uncertainty considered for the measurement are given in Table 1. Systematic effects that are asso-




Fig. 2. Simultaneous fit to the dijet invariant mass distribution of $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ candidates in the (left) signal and (right) control regions.




Fig. 3. Background-subtracted distribution compared with the $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ mass model in the (left) signal and (right) control regions. The one standard deviation total uncertainty band in the background-only hypothesis is also shown. This band includes statistical and systematic uncertainties.

Table 1

Systematic uncertainties on the cross-section, $\sigma_Z = \sigma(pp \rightarrow Z)\mathcal{B}(Z \rightarrow b\bar{b})$, and jet energy scale in percent. The total uncertainty is the sum in quadrature of all the contributions.

Systematic source	σ_Z [%]	k_{JES} [%]
Heavy-flavour tagging efficiency	16.6	0.5
Hardware trigger efficiency	1.9	-
GEC efficiency	1.7	-
Jet energy correction	2.7	0.3
Jet energy resolution	1.0	0.2
Jet identification efficiency	2.0	< 0.1
Balancing-jet selection efficiency	1.8	-
Signal model	2.0	0.3
QCD model	1.1	< 0.1
Transfer functions	1.5	0.8
R efficiencies ratio	0.3	< 0.1
Fit bias	2.1	-
Subdominant backgrounds ($t\bar{t}$, $W \rightarrow qq'$)	1.9	< 0.1
Final-state radiation	0.9	-
$f_{Z \rightarrow c\bar{c}}$ fraction	0.1	-
Luminosity	1.2	-
Total	17.7	1.1

ciated with differences between data and simulation can affect the signal invariant mass distribution model and the selection efficiency. The impact of these differences is evaluated by repeating the fit with a modified signal model and by recalculating the cross-

section varying ϵ_Z^S . Other sources of systematic uncertainties are related to the signal extraction procedure.

The method described in Ref. [28] is used to assess the systematic uncertainty due to the heavy-flavour tagging efficiency which amounts to 5%–10% per jet, depending on the p_T range. This uncertainty is dominated by the size of the calibration samples used in the heavy-flavour tagging efficiency measurement. Since one of the two b -jet candidates must be tagged by a SV selected by the software trigger, the uncertainty on this trigger efficiency is included in this contribution. The systematic uncertainty associated with the hardware trigger efficiency is determined by measuring the efficiency with a tag-and-probe technique, using the high purity $Z(\rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-) + \text{jet}$ data sample [24]. In order to avoid trigger bias on the jet selection, the tag is the muon that triggered the event and the probe is the associated jet. The hardware trigger efficiency measured on probe jets is compared between data and simulation and the maximum difference in intervals of the jet p_T is taken as an uncertainty. The latter does not take into account the systematic uncertainty on the GEC efficiency, which is determined separately by studying its dependence on the b -dijet invariant mass and assigning the largest variation as the uncertainty. The systematic uncertainty on the jet energy correction includes biases due to jet flavour dependence, reconstruction of tracks which are not associated to a real particle, the track momentum resolution and residual differences between simulation and data, as described in Refs. [24, 25]. The jet energy resolution is modelled in simulation with an uncertainty measured in Refs. [23, 25]. The uncertainties related to the jet reconstruction and identification are taken from Ref. [25]. The systematic uncertainty associated with the balancing-jet se-

lection efficiency is evaluated by measuring this efficiency in the $Z(\rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-) + \text{jet}$ data and simulation samples and taking the difference as a systematic uncertainty.

The uncertainty on the model of the signal invariant mass distribution is determined by repeating the fit with an alternative distribution, consisting of the sum of two modified Gaussians. The uncertainty on the QCD model is determined by considering an alternative parametrization, consisting of an exponential decay model multiplied by a function that describes the effect of the jet p_T requirements on the invariant mass distribution. It has been verified, by generating pseudoexperiments with this alternative model and by fitting them with the default model, that the choice of the QCD distribution model introduces a small bias in the measurement. This bias is taken as the systematic uncertainty. The systematic uncertainty associated with the transfer functions is evaluated by repeating the fit using second-order polynomial functions instead of linear functions. In these fits the coefficients of the quadratic terms are varied in a range consistent with the data in the invariant mass sidebands used in the determination of the transfer functions. The maximum variation with respect to the default measurement is taken as the uncertainty. The efficiency ratio R is determined using both $Z(\rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-) + \text{jet}$ data and simulation, and the observed difference is taken as a systematic uncertainty. The uncertainty associated with a possible bias introduced by the fit procedure is determined using pseudoexperiments.

The fit is repeated introducing contributions from the subdominant backgrounds, $t\bar{t}$ and $W \rightarrow qq'$, fixed to their SM expectations [30] and modelled with the simulation. The difference in the results is assigned as a systematic uncertainty. The final-state radiation systematic uncertainty is determined as described in Ref. [16]. The systematic uncertainty due to the $Z \rightarrow c\bar{c}$ contribution is dominated by the knowledge of the $Z \rightarrow c\bar{c}$ branching fraction [30] used in the evaluation of the $f_{Z \rightarrow c\bar{c}}$ parameter. The systematic uncertainty on the luminosity is determined as in Ref. [34].

The different sources of systematic uncertainties are considered to be uncorrelated and the total, relative systematic uncertainty is 17.7% for the cross-section measurement, dominated by the heavy-flavour tagging efficiency uncertainty (16.6%). The total systematic uncertainty for the jet energy scale measurement is 1.1% and is dominated by the uncertainty on the transfer functions (0.8%). The significance of the signal yield, including all statistical and systematic uncertainties, is 6.0 standard deviations.

6. Results and conclusions

The product of the Z -boson production cross-section and the $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ branching fraction in pp collisions at a centre-of-mass energy of 8 TeV is

$$\sigma(pp \rightarrow Z)\mathcal{B}(Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}) = 332 \pm 46 \pm 59 \text{ pb},$$

where the first uncertainty is statistical and the second is systematic. The measurement is made in the fiducial region defined by two particle-level b jets with $p_T > 20$ GeV, $2.2 < \eta < 4.2$, and $45 < m_{jj} < 165$ GeV.

The expected cross-section in the fiducial region of the experimental measurement is calculated at NLO using aMC@NLO plus PYTHIA for the parton showers and the NNPDF3.0 Parton Distribution Functions (PDFs) set [35]. The theoretical prediction determined in this way is

$$\sigma(pp \rightarrow Z)\mathcal{B}(Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}) = 272_{-12}^{+9}(\text{scale}) \pm 5(\text{PDFs}) \text{ pb},$$

where the first uncertainty is related to the missing higher-order corrections and to the value of the strong coupling constant, and the second uncertainty is related to the PDFs. The uncertainty

due to missing higher-order corrections is evaluated by varying the renormalization and factorization scales by a factor of two around the nominal choice, and taking the maximum differences with respect to the nominal values. The uncertainty on the strong coupling is included by varying it within its uncertainty and recalculating the cross-section. The uncertainty on the PDFs is estimated by taking the variance of the cross-section predictions, where each replica of the NNPDF3.0 set is used in turn. The prediction and the measurement are compatible within one standard deviation. The additional data being collected by the LHCb collaboration will allow a more stringent comparison with the theoretical prediction in the future. Moreover, the systematic uncertainty on the heavy-flavour tagging efficiency will be reduced by collecting more data [28].

The measured jet energy scale factor is

$$k_{\text{JES}} = 1.009 \pm 0.015 \pm 0.011,$$

where the first uncertainty is statistical and the second uncertainty is systematic. The k_{JES} factor is compatible with unity, which demonstrates that the LHCb simulation reproduces accurately the b -jet energy in data for $b\bar{b}$ -jet pairs with about 100 GeV of invariant mass. Since a jet energy correction evaluated using simulation is already applied on b jets, k_{JES} represents the residual correction obtained using the data.

Acknowledgements

We express our gratitude to our colleagues in the CERN accelerator departments for the excellent performance of the LHC. We thank the technical and administrative staff at the LHCb institutes. We acknowledge support from CERN and from the national agencies: CAPES, CNPq, FAPERJ and FINEP (Brazil); MOST and NSFC (China); CNRS/IN2P3 (France); BMBF, DFG and MPG (Germany); INFN (Italy); NWO (The Netherlands); MNiSW and NCN (Poland); MEN/IFA (Romania); MinES and FASO (Russia); MinEco (Spain); SNSF and SER (Switzerland); NASU (Ukraine); STFC (United Kingdom); NSF (USA). We acknowledge the computing resources that are provided by CERN, IN2P3 (France), KIT and DESY (Germany), INFN (Italy), SURF (The Netherlands), PIC (Spain), GridPP (United Kingdom), RRCKI and Yandex LLC (Russia), CSCS (Switzerland), IFIN-HH (Romania), CBPF (Brazil), PL-GRID (Poland) and OSC (USA). We are indebted to the communities behind the multiple open-source software packages on which we depend. Individual groups or members have received support from AvH Foundation (Germany), EPLANET, Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions and ERC (European Union), ANR, Labex P2IO, ENIGMASS and OCEVU, and Région Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes (France), RFBR and Yandex LLC (Russia), GVA, XuntaGal and GENCAT (Spain), Herchel Smith Fund, the Royal Society, the English-Speaking Union and the Leverhulme Trust (United Kingdom).

References

- [1] E. Majorana, Teoria simmetrica dell'elettrone e del positrone, *Nuovo Cimento* 14 (1937) 171.
- [2] J.C. Pati, A. Salam, Lepton number as the fourth color, *Phys. Rev. D* 10 (1974) 275; J.C. Pati, A. Salam, *Phys. Rev. D* 11 (1975) 703 (Erratum).
- [3] R.N. Mohapatra, G. Senjanovič, Neutrino mass and spontaneous parity violation, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 44 (1980) 912.
- [4] ATLAS, CMS collaborations, Measurements of the Higgs boson production and decay rates and constraints on its couplings from a combined ATLAS and CMS analysis of the LHC pp collision data at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ and 8 TeV, ATLAS-CONF-2015-044, CMS-PAS-HIG-15-002, CERN, Geneva, 2015.
- [5] U. Baur, M. Spira, P.M. Zerwas, Excited quark and lepton production at hadron Colliders, *Phys. Rev. D* 42 (1990) 815.

- [6] P.H. Frampton, S.L. Glashow, Chiral color: an alternative to the Standard Model, *Phys. Lett. B* 190 (1987) 157.
- [7] CMS collaboration, A.M. Sirunyan, et al., Search for low mass vector resonances decaying to quark–antiquark pairs in proton–proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, arXiv:1705.10532.
- [8] B. Grinstein, C.W. Murphy, Bottom-quark forward–backward asymmetry in the Standard Model and beyond, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 111 (2013) 062003, arXiv:1302.6995.
- [9] LHCb collaboration, R. Aaij, et al., First measurement of the charge asymmetry in beauty–quark pair production, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 113 (2014) 082003, arXiv:1406.4789.
- [10] J. Donini, et al., Energy calibration of b -quark jets with $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ decays at the Tevatron collider, *Nucl. Instrum. Methods, Sect. A* 596 (2008) 354, arXiv:0801.3906.
- [11] ATLAS collaboration, G. Aad, et al., Measurement of the cross section of high transverse momentum $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ production in proton–proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV with the ATLAS detector, *Phys. Lett. B* 738 (2014) 25, arXiv:1404.7042.
- [12] CMS collaboration, Inclusive search for the standard model Higgs boson produced in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV using $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ decays, CMS-PAS-HIG-17-010, CERN, Geneva, 2017.
- [13] LHCb collaboration, A.A. Alves Jr., et al., The LHCb detector at the LHC, *J. Instrum.* 3 (2008) S08005.
- [14] LHCb collaboration, R. Aaij, et al., LHCb detector performance, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* 30 (2015) 1530022, arXiv:1412.6352.
- [15] T. Likhomanenko, et al., LHCb topological trigger reoptimization, *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* 664 (2015) 082025, arXiv:1510.00572.
- [16] T. Sjöstrand, S. Mrenna, P. Skands, A brief introduction to PYTHIA 8.1, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* 178 (2008) 852, arXiv:0710.3820; T. Sjöstrand, S. Mrenna, P. Skands, PYTHIA 6.4 physics and manual, *J. High Energy Phys.* 05 (2006) 026, arXiv:hep-ph/0603175.
- [17] I. Belyaev, et al., Handling of the generation of primary events in Gauss, the LHCb simulation framework, *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* 331 (2011) 032047.
- [18] D.J. Lange, The EvtGen particle decay simulation package, *Nucl. Instrum. Methods, Sect. A* 462 (2001) 152.
- [19] P. Golonka, Z. Was, PHOTOS Monte Carlo: a precision tool for QED corrections in Z and W decays, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 45 (2006) 97, arXiv:hep-ph/0506026.
- [20] Geant4 collaboration, J. Allison, et al., Geant4 developments and applications, *IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci.* 53 (2006) 270; Geant4 collaboration, S. Agostinelli, et al., Geant4: a simulation toolkit, *Nucl. Instrum. Methods, Sect. A* 506 (2003) 250.
- [21] M. Clemencic, et al., The LHCb simulation application, Gauss: design, evolution and experience, *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* 331 (2011) 032023.
- [22] LHCb collaboration, R. Aaij, et al., First observation of top quark production in the forward region, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 115 (2015) 112001, arXiv:1506.00903.
- [23] LHCb collaboration, R. Aaij, et al., Study of W boson production in association with beauty and charm, *Phys. Rev. D* 92 (2015) 052012, arXiv:1505.04051.
- [24] LHCb collaboration, R. Aaij, et al., Measurement of forward W and Z boson production in association with jets in proton–proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV, *J. High Energy Phys.* 05 (2016) 131, arXiv:1605.00951.
- [25] LHCb collaboration, R. Aaij, et al., Study of forward Z + jet production in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV, *J. High Energy Phys.* 01 (2014) 033, arXiv:1310.8197.
- [26] M. Cacciari, G.P. Salam, G. Soyez, The anti- k_T jet clustering algorithm, *J. High Energy Phys.* 04 (2008) 063, arXiv:0802.1189.
- [27] M. Cacciari, G.P. Salam, G. Soyez, FastJet user manual, arXiv:1111.6097.
- [28] LHCb collaboration, R. Aaij, et al., Identification of beauty and charm quark jets at LHCb, *J. Instrum.* 10 (2015) P06013, arXiv:1504.07670.
- [29] J.M. Campbell, J.W. Huston, W.J. Stirling, Hard interactions of quarks and gluons: a primer for LHC physics, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* 70 (2007) 89, arXiv:hep-ph/061148.
- [30] Particle Data Group, C. Patrignani, et al., Review of particle physics, *Chin. Phys. C* 40 (2016) 100001, and 2017 update.
- [31] A. Rogozhnikov, et al., New approaches for boosting to uniformity, *J. Instrum.* 10 (2015) T03002, arXiv:1410.4140.
- [32] S.S. Wilks, The large-sample distribution of the likelihood ratio for testing composite hypotheses, *Ann. Math. Stat.* 9 (1938) 60.
- [33] 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, *J. High Energy Phys.* 07 (2014) 079, arXiv:1405.0301.
- [34] LHCb collaboration, R. Aaij, et al., Precision luminosity measurements at LHCb, *J. Instrum.* 9 (2014) P12005, arXiv:1410.0149.
- [35] NNPDF collaboration, R.D. Ball, et al., Parton distributions for the LHC Run II, *J. High Energy Phys.* 04 (2015) 040, arXiv:1410.8849.

LHCb Collaboration

R. Aaij⁴⁰, B. Adeva³⁹, M. Adinolfi⁴⁸, Z. Ajaltouni⁵, S. Akar⁵⁹, J. Albrecht¹⁰, F. Alessio⁴⁰, M. Alexander⁵³, A. Alfonso Alberio³⁸, S. Ali⁴³, G. Alkhazov³¹, P. Alvarez Cartelle⁵⁵, A.A. Alves Jr⁵⁹, S. Amato², S. Amerio²³, Y. Amhis⁷, L. An³, L. Anderlini¹⁸, G. Andreassi⁴¹, M. Andreotti^{17,g}, J.E. Andrews⁶⁰, R.B. Appleby⁵⁶, F. Archilli⁴³, P. d'Argent¹², J. Arnau Romeu⁶, A. Artamonov³⁷, M. Artuso⁶¹, E. Aslanides⁶, G. Auriemma²⁶, M. Baalouch⁵, I. Babuschkin⁵⁶, S. Bachmann¹², J.J. Back⁵⁰, A. Badalov^{38,m}, C. Baesso⁶², S. Baker⁵⁵, V. Balagura^{7,b}, W. Baldini¹⁷, A. Baranov³⁵, R.J. Barlow⁵⁶, C. Barschel⁴⁰, S. Barsuk⁷, W. Barter⁵⁶, F. Baryshnikov³², V. Batozskaya²⁹, V. Battista⁴¹, A. Bay⁴¹, L. Beaucourt⁴, J. Beddow⁵³, F. Bedeschi²⁴, I. Bediaga¹, A. Beiter⁶¹, L.J. Bel⁴³, N. Belyi⁶³, V. Bellee⁴¹, N. Belloli^{21,i}, K. Belous³⁷, I. Belyaev³², E. Ben-Haim⁸, G. Bencivenni¹⁹, S. Benson⁴³, S. Beranek⁹, A. Berezhnoy³³, R. Bernet⁴², D. Berninghoff¹², E. Bertholet⁸, A. Bertolin²³, C. Betancourt⁴², F. Betti¹⁵, M.-O. Bettler⁴⁰, M. van Beuzekom⁴³, I. Bezshyiko⁴², S. Bifani⁴⁷, P. Billoir⁸, A. Birnkraut¹⁰, A. Bitadze⁵⁶, A. Bizzeti^{18,u}, M. Bjørn⁵⁷, T. Blake⁵⁰, F. Blanc⁴¹, J. Blouw^{11,†}, S. Blusk⁶¹, V. Bocci²⁶, T. Boettcher⁵⁸, A. Bondar^{36,w}, N. Bondar³¹, W. Bonivento¹⁶, I. Bordyuzhin³², A. Borgheresi^{21,i}, S. Borghi⁵⁶, M. Borisyak³⁵, M. Borsato³⁹, F. Bossu⁷, M. Boubdir⁹, T.J.V. Bowcock⁵⁴, E. Bowen⁴², C. Bozzi^{17,40}, S. Braun¹², T. Britton⁶¹, J. Brodzicka²⁷, D. Brundu¹⁶, E. Buchanan⁴⁸, C. Burr⁵⁶, A. Bursche^{16,f}, J. Buytaert⁴⁰, W. Byczynski⁴⁰, S. Cadeddu¹⁶, H. Cai⁶⁴, R. Calabrese^{17,g}, R. Calladine⁴⁷, M. Calvi^{21,i}, M. Calvo Gomez^{38,m}, A. Camboni^{38,m}, P. Campana¹⁹, D.H. Campora Perez⁴⁰, L. Capriotti⁵⁶, A. Carbone^{15,e}, G. Carboni^{25,j}, R. Cardinale^{20,h}, A. Cardini¹⁶, P. Carniti^{21,i}, L. Carson⁵², K. Carvalho Akiba², G. Casse⁵⁴, L. Cassina²¹, L. Castillo Garcia⁴¹, M. Cattaneo⁴⁰, G. Cavallero^{20,40,h}, R. Cenci^{24,t}, D. Chamont⁷, M.G. Chapman⁴⁸, M. Charles⁸, Ph. Charpentier⁴⁰, G. Chatzikonstantinidis⁴⁷, M. Chefdeville⁴, S. Chen⁵⁶, S.F. Cheung⁵⁷, S.-G. Chitic⁴⁰, V. Chobanova³⁹, M. Chrzaszcz^{42,27}, A. Chubykin³¹, P. Ciambriano¹⁹, X. Cid Vidal³⁹, G. Ciezarek⁴³, P.E.L. Clarke⁵², M. Clemencic⁴⁰, H.V. Cliff⁴⁹, J. Closier⁴⁰, J. Cogan⁶, E. Cogneras⁵, V. Cogoni^{16,f}, L. Cojocariu³⁰, P. Collins⁴⁰, T. Colombo⁴⁰, A. Comerma-Montells¹², A. Contu⁴⁰, A. Cook⁴⁸, G. Coombs⁴⁰, S. Coquereau³⁸, G. Corti⁴⁰, M. Corvo^{17,g}, C.M. Costa Sobral⁵⁰, B. Couturier⁴⁰, G.A. Cowan⁵², D.C. Craik⁵⁸, A. Crocombe⁵⁰,

M. Cruz Torres ¹, R. Currie ⁵², C. D'Ambrosio ⁴⁰, F. Da Cunha Marinho ², E. Dall'Occo ⁴³, J. Dalseno ⁴⁸, A. Davis ³, O. De Aguiar Francisco ⁵⁴, S. De Capua ⁵⁶, M. De Cian ¹², J.M. De Miranda ¹, L. De Paula ², M. De Serio ^{14,d}, P. De Simone ¹⁹, C.T. Dean ⁵³, D. Decamp ⁴, L. Del Buono ⁸, H.-P. Dembinski ¹¹, M. Demmer ¹⁰, A. Dendek ²⁸, D. Derkach ³⁵, O. Deschamps ⁵, F. Dettori ⁵⁴, B. Dey ⁶⁵, A. Di Canto ⁴⁰, P. Di Nezza ¹⁹, H. Dijkstra ⁴⁰, F. Dordei ⁴⁰, M. Dorigo ⁴⁰, A. Dosil Suárez ³⁹, L. Douglas ⁵³, A. Dovbnya ⁴⁵, K. Dreimanis ⁵⁴, L. Dufour ⁴³, G. Dujany ⁸, P. Durante ⁴⁰, R. Dzhelyadin ³⁷, M. Dziewiecki ¹², A. Dziurda ⁴⁰, A. Dzyuba ³¹, S. Easo ⁵¹, M. Ebert ⁵², U. Egede ⁵⁵, V. Egorychev ³², S. Eidelman ^{36,w}, S. Eisenhardt ⁵², U. Eitschberger ¹⁰, R. Ekelhof ¹⁰, L. Eklund ⁵³, S. Ely ⁶¹, S. Esen ¹², H.M. Evans ⁴⁹, T. Evans ⁵⁷, A. Falabella ¹⁵, N. Farley ⁴⁷, S. Farry ⁵⁴, D. Fazzini ^{21,i}, L. Federici ²⁵, D. Ferguson ⁵², G. Fernandez ³⁸, P. Fernandez Declara ⁴⁰, A. Fernandez Prieto ³⁹, F. Ferrari ¹⁵, F. Ferreira Rodrigues ², M. Ferro-Luzzi ⁴⁰, S. Filippov ³⁴, R.A. Fini ¹⁴, M. Fiore ^{17,g}, M. Fiorini ^{17,g}, M. Firlej ²⁸, C. Fitzpatrick ⁴¹, T. Fiutowski ²⁸, F. Fleuret ^{7,b}, K. Fohl ⁴⁰, M. Fontana ^{16,40}, F. Fontanelli ^{20,h}, D.C. Forshaw ⁶¹, R. Forty ⁴⁰, V. Franco Lima ⁵⁴, M. Frank ⁴⁰, C. Frei ⁴⁰, J. Fu ^{22,q}, W. Funk ⁴⁰, E. Furfaro ^{25,j}, C. Färber ⁴⁰, E. Gabriel ⁵², A. Gallas Torreira ³⁹, D. Galli ^{15,e}, S. Gallorini ²³, S. Gambetta ⁵², M. Gandelman ², P. Gandini ⁵⁷, Y. Gao ³, L.M. Garcia Martin ⁷⁰, J. García Pardiñas ³⁹, J. Garra Tico ⁴⁹, L. Garrido ³⁸, P.J. Garsed ⁴⁹, D. Gascon ³⁸, C. Gaspar ⁴⁰, L. Gavardi ¹⁰, G. Gazzoni ⁵, D. Gerick ¹², E. Gersabeck ¹², M. Gersabeck ⁵⁶, T. Gershon ⁵⁰, Ph. Ghez ⁴, S. Gianì ⁴¹, V. Gibson ⁴⁹, O.G. Girard ⁴¹, L. Giubega ³⁰, K. Gizdov ⁵², V.V. Gligorov ⁸, D. Golubkov ³², A. Golutvin ^{55,40}, A. Gomes ^{1,a}, I.V. Gorelov ³³, C. Gotti ^{21,i}, E. Govorkova ⁴³, J.P. Grabowski ¹², R. Graciani Diaz ³⁸, L.A. Granado Cardoso ⁴⁰, E. Graugés ³⁸, E. Graverini ⁴², G. Graziani ¹⁸, A. Greco ³⁰, R. Greim ⁹, P. Griffith ¹⁶, L. Grillo ^{21,40,i}, L. Gruber ⁴⁰, B.R. Gruber Cazon ⁵⁷, O. Grünberg ⁶⁷, E. Gushchin ³⁴, Yu. Guz ³⁷, T. Gys ⁴⁰, C. Göbel ⁶², T. Hadavizadeh ⁵⁷, C. Hadjivasiliou ⁵, G. Haefeli ⁴¹, C. Haen ⁴⁰, S.C. Haines ⁴⁹, B. Hamilton ⁶⁰, X. Han ¹², T.H. Hancock ⁵⁷, S. Hansmann-Menzemer ¹², N. Harnew ⁵⁷, S.T. Harnew ⁴⁸, J. Harrison ⁵⁶, C. Hasse ⁴⁰, M. Hatch ⁴⁰, J. He ⁶³, M. Hecker ⁵⁵, K. Heinicke ¹⁰, A. Heister ⁹, K. Hennessy ⁵⁴, P. Henrard ⁵, L. Henry ⁷⁰, E. van Herwijnen ⁴⁰, M. Heß ⁶⁷, A. Hicheur ², D. Hill ⁵⁷, C. Hombach ⁵⁶, P.H. Hopchev ⁴¹, Z.C. Huard ⁵⁹, W. Hulsbergen ⁴³, T. Humair ⁵⁵, M. Hushchyn ³⁵, D. Hutchcroft ⁵⁴, P. Ibis ¹⁰, M. Idzik ²⁸, P. Ilten ⁵⁸, R. Jacobsson ⁴⁰, J. Jalocha ⁵⁷, E. Jans ⁴³, A. Jawahery ⁶⁰, F. Jiang ³, M. John ⁵⁷, D. Johnson ⁴⁰, C.R. Jones ⁴⁹, C. Joram ⁴⁰, B. Jost ⁴⁰, N. Jurik ⁵⁷, S. Kandybei ⁴⁵, M. Karacson ⁴⁰, J.M. Kariuki ⁴⁸, S. Karodia ⁵³, N. Kazeev ³⁵, M. Kecke ¹², M. Kelsey ⁶¹, M. Kenzie ⁴⁹, T. Ketel ⁴⁴, E. Khairullin ³⁵, B. Khanji ¹², C. Khurewathanakul ⁴¹, T. Kirn ⁹, S. Klaver ⁵⁶, K. Klimaszewski ²⁹, T. Klimkovich ¹¹, S. Koliev ⁴⁶, M. Kolpin ¹², I. Komarov ⁴¹, R. Kopečna ¹², P. Koppenburg ⁴³, A. Kosmyntseva ³², S. Kotriakhova ³¹, M. Kozeiha ⁵, L. Kravchuk ³⁴, M. Kreps ⁵⁰, P. Krokovny ^{36,w}, F. Kruse ¹⁰, W. Krzemien ²⁹, W. Kucewicz ^{27,l}, M. Kucharczyk ²⁷, V. Kudryavtsev ^{36,w}, A.K. Kuonen ⁴¹, K. Kurek ²⁹, T. Kvaratskheliya ^{32,40}, D. Lacarrere ⁴⁰, G. Lafferty ⁵⁶, A. Lai ¹⁶, G. Lanfranchi ¹⁹, C. Langenbruch ⁹, T. Latham ⁵⁰, C. Lazzeroni ⁴⁷, R. Le Gac ⁶, A. Leflat ^{33,40}, J. Lefrançois ⁷, R. Lefèvre ⁵, F. Lemaître ⁴⁰, E. Lemos Cid ³⁹, O. Leroy ⁶, T. Lesiak ²⁷, B. Leverington ¹², P.-R. Li ⁶³, T. Li ³, Y. Li ⁷, Z. Li ⁶¹, T. Likhomanenko ⁶⁸, R. Lindner ⁴⁰, F. Lionetto ⁴², V. Lisovskyi ⁷, X. Liu ³, D. Loh ⁵⁰, A. Loi ¹⁶, I. Longstaff ⁵³, J.H. Lopes ², D. Lucchesi ^{23,o}, M. Lucio Martinez ³⁹, H. Luo ⁵², A. Lupato ²³, E. Luppi ^{17,g}, O. Lupton ⁴⁰, A. Lusiani ²⁴, X. Lyu ⁶³, F. Machefert ⁷, F. Maciuc ³⁰, V. Macko ⁴¹, P. Mackowiak ¹⁰, S. Maddrell-Mander ⁴⁸, O. Maev ^{31,40}, K. Maguire ⁵⁶, D. Maisuzenko ³¹, M.W. Majewski ²⁸, S. Malde ⁵⁷, A. Malinin ⁶⁸, T. Maltsev ^{36,w}, G. Manca ^{16,f}, G. Mancinelli ⁶, P. Manning ⁶¹, D. Marangotto ^{22,q}, J. Maratas ^{5,v}, J.F. Marchand ⁴, U. Marconi ¹⁵, C. Marin Benito ³⁸, M. Marinangeli ⁴¹, P. Marino ⁴¹, J. Marks ¹², G. Martellotti ²⁶, M. Martin ⁶, M. Martinelli ⁴¹, D. Martinez Santos ³⁹, F. Martinez Vidal ⁷⁰, D. Martins Tostes ², L.M. Massacrier ⁷, A. Massafferri ¹, R. Matev ⁴⁰, A. Mathad ⁵⁰, Z. Mathe ⁴⁰, C. Matteuzzi ²¹, A. Mauri ⁴², E. Maurice ^{7,b}, B. Maurin ⁴¹, A. Mazurov ⁴⁷, M. McCann ^{55,40}, A. McNab ⁵⁶, R. McNulty ¹³, J.V. Mead ⁵⁴, B. Meadows ⁵⁹, C. Meaux ⁶, F. Meier ¹⁰, N. Meinert ⁶⁷, D. Melnychuk ²⁹, M. Merk ⁴³, A. Merli ^{22,40,q}, E. Michielin ²³, D.A. Milanes ⁶⁶, E. Millard ⁵⁰, M.-N. Minard ⁴, L. Minzoni ¹⁷, D.S. Mitzel ¹², A. Mogini ⁸, J. Molina Rodriguez ¹, T. Mombächer ¹⁰, I.A. Monroy ⁶⁶, S. Monteil ⁵, M. Morandin ²³, M.J. Morello ^{24,t}, O. Morgunova ⁶⁸, J. Moron ²⁸, A.B. Morris ⁵², R. Mountain ⁶¹, F. Muheim ⁵², M. Mulder ⁴³, D. Müller ⁵⁶, J. Müller ¹⁰, K. Müller ⁴², V. Müller ¹⁰, P. Naik ⁴⁸, T. Nakada ⁴¹, R. Nandakumar ⁵¹, A. Nandi ⁵⁷, I. Nasteva ², M. Needham ⁵², N. Neri ^{22,40}, S. Neubert ¹², N. Neufeld ⁴⁰, M. Neuner ¹², T.D. Nguyen ⁴¹, C. Nguyen-Mau ^{41,n}, S. Nieswand ⁹, R. Niet ¹⁰, N. Nikitin ³³, T. Nikodem ¹², A. Nogay ⁶⁸, D.P. O'Hanlon ⁵⁰, A. Oblakowska-Mucha ²⁸, V. Obraztsov ³⁷, S. Ogilvy ¹⁹, R. Oldeman ^{16,f}, C.J.G. Onderwater ⁷¹,

A. Ossowska²⁷, J.M. Otalora Goicochea², P. Owen⁴², A. Oyanguren⁷⁰, P.R. Pais⁴¹, A. Palano^{14,d}, M. Palutan^{19,40}, A. Papanestis⁵¹, M. Pappagallo^{14,d}, L.L. Pappalardo^{17,g}, W. Parker⁶⁰, C. Parkes⁵⁶, G. Passaleva¹⁸, A. Pastore^{14,d}, M. Patel⁵⁵, C. Patrignani^{15,e}, A. Pearce⁴⁰, A. Pellegrino⁴³, G. Penso²⁶, M. Pepe Altarelli⁴⁰, S. Perazzini⁴⁰, P. Perret⁵, L. Pescatore⁴¹, K. Petridis⁴⁸, A. Petrolini^{20,h}, A. Petrov⁶⁸, M. Petruzzo^{22,q}, E. Picatoste Olloqui³⁸, B. Pietrzyk⁴, M. Pikies²⁷, D. Pinci²⁶, F. Pisani⁴⁰, A. Pistone^{20,h}, A. Piucci¹², V. Placinta³⁰, S. Playfer⁵², M. Plo Casasus³⁹, F. Polci⁸, M. Poli Lener¹⁹, A. Poluektov^{50,36}, I. Polyakov⁶¹, E. Polcarpo², G.J. Pomery⁴⁸, S. Ponce⁴⁰, A. Popov³⁷, D. Popov^{11,40}, S. Poslavskii³⁷, C. Potterat², E. Price⁴⁸, J. Prisciandaro³⁹, C. Prouve⁴⁸, V. Pugatch⁴⁶, A. Puig Navarro⁴², H. Pullen⁵⁷, G. Punzi^{24,p}, W. Qian⁵⁰, R. Quagliani^{7,48}, B. Quintana⁵, B. Rachwal²⁸, J.H. Rademacker⁴⁸, M. Rama²⁴, M. Ramos Pernas³⁹, M.S. Rangel², I. Raniuk^{45,†}, F. Ratnikov³⁵, G. Raven⁴⁴, M. Ravonel Salzgeber⁴⁰, M. Reboud⁴, F. Redi⁵⁵, S. Reichert¹⁰, A.C. dos Reis¹, C. Remon Alepuz⁷⁰, V. Renaudin⁷, S. Ricciardi⁵¹, S. Richards⁴⁸, M. Rihl⁴⁰, K. Rinnert⁵⁴, V. Rives Molina³⁸, P. Robbe⁷, A. Robert⁸, A.B. Rodrigues¹, E. Rodrigues⁵⁹, J.A. Rodriguez Lopez⁶⁶, P. Rodriguez Perez^{56,†}, A. Rogozhnikov³⁵, S. Roiser⁴⁰, A. Rollings⁵⁷, V. Romanovskiy³⁷, A. Romero Vidal³⁹, J.W. Ronayne¹³, M. Rotondo¹⁹, M.S. Rudolph⁶¹, T. Ruf⁴⁰, P. Ruiz Valls⁷⁰, J. Ruiz Vidal⁷⁰, J.J. Saborido Silva³⁹, E. Sadykhov³², N. Sagidova³¹, B. Saitta^{16,f}, V. Salustino Guimaraes¹, C. Sanchez Mayordomo⁷⁰, B. Sanmartin Sedes³⁹, R. Santacesaria²⁶, C. Santamarina Rios³⁹, M. Santimaria¹⁹, E. Santovetti^{25,j}, G. Sarpis⁵⁶, A. Sarti²⁶, C. Satriano^{26,s}, A. Satta²⁵, D.M. Saunders⁴⁸, D. Savrina^{32,33}, S. Schael⁹, M. Schellenberg¹⁰, M. Schiller⁵³, H. Schindler⁴⁰, M. Schlupp¹⁰, M. Schmelling¹¹, T. Schmelzer¹⁰, B. Schmidt⁴⁰, O. Schneider⁴¹, A. Schopper⁴⁰, H.F. Schreiner⁵⁹, K. Schubert¹⁰, M. Schubiger⁴¹, M.-H. Schune⁷, R. Schwemmer⁴⁰, B. Sciascia¹⁹, A. Sciubba^{26,k}, A. Semennikov³², E.S. Sepulveda⁸, A. Sergi⁴⁷, N. Serra⁴², J. Serrano⁶, L. Sestini^{23,*}, P. Seyfert⁴⁰, M. Shapkin³⁷, I. Shapoval⁴⁵, Y. Shcheglov³¹, T. Shears⁵⁴, L. Shekhtman^{36,w}, V. Shevchenko⁶⁸, B.G. Siddi^{17,40}, R. Silva Coutinho⁴², L. Silva de Oliveira², G. Simi^{23,o}, S. Simone^{14,d}, M. Sirendi⁴⁹, N. Skidmore⁴⁸, T. Skwarnicki⁶¹, E. Smith⁵⁵, I.T. Smith⁵², J. Smith⁴⁹, M. Smith⁵⁵, I. Soares Lavra¹, M.D. Sokoloff⁵⁹, F.J.P. Soler⁵³, B. Souza De Paula², B. Spaan¹⁰, P. Spradlin⁵³, S. Sridharan⁴⁰, F. Stagni⁴⁰, M. Stahl¹², S. Stahl⁴⁰, P. Stefko⁴¹, S. Stefkova⁵⁵, O. Steinkamp⁴², S. Stemmler¹², O. Stenyakin³⁷, M. Stepanova³¹, H. Stevens¹⁰, S. Stone⁶¹, B. Storaci⁴², S. Stracka^{24,p}, M.E. Stramaglia⁴¹, M. Straticiu³⁰, U. Straumann⁴², J. Sun³, L. Sun⁶⁴, W. Sutcliffe⁵⁵, K. Swientek²⁸, V. Syropoulos⁴⁴, M. Szczekowski²⁹, T. Szumlak²⁸, M. Szymanski⁶³, S. T'Jampens⁴, A. Tayduganov⁶, T. Tekampe¹⁰, G. Tellarini^{17,g}, F. Teubert⁴⁰, E. Thomas⁴⁰, J. van Tilburg⁴³, M.J. Tilley⁵⁵, V. Tisserand⁴, M. Tobin⁴¹, S. Tolk⁴⁹, L. Tomassetti^{17,g}, D. Tonelli²⁴, F. Toriello⁶¹, R. Tourinho Jadallah Aoude¹, E. Tournefier⁴, M. Traill⁵³, M.T. Tran⁴¹, M. Tresch⁴², A. Trisovic⁴⁰, A. Tsaregorodtsev⁶, P. Tsopelas⁴³, A. Tully⁴⁹, N. Tuning^{43,40}, A. Ukleja²⁹, A. Usachov⁷, A. Ustyuzhanin³⁵, U. Uwer¹², C. Vacca^{16,f}, A. Vagner⁶⁹, V. Vagnoni^{15,40}, A. Valassi⁴⁰, S. Valat⁴⁰, G. Valenti¹⁵, R. Vazquez Gomez¹⁹, P. Vazquez Regueiro³⁹, S. Vecchi¹⁷, M. van Veghel⁴³, J.J. Velthuis⁴⁸, M. Veltri^{18,r}, G. Veneziano⁵⁷, A. Venkateswaran⁶¹, T.A. Verlage⁹, M. Vernet⁵, M. Vesterinen⁵⁷, J.V. Viana Barbosa⁴⁰, B. Viaud⁷, D. Vieira⁶³, M. Vieites Diaz³⁹, H. Viemann⁶⁷, X. Vilasis-Cardona^{38,m}, M. Vitti⁴⁹, V. Volkov³³, A. Vollhardt⁴², B. Voneki⁴⁰, A. Vorobyev³¹, V. Vorobyev^{36,w}, C. Voß⁹, J.A. de Vries⁴³, C. Vázquez Sierra³⁹, R. Waldi⁶⁷, C. Wallace⁵⁰, R. Wallace¹³, J. Walsh²⁴, J. Wang⁶¹, D.R. Ward⁴⁹, H.M. Wark⁵⁴, N.K. Watson⁴⁷, D. Websdale⁵⁵, A. Weiden⁴², M. Whitehead⁴⁰, J. Wicht⁵⁰, G. Wilkinson^{57,40}, M. Wilkinson⁶¹, M. Williams⁵⁶, M.P. Williams⁴⁷, M. Williams⁵⁸, T. Williams⁴⁷, F.F. Wilson⁵¹, J. Wimberley⁶⁰, M. Winn⁷, J. Wishahi¹⁰, W. Wislicki²⁹, M. Witek²⁷, G. Wormser⁷, S.A. Wotton⁴⁹, K. Wraight⁵³, K. Wyllie⁴⁰, Y. Xie⁶⁵, Z. Xu⁴, Z. Yang³, Z. Yang⁶⁰, Y. Yao⁶¹, H. Yin⁶⁵, J. Yu⁶⁵, X. Yuan⁶¹, O. Yushchenko³⁷, K.A. Zarebski⁴⁷, M. Zavertyaev^{11,c}, L. Zhang³, Y. Zhang⁷, A. Zhelezov¹², Y. Zheng⁶³, X. Zhu³, V. Zhukov³³, J.B. Zonneveld⁵², S. Zucchelli¹⁵

¹ Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Físicas (CBPF), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil² Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil³ Center for High Energy Physics, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China⁴ LAPP, Université Savoie Mont-Blanc, CNRS/IN2P3, Annecy-Le-Vieux, France⁵ Clermont Université, Université Blaise Pascal, CNRS/IN2P3, LPC, Clermont-Ferrand, France⁶ Aix Marseille Univ, CNRS/IN2P3, CPPM, Marseille, France⁷ LAL, Université Paris-Sud, CNRS/IN2P3, Orsay, France⁸ LPNHE, Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Université Paris Diderot, CNRS/IN2P3, Paris, France⁹ I. Physikalisches Institut, RWTH Aachen University, Aachen, Germany¹⁰ Fakultät Physik, Technische Universität Dortmund, Dortmund, Germany

- ¹¹ Max-Planck-Institut für Kernphysik (MPIK), Heidelberg, Germany
¹² Physikalisches Institut, Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg, Heidelberg, Germany
¹³ School of Physics, University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland
¹⁴ Sezione INFN di Bari, Bari, Italy
¹⁵ Sezione INFN di Bologna, Bologna, Italy
¹⁶ Sezione INFN di Cagliari, Cagliari, Italy
¹⁷ Università e INFN, Ferrara, Ferrara, Italy
¹⁸ Sezione INFN di Firenze, Firenze, Italy
¹⁹ Laboratori Nazionali dell'INFN di Frascati, Frascati, Italy
²⁰ Sezione INFN di Genova, Genova, Italy
²¹ Università & INFN, Milano-Bicocca, Milano, Italy
²² Sezione di Milano, Milano, Italy
²³ Sezione INFN di Padova, Padova, Italy
²⁴ Sezione INFN di Pisa, Pisa, Italy
²⁵ Sezione INFN di Roma Tor Vergata, Roma, Italy
²⁶ Sezione INFN di Roma La Sapienza, Roma, Italy
²⁷ Henryk Niewodniczanski Institute of Nuclear Physics Polish Academy of Sciences, Kraków, Poland
²⁸ AGH – University of Science and Technology, Faculty of Physics and Applied Computer Science, Kraków, Poland
²⁹ National Center for Nuclear Research (NCBJ), Warsaw, Poland
³⁰ Horia Hulubei National Institute of Physics and Nuclear Engineering, Bucharest-Magurele, Romania
³¹ Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute (PNPI), Gatchina, Russia
³² Institute of Theoretical and Experimental Physics (ITEP), Moscow, Russia
³³ Institute of Nuclear Physics, Moscow State University (SINP MSU), Moscow, Russia
³⁴ Institute for Nuclear Research of the Russian Academy of Sciences (INR RAN), Moscow, Russia
³⁵ Yandex School of Data Analysis, Moscow, Russia
³⁶ Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics (SB RAS), Novosibirsk, Russia
³⁷ Institute for High Energy Physics (IHEP), Protvino, Russia
³⁸ ICCUB, Universitat de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain
³⁹ Universidad de Santiago de Compostela, Santiago de Compostela, Spain
⁴⁰ European Organization for Nuclear Research (CERN), Geneva, Switzerland
⁴¹ Institute of Physics, Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), Lausanne, Switzerland
⁴² Physik-Institut, Universität Zürich, Zürich, Switzerland
⁴³ Nikhef National Institute for Subatomic Physics, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
⁴⁴ Nikhef National Institute for Subatomic Physics and VU University Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
⁴⁵ NSC Kharkiv Institute of Physics and Technology (NSC KIPT), Kharkiv, Ukraine
⁴⁶ Institute for Nuclear Research of the National Academy of Sciences (KINR), Kyiv, Ukraine
⁴⁷ University of Birmingham, Birmingham, United Kingdom
⁴⁸ H.H. Wills Physics Laboratory, University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom
⁴⁹ Cavendish Laboratory, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom
⁵⁰ Department of Physics, University of Warwick, Coventry, United Kingdom
⁵¹ STFC Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom
⁵² School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, United Kingdom
⁵³ School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, United Kingdom
⁵⁴ Oliver Lodge Laboratory, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, United Kingdom
⁵⁵ Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom
⁵⁶ School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Manchester, Manchester, United Kingdom
⁵⁷ Department of Physics, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom
⁵⁸ Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, United States
⁵⁹ University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH, United States
⁶⁰ University of Maryland, College Park, MD, United States
⁶¹ Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY, United States
⁶² Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro (PUC-Rio), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil ^x
⁶³ University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China ^y
⁶⁴ School of Physics and Technology, Wuhan University, Wuhan, China ^y
⁶⁵ Institute of Particle Physics, Central China Normal University, Wuhan, Hubei, China ^y
⁶⁶ Departamento de Física, Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Bogotá, Colombia ^z
⁶⁷ Institut für Physik, Universität Rostock, Rostock, Germany ^{aa}
⁶⁸ National Research Centre Kurchatov Institute, Moscow, Russia ^{ab}
⁶⁹ National Research Tomsk Polytechnic University, Tomsk, Russia ^{ab}
⁷⁰ Instituto de Física Corpuscular, Centro Mixto Universidad de Valencia – CSIC, Valencia, Spain ^{ac}
⁷¹ Van Swinderen Institute, University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands ^{ad}

* Corresponding author.

^a Universidade Federal do Triângulo Mineiro (UFTM), Uberaba-MG, Brazil.

^b Laboratoire Leprince-Ringuet, Palaiseau, France.

^c P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Russian Academy of Science (LPI RAS), Moscow, Russia.

^d Università di Bari, Bari, Italy.

^e Università di Bologna, Bologna, Italy.

^f Università di Cagliari, Cagliari, Italy.

^g Università di Ferrara, Ferrara, Italy.

^h Università di Genova, Genova, Italy.

ⁱ Università di Milano Bicocca, Milano, Italy.

^j Università di Roma Tor Vergata, Roma, Italy.

^k Università di Roma La Sapienza, Roma, Italy.

^l AGH – University of Science and Technology, Faculty of Computer Science, Electronics and Telecommunications, Kraków, Poland.

^m LIFAELS, La Salle, Universitat Ramon Llull, Barcelona, Spain.

ⁿ Hanoi University of Science, Hanoi, Viet Nam.

- ^o Università di Padova, Padova, Italy.
- ^p Università di Pisa, Pisa, Italy.
- ^q Università degli Studi di Milano, Milano, Italy.
- ^r Università di Urbino, Urbino, Italy.
- ^s Università della Basilicata, Potenza, Italy.
- ^t Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa, Italy.
- ^u Università di Modena e Reggio Emilia, Modena, Italy.
- ^v Iligan Institute of Technology (IIT), Iligan, Philippines.
- ^w Novosibirsk State University, Novosibirsk, Russia.
- ^x Associated to: Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.
- ^y Associated to: Center for High Energy Physics, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China.
- ^z Associated to: LPNHE, Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Université Paris Diderot, CNRS/IN2P3, Paris, France.
- ^{aa} Associated to: Physikalisches Institut, Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg, Heidelberg, Germany.
- ^{ab} Associated to: Institute of Theoretical and Experimental Physics (ITEP), Moscow, Russia.
- ^{ac} Associated to: ICCUB, Universitat de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain.
- ^{ad} Associated to: Nikhef National Institute for Subatomic Physics, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
- [†] Deceased.