



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Physics Letters B

www.elsevier.com/locate/physletb



Nuclear modification of Y states in pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV

The CMS Collaboration*

CERN, Geneva, Switzerland

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 23 February 2022
 Received in revised form 5 August 2022
 Accepted 22 August 2022
 Available online xxxx
 Editor: M. Doser

Keywords:

CMS
 Bottomonium
 Quarkonium suppression
 Quark-gluon plasma
 Heavy ion collisions

ABSTRACT

Production cross sections of Y(1S), Y(2S), and Y(3S) states decaying into $\mu^+\mu^-$ in proton-lead (pPb) collisions are reported using data collected by the CMS experiment at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV. A comparison is made with corresponding cross sections obtained with pp data measured at the same collision energy and scaled by the Pb nucleus mass number. The nuclear modification factor for Y(1S) is found to be $R_{pPb}(Y(1S)) = 0.806 \pm 0.024(\text{stat}) \pm 0.059(\text{syst})$. Similar results for the excited states indicate a sequential suppression pattern, such that $R_{pPb}(Y(1S)) > R_{pPb}(Y(2S)) > R_{pPb}(Y(3S))$. The suppression of all states is much less pronounced in pPb than in PbPb collisions, and independent of transverse momentum p_T^Y and center-of-mass rapidity y_{CM}^Y of the individual Y state in the studied range $p_T^Y < 30$ GeV/c and $|y_{CM}^Y| < 1.93$. Models that incorporate final-state effects of bottomonia in pPb collisions are in better agreement with the data than those which only assume initial-state modifications.

© 2022 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

Properties of the color-deconfined quark-gluon plasma (QGP) created in high-energy collisions of heavy nuclei can be studied using heavy-quark resonances produced by initial hard scatterings [1–6]. Yields of various quarkonium states, which have a short formation time in their rest frames and can typically escape the QGP before they decay, encode information on the evolution of the plasma starting from its early stages [1,2,4,6–9]. Debye screening and gluo-dissociation [10–14] in the QGP produced in lead-lead (PbPb) collisions are understood to modify yields of quarkonium states hierarchically, according to their binding energies. Each state dissociates when a high enough temperature is reached in the QGP [4–6,9,15]. To interpret the quarkonium-state suppression patterns observed in heavy ion collisions as signals of color deconfinement in the hot plasma, it is essential to understand “cold nuclear matter” (CNM) effects. In this context, initial state refers to the partons in the relevant quantum chromodynamics process that stem from the colliding proton (p) or nucleus and scatter to produce a heavy quark pair but before it hadronizes into a quarkonium state. Examples of CNM effects that have been discussed in pA collisions include shadowing of the parton distribution functions in the nucleus (initial state) [16], energy loss in the nucleus (initial and final states) [17], and interactions with hadronic comovers (final state) [18]. For a recent review, see Ref. [7]. Traditionally, all modifications observed in pPb collisions were assumed to be due

to CNM effects. However, it is worth noting that this assumption has been questioned given recent evidence of collective behavior in pp and pPb collisions with the highest amount of emitted particles, further referred to as high-activity [19–25]. This might be explained by assuming the formation of a QGP-like medium [26].

Bottomonia serve as particularly powerful probes for studying the QGP, since their high masses require that their production be dominated by initial hard scattering of partons in the collisions [7,27–30]. When compared to charmonia, their yields are considerably less modified by regeneration or recombination in the QGP [30–32]. Measurements by the CMS experiment showing sequential modification of Y(nS) (where $n = 1, 2, 3$) decaying via the dimuon channel in PbPb compared with pp collisions at a nucleon-nucleon center-of-mass energy of $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV [33,34] and 5.02 TeV [35,36] were used to infer model-dependent [32,37] QGP temperatures. This effect is consistent with models that incorporate sequential suppression due to color screening [5,8,30]. Similar measurements of Y(nS) production in pPb collisions can help to disentangle hot and cold nuclear matter effects and to investigate various CNM mechanisms.

Nuclear modification factors R_{pPb} are ratios of particle production cross sections in pPb collisions over the corresponding cross sections in pp collisions scaled to account for the number of nucleons in the Pb nucleus. The R_{pPb} values quantify the modification of hard probe production in pPb collisions due to the nuclear environment created by a single lead nucleus in the initial state. In this analysis, these factors are determined for Y(nS) under the assumption that the cross sections scale as $\sigma_{pPb} = A\sigma_{pp}$, where A is the mass number of Pb. With this assumption, also known

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

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2022.137397>

0370-2693/© 2022 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.

as the A-scaling hypothesis, values of R_{pPb} different from unity indicate modifications that go beyond simple superposition of binary nucleon-nucleon collisions. These R_{pPb} values, together with measurements of the nuclear modification factors R_{AA} in PbPb collisions [36], can be used to investigate the relative contributions of hot and cold nuclear matter effects.

Since pPb collisions create an imbalance of nuclear matter in the proton-going (forward rapidity) and lead-going (backward rapidity) directions, they can be used to investigate differences in CNM effects in these regions of varying nuclear matter density within the same collision system. In the charmonium sector, CMS has found hints of differences in the level of suppression between the excited and ground state in the lead-going region [38,39]. One CNM modification mechanism that relies on the abundance of nuclear matter is dissociation by interaction with comoving particles, where the cross section of interaction increases with particle multiplicity in the rapidity region of the produced Y meson [18,40]. This is quantified by measuring the forward-backward production ratios R_{FB} of Y states in pPb collisions.

The LHCb [41] and ALICE [42] Collaborations reported measurements of the $Y(nS)/Y(1S)$ yield ratios (LHCb for $n = 2$ and 3; ALICE for $n = 2$), along with R_{pPb} and R_{FB} for $Y(1S)$ in pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV using Y mesons detected in the forward rapidity region. In those studies, the proton reference was obtained by interpolating results from event samples collected at other collision energies, i.e., 2.76, 7, and 8 TeV. In the midrapidity region, the ATLAS Collaboration studied bottomonia in pPb collisions using same-energy pp reference data [43], reporting $Y(nS)/Y(1S)$ (for $n = 2$ and 3), as well as $Y(1S)$ yields self-normalized to their activity-integrated values, and R_{pPb} ($Y(1S)$). The CMS Collaboration previously reported the $Y(nS)/Y(1S)$ (for $n = 2$ and 3) yield ratios versus event activity in the pPb system at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV [44], as well as in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 2.76$ TeV [44] and 7 TeV [45]. More recently, the LHCb [46] and ALICE [47] Collaborations measured R_{pPb} and R_{FB} for both $Y(1S)$ and $Y(2S)$ at the higher energy $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 8.16$ TeV, using pp reference data interpolated from measurements at $\sqrt{s} = 2.76, 7, 8,$ and 13 TeV. Data for PbPb collisions are not available at 8.16 TeV for direct comparison. These bottomonium measurements in pPb have focused on the ground state and indicate that the level of suppression is consistent with that expected from shadowing calculations, but they provide little information on the behavior of the excited states.

In this Letter, we analyze pPb and pp collision data from the CERN LHC collected with the CMS detector at the same nucleon-nucleon center-of-mass (CM) energy of $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV. The yields of $Y(nS)$ mesons are measured using their decay to two muons. By comparing the yields measured in the two colliding systems, the R_{pPb} and R_{FB} factors are determined including all bottomonium states for the first time. Because models which incorporate final-state CNM effects are the only ones to predict different modifications for the excited states, these measurements for the ordering of excited state R_{pPb} values may reveal these types of final-state mechanisms. Ordered suppression could arise from various causes – e.g., the size of the states, their cross section with potential comovers, or their binding energy. These results are compared with measurements of the $Y(nS)$ nuclear modification factors R_{AA} in PbPb collisions [36] using PbPb data also collected at 5.02 TeV with the CMS detector, allowing a model-dependent comparison of bottomonia in hot and cold nuclear matter.

2. The CMS detector

The central feature of the CMS apparatus is a superconducting solenoid of 6 m internal diameter, providing a magnetic field of 3.8 T. Within the solenoid volume are a silicon pixel and strip tracker, a lead tungstate crystal electromagnetic calorimeter, and

a brass and scintillator hadron calorimeter, each composed of a barrel and two endcap sections. Muons are detected in the range $|\eta_{lab}| < 2.4$ in gas-ionization detectors embedded in the steel flux-return yoke outside the solenoid. In the barrel region $|\eta_{lab}| < 1.2$ muon detection planes are based on drift tube technology, while the endcap region $0.9 < |\eta_{lab}| < 2.4$ uses cathode strip chambers. Resistive plate chambers provide additional muon detection capability in the range $|\eta_{lab}| < 1.6$. Matching muons to tracks measured in the silicon tracker leads to a relative transverse momentum p_T resolution on the order of 1% for a typical muon used in this analysis [48]. In addition, two steel and quartz-fiber hadron forward calorimeters cover the range $2.9 < |\eta_{lab}| < 5.2$. A detailed description of the CMS detector, together with a definition of the coordinate system used and the relevant kinematic variables, can be found in Ref. [49].

A two-tiered system is used to select collision events of interest from the detector. The first level (L1), composed of custom hardware processors, uses information from the calorimeters and muon detectors to select events at a rate of around 100 kHz within a fixed latency of about 4 μ s [50]. The second level, known as the high-level trigger (HLT), consists of a farm of processors running a version of the full event reconstruction software optimized for fast processing, and reduces the event rate to around 1 kHz before data storage [51].

3. Data selection and simulated samples

The events used for this analysis are selected using the trigger systems described above, requiring two muon candidates in the muon detectors with no explicit cuts in muon transverse momentum, p_T^μ , or muon pseudorapidity measured in the laboratory, η_{lab}^μ . The event samples used in this analysis correspond to integrated luminosities of 28.0 ± 0.6 pb $^{-1}$ and 34.6 ± 1.2 nb $^{-1}$ for pp [52] and pPb [53] collisions, respectively. The uncertainties in the integrated luminosity determination are considered as a global uncertainty in all results. All recorded pPb events are required to have an energy deposit above 3 GeV in the hadron forward calorimeters on each side of the interaction point in order to suppress background from ultra-peripheral collisions and beam-gas events, while having a high efficiency for the selection of beam-beam hadronic collisions.

In the case of pPb collisions, the value of the integrated luminosity represents the combined luminosity of collisions with proton and lead beams traveling in either direction. While in the symmetric pp and PbPb collision systems the CM and laboratory (lab) reference frames coincide, in the case of pPb collisions the difference between the energy-per-nucleon of the two beams induces a shift between the two frames. For pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV, the rapidity y is shifted in the CM frame by $\delta y = 0.465$ compared to the lab frame. The rapidity range of the reconstructed dimuons in the lab frame $|\eta_{lab}^\mu| < 2.4$ corresponds to a CM frame rapidity range of either $-2.87 < y_{CM}^\mu < 1.93$ (Pb) or $-1.93 < y_{CM}^\mu < 2.87$ (pPb), depending on the direction of the proton beam. In order to minimize the influence of asymmetric detector conditions, data are taken with both beam directions and then combined by inverting the rapidity of one of the datasets.

For both pp and pPb data, we select events with muon candidates in the kinematic range $p_T^\mu > 4$ GeV/c, $|\eta_{lab}^\mu| < 2.4$. The muon tracks are required to have at least 6 hits in the silicon tracker, at least one hit in the silicon pixel detector, and match with at least one segment in any detection plane of the muon system. The distance of the track from the closest primary vertex [54] must be less than 20 cm in the longitudinal direction and 0.3 cm in the transverse direction. When forming a muon pair, each of the two muons is required to match the hardware trigger that prompted

recording of the event and to originate from a common vertex with a χ^2 probability larger than 1%, as obtained by a Kalman vertex filter algorithm [55]. For pPb data, an additional filter is used to remove events that contain multiple interactions per bunch crossing (pileup) [38]. This filter reduces the fraction of pileup events from 3% to less than 0.2%, and reduces the effective luminosity of pPb collisions by 4.1% compared to the numbers noted above.

Dedicated Monte Carlo (MC) simulations of collision data are used to validate fitting techniques and to correct the extracted $Y(nS)$ yields for losses due to finite detector acceptance and efficiency. Simulated samples are independently generated for the $Y(1S)$, $Y(2S)$, and $Y(3S)$ mesons, in pp collisions using PYTHIA8.209 [56], assuming no polarization based on measurements at the LHC [57,58]. To simulate pPb collisions, the rapidities of all particles in the generated pp events are boosted by $\delta y = 0.465$ in the Pb-going direction to mimic the y_{CM} shift in data. The CMS detector response is simulated using GEANT4 [59]. The reconstructed p_T^Y distributions of the simulated Y states are weighted using a fit to the ratio of the p_T^Y spectra in data and simulation. The rapidity distributions in simulation are consistent with those in data.

4. Analysis

4.1. Signal extraction

Fig. 1 shows the invariant mass distributions of opposite-sign muon pairs for pp(top) and pPb(bottom) collisions. The dimuon data are integrated in the dimuon range $p_T^{\mu\mu} < 30 \text{ GeV}/c$ and $|y_{CM}^{\mu\mu}| < 1.93$. The yields of the Y states, uncorrected for detector acceptance and efficiency, are obtained via unbinned maximum-likelihood fits to the invariant mass spectra, shown as solid blue lines. A dashed red line is used in Fig. 1 (bottom) to depict the expected $Y(1S)$, $Y(2S)$, and $Y(3S)$ yields under the $R_{pPb} = 1$ hypothesis, obtained by scaling the signal shape of each state by the inverse of its finally measured R_{pPb} value (including the ratio of the efficiencies corresponding to pp and pPb collisions). This comparison illustrates that the $Y(nS)$ yields are suppressed in pPb relative to pp collisions in the integrated kinematic region. We bin the data in the dimuon kinematic variables $p_T^{\mu\mu}$ and $y_{CM}^{\mu\mu}$, as well as in event activity variables which we discuss below.

Quarkonium peaks can be modeled by a Crystal Ball (CB) function [60], whose low-mass power-law tail accounts for dimuons that undergo bremsstrahlung radiation in the detector material as well as final-state radiation. We model the shape of each Y state with a sum of two CB functions. A parameter representing the relative CB widths is left free in the fit, to accommodate muons with different momentum resolutions (depending on their η_{lab}^{μ}). The relative contributions of the two CBs are also allowed to vary, both in the kinematic and event activity variables.

To eliminate unnecessary degrees-of-freedom in the fits, the relative widths and relative contributions of the two CB functions are constrained to be the same for all three Y states, consistent with fits to simulated samples. Furthermore, parameters governing the shape of the radiative tail are constrained to be the same for all six CB functions in the fit. The mass parameter of the $Y(1S)$ is left free to account for possible systematic shifts in the momentum scale of the reconstructed tracks. The final value of this parameter is consistent between fits to pp and pPb data. Since any changes in the momentum scale should affect all measured $Y(nS)$ similarly, we constrain the masses of the excited states such that their ratio matches the Particle Data Group (PDG) world-average values [61] as follows: $(m(nS)/m(1S))_{fit} = (m(nS)/m(1S))_{PDG}$. Similarly, the CB widths are also scaled by the ratio of the PDG mass values.

The parameters governing the tail shapes and ratio of CB widths are found to be correlated across kinematic bins. Rather than al-




Fig. 1. Measured dimuon invariant mass distributions (closed circles) for pp (top) and pPb (bottom) collisions. The total unbinned maximum-likelihood fits to the data are shown as solid blue lines, with the background component indicated by dashed blue lines. The individual $Y(1S)$, $Y(2S)$, and $Y(3S)$ signal shapes in pp are depicted as dashed orange lines in the left panel. The dashed red line in the right panel is obtained by scaling the $Y(1S)$, $Y(2S)$, and $Y(3S)$ signal shapes in pPb (solid blue line) under the assumption that R_{pPb} is unity.

lowing the parameters to be completely unconstrained, we instead allow them to vary around their mean values within an interval estimated from a set of preliminary fits. The deviation of each parameter is translated into a Gaussian probability that is multiplied with the fit likelihood. The width of each Gaussian function is set to the RMS value of the corresponding parameter in the preliminary fits. In the case of pPb collisions, the central value of the parameter determining the relative contributions of the two CB functions is constrained in this manner as well.

As a result of the large number of free parameters in the preliminary fits, it is possible for parameters to converge to different values in repeated fits. By fitting the data across all the analysis bins, we find certain parameter values to be normally distributed. Each normally distributed parameter is first restricted to its mean value across the preliminary fits, in order to enable the rest of the parameters to converge consistently across the bins. We take an it-

erative approach to this constraining technique to avoid biasing the final parameter values. The mean values of parameters from preliminary fits are obtained separately in different rapidity regions to allow for differences in Y meson reconstruction resolution in the barrel and end-cap regions of the detector, where muons pass through different amounts of material and are detected using different technologies.

The background is modeled with a shifted and scaled error function multiplied by an exponential. The exponential function models the dominant combinatorial background, which falls with increasing dimuon invariant mass according to a statistical phase space factor. The use of an error function is motivated by the effect of the $p_T^\mu > 4 \text{ GeV}/c$ selection applied to single muons, which produces a hump-like feature in the combinatorial background at low invariant masses and at low dimuon p_T^μ . For dimuon $p_T^\mu > 6 \text{ GeV}/c$, this feature moves to lower invariant masses outside the fit region and we model the background solely with an exponential function.

4.2. Acceptance and efficiency corrections

The $Y(nS)$ yields that are extracted using fits to the invariant mass spectra are corrected to account for geometric limitations of the detector and inefficiencies of the online and offline selection algorithms. The dedicated MC simulations of $Y(nS)$ decays are used to determine the acceptance, which is the fraction of generated Y mesons in a given kinematic region that decay to muons satisfying the kinematic requirements applied in this analysis.

The efficiency of dimuon reconstruction, event triggering, and muon identification are studied using dedicated MC simulations of $Y(nS)$ decays, after they have undergone full detector response simulation. The dimuon efficiency is determined as the fraction of generated Y mesons in simulation that are identified as such, having satisfied all the same conditions that are required of muon pairs in collision data. Since pure PYTHIA-based MC samples are used for pPb collisions, we verify that the efficiency correction does not exhibit any dependence on multiplicity. This was also found in the related study of charmonium states reconstructed via muon pairs in pPb collisions [38].

Additional corrections are estimated to compensate for possible discrepancies between simulation and data efficiencies. To estimate such discrepancies, muon triggering, track reconstruction, and identification efficiencies are measured using single muons from prompt J/ψ meson decays in both simulation and data, as described in Ref. [48]. The ratios of the single-muon detection efficiencies between J/ψ data and simulation are estimated. These ratios differ significantly from unity in the case of muon triggering and identification in pPb collisions and muon triggering and track reconstruction in pp collisions. These ratios are used to correct the simulation-based efficiencies. For the bulk of muons in this analysis this correction to the efficiencies is small ($\sim 1\%$, but for some regions of phase space it can grow to at most 10%).

4.3. Systematic uncertainties

Typical ranges of total and individual sources of systematic uncertainties in R_{pPb} and R_{FB} for all three $Y(nS)$ states are tabulated in Table 1. Two important sources of systematic uncertainty in the $Y(nS)$ yields originate from an incomplete knowledge of the signal and background shapes. The signal shape systematic uncertainty is estimated using an alternative fit model of the signal, consisting of a single CB function in combination with a Gaussian function. This alternative fit model provides a comparable goodness-of-fit to the nominal one. For the background uncertainty estimation, a similar method of recalculating yields using an alternative fit model for the background is used. Because the background shape evolves

Table 1

Ranges of typical systematic uncertainties in R_{pPb} and R_{FB} for $Y(nS)$. For acceptance and efficiency the range quoted covers the efficiency of all three Y states. The uncertainties in luminosity are global uncertainties that apply to all three Y states. The luminosity uncertainty cancels in the calculation of the R_{FB} .

Source	$Y(1S)$	$Y(2S)$	$Y(3S)$
		R_{pPb}	
Background	0.3–12%	1–6%	2–8%
Signal	1–8%	2–10%	3–9%
Acceptance		$\lesssim 1\%$	
Efficiency		4–6%	
Luminosity (pPb)		3.5%	
Luminosity (pp)		2.3%	
		R_{FB}	
Background	2–4%	4–7%	5–7%
Signal	2–3%	2–5%	5–6%
Acceptance		$\lesssim 1\%$	
Efficiency		$\approx 2\%$	

with p_T^μ , the model was varied in different kinematic regions. In higher p_T^μ regions, a power law is used as the alternative background fit model. In lower p_T^μ regions, the background model is constructed from a linear combination of four invariant-mass fits to four p_T^μ subintervals of a MC simulation of dimuon decays.

When estimating systematic uncertainties in the $Y(nS)$ yields using nominal and alternative models for signal and background distributions, we employ a method which helps to reduce the contribution of statistical fluctuations. We perform pseudo-experiments where we generate a set of invariant mass distributions by MC sampling the shape fitted to the dimuon invariant mass spectra in each analysis bin. Each generated invariant-mass distribution is fitted separately with the nominal and alternative signal models, using the nominal background model in both cases. The systematic uncertainty is evaluated as the mean of absolute values of relative differences between yields extracted using the nominal and alternative models. Similarly, additional pseudo-experiments are performed to estimate the uncertainty associated to the choice of the background model.

The procedure for constraining the parameters of the signal model introduces another source of systematic uncertainty. In order to estimate the systematic uncertainty on the yields we perform a set of preliminary fits to the dedicated $Y(nS)$ MC simulations, in which the parameter phase space is iteratively reduced in the same way as for data. For each parameter, we use the mean value obtained from the last iteration of MC fits as an alternative value for the mean of the Gaussian probability function used to constrain the parameters when fitting to data. In the case of pPb, the value of the parameter determining the relative contributions of the two CB functions in the free-parameter fit to MC is used as its alternative value. We compare the yields from the nominal fits with those extracted using the alternative mean of the constraining Gaussians and calculate the deviations of the yields for each constrained parameter. The largest of these deviations is assigned as the systematic uncertainty.

Systematic uncertainties in the acceptance corrections are estimated by varying the parameters of the fit used to weight MC p_T^μ spectra within uncertainties, and recording the largest produced deviation. For the R_{pPb} measurement, the Y states are assumed to be unpolarized in both pp and pPb collisions. We also assume that if the production mechanism of $Y(nS)$ leads to a different polarization, that it remains the same for both pp and pPb collisions. As a consequence, the acceptance ratio under a different polarization scenario will remain equal to unity. Therefore the uncertainty in the polarization would not affect the nuclear modification factor.

Systematic uncertainties in efficiency corrections are estimated by combining two sources in quadrature. The first is the uncertainty in weighting MC p_T^μ spectra, which is estimated by de-




Fig. 2. Cross section times dimuon branching fraction of $Y(1S)$ (red circles), $Y(2S)$ (blue squares), and $Y(3S)$ (green diamonds) as functions of p_T^Y (left) and y_{CM}^Y (right) in pPb (upper row) and pp (lower row) collisions. For pPb collisions, the p-going side corresponds to $y_{CM}^Y > 0$. Because pp collisions are symmetric in the center-of-mass frame, the absolute value of rapidity $|y_{CM}^Y|$ is used in the lower right panel. Vertical bars represent statistical and fit uncertainties and filled boxes represent systematic uncertainties. A 3.5 (2.3)% global uncertainty in determining the integrated luminosity of pPb (pp) collisions, applicable to all points, is not included in the point-by-point uncertainties.

termining the efficiency using the MC samples with and without weighting. The second source of uncertainty arises from the data-to-simulation ratio of single-muon detection efficiencies that are used to correct the purely simulation-based dimuon efficiencies. The systematic uncertainty in the efficiency of each stage of muon detection (triggering, tracking, muon identification) is studied by varying the selection criterion for that stage, while the statistical uncertainty is determined by repeating such variations one hundred times and estimating the standard deviation.

The total systematic uncertainty from uncorrelated sources is obtained by combining the uncertainties in quadrature in the signal and background extractions, as well as in the acceptance and efficiency corrections. The combined systematic uncertainty in the results increases slightly with increasing $|y_{CM}^Y|$ and with decreasing p_T^Y . Because of the asymmetry of pPb collisions, the most forward y_{CM}^Y bins, which are at the edge of the detector, have larger systematic uncertainty than the most backward y_{CM}^Y bins because the latter are closer to $y_{lab}^Y = 0$. The total systematic uncertainty also increases with increasing event activity for integrated p_T^Y and y_{CM}^Y .

5. Results

The product of the branching fraction of $Y(nS)$ to muon pairs, $\mathcal{B}(Y(nS) \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)$, and the double-differential production cross section, $d^2\sigma/dp_T^Y dy_{CM}^Y$, is obtained as:

$$\mathcal{B}(Y(nS) \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-) \frac{d^2\sigma}{dp_T^Y dy_{CM}^Y} = \frac{N_{Fit}^{Y(nS)} / (a\varepsilon)}{\mathcal{L}_{int} \Delta p_T^{\mu\mu} \Delta y_{CM}^{\mu\mu}}, \quad (1)$$

where $N_{Fit}^{Y(nS)}$ is the yield of $Y(nS)$ mesons extracted from the fit in a given $(p_T^{\mu\mu}, y_{CM}^{\mu\mu})$ bin, a is the dimuon acceptance correction, ε is the dimuon efficiency correction, and \mathcal{L}_{int} is the integrated luminosity. Fig. 2 (upper row) shows the cross sections of $Y(1S)$, $Y(2S)$, and $Y(3S)$ in pPb collisions as functions of p_T^Y (left) and y_{CM}^Y (right). The error bars on the points are those from the fits to obtain the yields, which take into account the Poisson statistical uncertainties in the invariant mass distribution and the uncertainties associated with correlations between the parameters used in the probability density functions to fit the data. The filled boxes

represent the systematic uncertainties, as discussed in the previous section. When investigating the pPb cross section dependence on p_T^Y and when determining the R_{pPb} and R_{FB} , we restrict the CM rapidity range to the symmetric region $|y_{CM}^{YY}| < 1.93$ where data for both pp and pPb collisions are available. The $Y(nS)$ cross sections in pp collisions are also determined for $|y_{CM}^Y| < 1.93$ as functions of the kinematic variables. These are shown in Fig. 2 (lower row).

The quantity R_{pPb} is calculated as

$$R_{pPb}(p_T^Y, y_{CM}^Y) = \frac{(d^2\sigma/dp_T^Y dy_{CM}^Y)_{pPb}}{A(d^2\sigma/dp_T^Y dy_{CM}^Y)_{pp}}, \quad (2)$$

where $A = 208$ is the mass number of the Pb nucleus. Results for R_{pPb} are shown in Fig. 3 as functions of p_T^Y and y_{CM}^Y . We observe that all three $Y(nS)$ states are suppressed in pPb relative to pp collisions throughout the kinematic region explored, suggesting modification by CNM effects in pPb collisions. Similar to the PbPb case [36], the level of suppression for each Y state in pPb collisions is consistent with a constant value in the kinematic region studied, although the level of suppression seen in PbPb is much stronger. The ATLAS Collaboration reported an increasing R_{pPb} with p_T^Y for $Y(1S)$ [43] in a similar midrapidity region as in CMS. The CMS data is consistent with no dependence, but the overall p_T^Y dependence of the R_{pPb} ($Y(1S)$) in the two experiments is consistent within uncertainties. Moreover, our data shows no y_{CM}^Y dependence, which is consistent with the ATLAS result.

In the charmonium sector, the CMS Collaboration found hints of an ordered suppression pattern. The R_{pPb} of $\psi(2S)$ was found to be smaller than that of J/ψ [38] in pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV for backward rapidity and $p_T^{J/\psi} < 10$ GeV/c [39]. The results presented here suggest a similar ordered suppression of the Y states in the backward rapidity region as well as across the entire p_T^Y region studied. The measured R_{pPb} ($Y(1S)$) is systematically larger than that of $Y(2S)$, which in turn is systematically larger than the R_{pPb} ($Y(3S)$), suggesting different levels of modification to the three states by final-state effects in these regions. In the forward rapidity region, the measured R_{pPb} of the three states appear more mutually consistent.

We further compare the y_{CM}^Y dependence of the measured R_{pPb} to predictions from three CNM models: shadowing, energy loss, and comover interaction. The shadowing calculations incorporate next-to-leading order nuclear modifications of the PDFs (nPDFs) [16], according to EPS09 [62]. Predictions using coherent energy loss [17] are made with and without using EPS09. Since they affect the quarkonium system before hadronization, both shadowing and energy loss are initial-state effects. Finally, predictions using the comover interaction model (CIM) [18] are provided with two different leading-order nPDF calculations: EPS09 and nCTEQ15 [63]. Since the comovers in the CIM interact with the quarkonium system after hadronization, it is deemed to be a final-state CNM effect.

In Fig. 4, the measured R_{pPb} ($Y(1S)$) is compared to predictions from shadowing [16] (top) and predictions using energy loss only and energy loss with shadowing [17] (bottom). The uncertainty in the models comes from the nPDFs. The combined energy loss with shadowing model is in better agreement with our data, but given the current uncertainties in theory and experiment, the models using only shadowing or energy loss cannot be ruled out. The shadowing model, which includes only initial-state effects, predicts equal modification of all bottomonium states and therefore is incompatible with the $Y(2S)$ and $Y(3S)$ data.

In contrast to shadowing and energy-loss models, the CIM predicts different degrees of modification for the $Y(1S)$, $Y(2S)$, and $Y(3S)$ states [18,40], since higher excited states have a larger size




Fig. 3. R_{pPb} of $Y(1S)$ (red circles), $Y(2S)$ (blue squares), and $Y(3S)$ (green diamonds) as functions of p_T^Y (top) and y_{CM}^Y (bottom), where the right panel is integrated over $p_T^Y < 30$ GeV/c. Vertical bars on the points represent statistical and fit uncertainties and filled boxes represent systematic uncertainties. The gray box around the line at unity represents the global uncertainty due to luminosity normalization (4.2%).

and hence increased comover interactions. In addition, comover modification of quarkonium states is expected to be stronger in regions where the comover densities are larger, such as in the nucleus-going direction in asymmetric proton-nucleus collisions and in regions of higher event activity. Fig. 5 shows comparisons of predicted R_{pPb} in the CIM [18], including shadowing corrections from both nCTEQ15 and EPS09 nPDFs, with the measured R_{pPb} for $Y(1S)$ (upper left), $Y(2S)$ (upper right), and $Y(3S)$ (lower). The CIM R_{pPb} predictions show similar ordered suppression to that found in the data, an effect missing in models with only initial-state effects.

By comparing the R_{pPb} ($Y(nS)$) in the forward (proton-going) and backward (lead-going) directions, we can investigate the dependence of bottomonium suppression on the amount of nuclear matter present. Fig. 6 shows the R_{pPb} of $Y(nS)$ states for $-1.93 < y_{CM}^Y < 0$ and $0 < y_{CM}^Y < 1.93$ in the low- p_T^Y (top) and high- p_T^Y (bottom) regions. We find indication of greater differences between the suppression levels of low- p_T^Y $Y(nS)$ states in the lead-going versus the proton-going y_{CM}^Y directions. A similar observation was made by CMS in the charmonium sector [39], where the modi-




Fig. 4. R_{ppb} of $Y(1S)$ (red circles) versus y_{CM}^Y with initial-state model calculations: nPDF modification [16] (top) and energy loss (E. Loss) with and without shadowing corrections [17] (bottom). The uncertainty range for each model calculation is shown. Vertical bars on the points represent statistical and fit uncertainties and filled boxes represent systematic uncertainties. The gray box around the line at unity represents the global uncertainty due to luminosity normalization (4.2%).

modification levels of $\psi(2S)$ and J/ψ with $p_T < 10 \text{ GeV}/c$ were more separated in the backward region, whereas both states experienced similar modification in the forward region.

We study the forward-backward production ratio of Y mesons in pPb collisions defined as follows:

$$R_{\text{FB}}(p_T^Y, y_{\text{CM}}^Y > 0) = \frac{(d^2\sigma(p_T^Y, y_{\text{CM}}^Y)/dp_T^Y dy_{\text{CM}}^Y)}{(d^2\sigma(p_T^Y, -y_{\text{CM}}^Y)/dp_T^Y dy_{\text{CM}}^Y)}, \quad (3)$$

where y_{CM}^Y is positive. We measure event activity near the measured Y meson using the number of reconstructed tracks, N_{tracks} , in the region $|\eta_{\text{lab}}| < 2.4$ (a detailed discussion of the event-activity variables can be found in Ref. [44]). To measure event activity further from the Y meson, we use the sum of deposited transverse energy E_T in $4 < |\eta_{\text{lab}}| < 5.2$. Fig. 7 shows the R_{FB} as a function N_{tracks} (top), and E_T (bottom). The uncorrected mean values of the event activity variables in minimum bias pPb collisions are $\langle N_{\text{tracks}} \rangle = 41$ and $\langle E_T \rangle = 14.7 \text{ GeV}$. The measured R_{FB} remains consistent with unity at all levels of event activity for all three Y states. This observation is independent of the η region used to measure event activity. The ALICE Collaboration determined a value

of R_{FB} consistent with unity for $Y(1S)$ for integrated event activity for Y mesons in the forward ($2.03 < y_{\text{CM}}^Y < 3.53$) and backward ($-4.46 < y_{\text{CM}}^Y < -2.96$) rapidity regions [42]. The LHCb Collaboration also measured $Y(1S)$ R_{FB} in the forward ($1.5 < y_{\text{CM}}^Y < 4.0$) and backward ($-5.0 < y_{\text{CM}}^Y < -2.5$) rapidity regions and reported an integrated R_{FB} of slightly less than unity [41]. In contrast to Y results reported here, the R_{FB} for prompt and nonprompt J/ψ were found by CMS to decrease with increasing E_T [38].

Fig. 8 shows the integrated R_{ppb} of Y states as well as the R_{AA} observed in PbPb collisions [36] at $\sqrt{s_{\text{NN}}} = 5.02 \text{ TeV}$. The 95% confidence level upper limit on the $Y(3S)$ R_{AA} is depicted using an arrow. The data indicate an ordering of nuclear modification for the Y family with $R_{\text{ppb}}(1S) > R_{\text{ppb}}(2S) > R_{\text{ppb}}(3S)$:

$$R_{\text{ppb}}(Y(1S)) = 0.806 \pm 0.024 (\text{stat}) \pm 0.059 (\text{syst}),$$

$$R_{\text{ppb}}(Y(2S)) = 0.702 \pm 0.041 (\text{stat}) \pm 0.058 (\text{syst}),$$

$$R_{\text{ppb}}(Y(3S)) = 0.536 \pm 0.058 (\text{stat}) \pm 0.050 (\text{syst}).$$

We determine the p -value of the observed suppression of Y states in pPb relative to pp collisions against the hypothesis of A -scaling, which predicts no nuclear modification. Given the uncertainties in the measured R_{ppb} values for $Y(1S)$, $Y(2S)$, and $Y(3S)$, we determine these p -values to be 1.16×10^{-3} , 1.36×10^{-5} , and 6.84×10^{-10} , respectively.

Given that initial-state CNM models predict equal nuclear modification to all three Y states in contrast to final-state CNM, which result in different levels of nuclear modification, we can determine the p -value of the observed additional suppression of each excited state compared to the ground state. This can be done under the hypothesis that no final-state CNM effects are evident, and the R_{ppb} of the excited and ground states are equal. The p -values of the measured lower R_{ppb} values of the excited states relative to $Y(1S)$ are 1.24×10^{-1} for $Y(2S)$ and 1.02×10^{-3} for $Y(3S)$, corresponding to significances of 1.2 and 3.1 standard deviations, respectively.

Fig. 8 illustrates that the measured modifications in $Y(nS)$ production in pPb collisions are considerably smaller than those seen in PbPb collisions [36]. A direct comparison of the R_{AA} to the R_{ppb} requires model-dependent scaling of the R_{ppb} to reflect modification by two lead nuclei in PbPb collisions instead of one. Such a comparison of the observed modification effect of CNM on bottomonia in pPb to the nucleus-nucleus collision environment is needed to determine whether hot nuclear matter effects in the QGP result in additional suppression of bottomonia in PbPb. Additional modification in PbPb compared to pPb collisions is expected from the presence of color deconfinement as predicted by Refs. [2,3,5,7,64], and by larger comover interaction effects in the dense medium [18].

Tabulated results are provided in the HEPData record for this analysis [65].

6. Summary

The $Y(nS)$ (where $n = 1, 2, 3$) family is studied in proton-lead (pPb) collisions at $\sqrt{s_{\text{NN}}} = 5.02 \text{ TeV}$ and the production cross sections are presented. Using pp collision data obtained at the same collision energy, the nuclear modification factors R_{ppb} in pPb collisions for the three Y states are measured. Compared to the hypothesis of scaling by the number of nucleons A , we find the $Y(nS)$ yields to be suppressed. This suppression is observed over the entire kinematic range that is studied, i.e., transverse momentum $p_T^Y < 30 \text{ GeV}/c$ and center-of-mass rapidity $|y_{\text{CM}}^Y| < 1.93$. The suppression level is constant both as a function of p_T^Y and of y_{CM}^Y




Fig. 5. R_{pPb} versus y_{CM}^Y with CIM predictions [18] with shadowing corrections using nCTEQ15 and EPS09 for Y(1S) (upper left; red circles), Y(2S) (upper right; blue squares) and Y(3S) (lower; green diamonds). The uncertainty range for each model calculation is shown. Vertical bars on the points represent statistical and fit uncertainties and filled boxes represent systematic uncertainties. The gray box around the line at unity represents the global uncertainty due to luminosity normalization (4.2%).

within the experimental uncertainties. An indication of higher separation of the excited states with $p_T^Y < 6 \text{ GeV}/c$ is observed in the Pb-going direction.

The forward-backward production ratios R_{FB} of Y(nS) states are studied as a function of event activity in two regions: A midrapidity region (where the Y(nS) states were measured), and a region with at least two units of rapidity separation from any measured Y(nS) state. The R_{FB} values are consistent with unity for all states, independent of the region used to measure the event activity.

The integrated nuclear modification factors for Y(nS) in pPb collisions are compared with those measured in PbPb collisions. The nuclear modification factors R_{AA} in PbPb collisions are much smaller than the corresponding R_{pPb} value for each state. However, a similar ordering of the measured R_{pPb} (Y(nS)) is observed, with Y(1S) the least suppressed. This suggests the presence of final-state effects in pPb collisions, consistent with predictions from models that break up the bound quarkonium states via interactions with comoving particles from the underlying event. These results will help us to understand how bottomonia are modified in heavy-ion collisions.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Data availability

box too small

Acknowledgements

We congratulate our colleagues in the CERN accelerator departments for the excellent performance of the LHC and thank the technical and administrative staffs at CERN and at other CMS institutes for their contributions to the success of the CMS effort. In addition, we gratefully acknowledge the computing centers and personnel of the Worldwide LHC Computing Grid and other centers for delivering so effectively the computing infrastructure essential to our analyses. Finally, we acknowledge the enduring support for the construction and operation of the LHC, the CMS detector, and the supporting computing infrastructure provided by




Fig. 6. R_{pPb} of Y(1S) (red circles), Y(2S) (blue squares), and Y(3S) (green diamonds) at forward and backward rapidity for $0 < p_T^Y < 6$ GeV/c (top) and $6 < p_T^Y < 30$ GeV/c (bottom). The points are shifted horizontally for better visibility. Vertical bars on the points represent statistical and fit uncertainties and filled boxes represent systematic uncertainties. The gray box around the line at unity represents the global uncertainty due to luminosity normalization (4.2%).

the following funding agencies: BMBWF and FWF (Austria); FNRS and FWO (Belgium); CNPq, CAPES, FAPERJ, FAPERGS, and FAPESP (Brazil); MES and BNSF (Bulgaria); CERN; CAS, MOST, and NSFC (China); MINCIENCIAS (Colombia); MSES and CSF (Croatia); RIF (Cyprus); SENESCYT (Ecuador); MoER, ERC PUT and ERDF (Estonia); Academy of Finland, MEC, and HIP (Finland); CEA and CNRS/IN2P3 (France); BMBF, DFG, and HGF (Germany); GSRI (Greece); NK-FIA (Hungary); DAE and DST (India); IPM (Iran); SFI (Ireland); INFN (Italy); MSIP and NRF (Republic of Korea); MES (Latvia); LAS (Lithuania); MOE and UM (Malaysia); BUAP, CINVESTAV, CONACYT, LNS, SEP, and UASLP-FAI (Mexico); MOS (Montenegro); MBIE (New Zealand); PAEC (Pakistan); MSHE and NSC (Poland); FCT (Portugal); JINR (Dubna); MON, ROSATOM, RAS, RFBR, and NRC KI (Russia); MESTD (Serbia); MCIN/AEI and PCTI (Spain); MoSTR (Sri Lanka); Swiss Funding Agencies (Switzerland); MST (Taipei); ThEPCenter, IPST, STAR, and NSTDA (Thailand); TUBITAK and TAEK (Turkey); NASU (Ukraine); STFC (United Kingdom); DOE and NSF (USA).

Individuals have received support from the Marie-Curie program and the European Research Council and Horizon 2020 Grant, contract Nos. 675440, 724704, 752730, 758316, 765710, 824093, 884104, and COST Action CA16108 (European Union); the Lev-




Fig. 7. R_{FB} versus N_{tracks} at mid-pseudorapidity (top) and vs. E_T at forward/backward pseudorapidity (bottom) of Y(1S) (red circles), Y(2S) (blue squares), and Y(3S) (green diamonds) for $p_T^Y < 30$ GeV/c and $|y_{CM}^Y| < 1.93$. Vertical bars on the points represent statistical and fit uncertainties and filled boxes represent systematic uncertainties. For Y(3S), a wide bin is used for high event activity, with the width indicated by a horizontal bar.

entis Foundation; the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation; the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation; the Belgian Federal Science Policy Office; the Fonds pour la Formation à la Recherche dans l'Industrie et dans l'Agriculture (FRIA-Belgium); the Agentschap voor Innovatie door Wetenschap en Technologie (IWT-Belgium); the F.R.S.-FNRS and FWO (Belgium) under the "Excellence of Science - EOS" - be.h project n. 30820817; the Beijing Municipal Science & Technology Commission, No. Z191100007219010; The Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (MEYS) of the Czech Republic; the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG), under Germany's Excellence Strategy - EXC 2121 "Quantum Universe" - 390833306, and under project number 400140256 - GRK2497; the Lendület ("Momentum") Program and the János Bolyai Research Scholarship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, the New National Excellence Program ÚNKP, the NKFI research grants 123842, 123959, 124845, 124850, 125105, 128713, 128786, and 129058 (Hungary); the Council of Science and Industrial Research, India; the Latvian Council of Science; the Ministry of Science and Higher Education and the National Science Center, contracts Opus 2014/15/B/ST2/03998 and 2015/19/B/ST2/02861 (Poland); the Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, grant CEECIND/01334/2018




Fig. 8. R_{pPb} of $Y(1S)$, $Y(2S)$ and $Y(3S)$ (red circles) for the integrated kinematic range $0 < p_T^Y < 30 \text{ GeV}/c$ and $|y_{CM}^Y| < 1.93$. The R_{pPb} results are compared to the CMS results on $Y(nS)$ R_{AA} (blue squares for $Y(1S)$ and $Y(2S)$ and blue arrow for the upper limit at 95% confidence level (CL) on $Y(3S)$) for $0 < p_T^Y < 30 \text{ GeV}/c$ and $|y_{CM}^Y| < 2.4$, at the same energy [36]. Vertical bars represent statistical and fit uncertainties and filled boxes around points represent systematic uncertainties. The gray and red boxes around the line at unity depict the uncertainty in the pp and pPb luminosity normalizations (2.3 and 3.5%), respectively. The blue box around unity depicts the global uncertainty pertaining to PbPb data ($^{+3.6\%}_{-4.1\%}$) [36].

(Portugal); the National Priorities Research Program by Qatar National Research Fund; the Ministry of Science and Higher Education, projects no. 0723-2020-0041 and no. FSWW-2020-0008 (Russia); MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033, ERDF “a way of making Europe”, and the Programa Estatal de Fomento de la Investigación Científica y Técnica de Excelencia María de Maeztu, grant MDM-2017-0765 and Programa Severo Ochoa del Principado de Asturias (Spain); the Stavros Niarchos Foundation (Greece); the Rachadapisek Sompot Fund for Postdoctoral Fellowship, Chulalongkorn University and the Chulalongkorn Academic into Its 2nd Century Project Advancement Project (Thailand); the Kavli Foundation; the Nvidia Corporation; the SuperMicro Corporation; the Welch Foundation, contract C-1845; and the Weston Havens Foundation (USA).

References

[1] T. Matsui, H. Satz, J/ψ suppression by quark-gluon plasma formation, Phys. Lett. B 178 (1986) 416, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693\(86\)91404-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693(86)91404-8).
[2] J.W. Harris, B. Müller, The search for the quark gluon plasma, Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. 46 (1996) 71, <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.nucl.46.1.71>, arXiv:hep-ph/9602235.
[3] J.F. Guion, R. Vogt, Determining the existence and nature of the quark-gluon plasma by upsilon suppression at the LHC, Nucl. Phys. B 492 (1997) 301, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0550-3213\(97\)80037-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0550-3213(97)80037-5), arXiv:hep-ph/9610420.
[4] S. Kim, P. Petreczky, A. Rothkopf, In-medium quarkonium properties from a lattice QCD based effective field theory, Nucl. Phys. A 956 (2016) 713, arXiv:1512.05289.
[5] A. Emerick, X. Zhao, R. Rapp, Bottomonia in the quark-gluon plasma and their production at RHIC and LHC, Eur. Phys. J. A 48 (2012) 72, <https://doi.org/10.1140/epja/i2012-12072-y>, arXiv:1111.6537.
[6] A. Rothkopf, What lattice QCD spectral functions can tell us about heavy quarkonium in the QGP, PoS ICHEP2016 (2016) 362, <https://doi.org/10.22323/1.282.0362>, arXiv:1611.06517.
[7] A. Andronic, et al., Heavy-flavour and quarkonium production in the LHC era: from proton-proton to heavy-ion collisions, Eur. Phys. J. C 76 (2016) 107, <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-015-3819-5>, arXiv:1506.03981.
[8] S. Digo, P. Petreczky, H. Satz, Quarkonium feed down and sequential suppression, Phys. Rev. D 64 (2001) 094015, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.64.094015>, arXiv:hep-ph/0106017.
[9] Y. Burnier, O. Kaczmarek, A. Rothkopf, Quarkonium at finite temperature: towards realistic phenomenology from first principles, J. High Energy Phys. 12 (2015) 101, [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP12\(2015\)101](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP12(2015)101), arXiv:1509.07366.

[10] M. Laine, O. Philipsen, P. Romatschke, M. Tassler, Real-time static potential in hot QCD, J. High Energy Phys. 03 (2007) 054, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2007/03/054>, arXiv:hep-ph/0611300.
[11] J.-P. Blaizot, D. De Boni, P. Faccioli, G. Garberoglio, Heavy quark bound states in a quark-gluon plasma: dissociation and recombination, Nucl. Phys. A 946 (2016) 49, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nuclphysa.2015.10.011>, arXiv:1503.03857.
[12] S. Chen, M. He, Gluo-dissociation of heavy quarkonium in the quark-gluon plasma reexamined, Phys. Rev. C 96 (2017) 034901, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.96.034901>, arXiv:1705.10110.
[13] M.C. Chu, T. Matsui, Dynamic Debye screening for a heavy-quark-anti-quark pair traversing a quark-gluon plasma, Phys. Rev. D 39 (1989) 1892, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.39.1892>.
[14] N. Brambilla, J. Ghiglieri, A. Vairo, P. Petreczky, Static quark-antiquark pairs at finite temperature, Phys. Rev. D 78 (2008) 014017, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.78.014017>, arXiv:0804.0993.
[15] Y. Burnier, A. Rothkopf, Complex heavy-quark potential and Debye mass in a gluonic medium from lattice QCD, Phys. Rev. D 95 (2017) 054511, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.95.054511>, arXiv:1607.04049.
[16] R. Vogt, Shadowing effects on J/ψ and Υ production at energies available at the CERN Large Hadron Collider, Phys. Rev. C 92 (2015) 034909, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.92.034909>, arXiv:1507.04418.
[17] F. Arleo, S. Peigné, Quarkonium suppression in heavy-ion collisions from coherent energy loss in cold nuclear matter, J. High Energy Phys. 10 (2014) 073, [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP10\(2014\)073](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP10(2014)073), arXiv:1407.5054.
[18] E.G. Ferreira, J.-P. Lansberg, Is bottomonium suppression in proton-nucleus and nucleus-nucleus collisions at LHC energies due to the same effects?, J. High Energy Phys. 10 (2018) 094, [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP10\(2018\)094](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP10(2018)094), arXiv:1804.04474; Erratum: [10.1007/JHEP03\(2019\)063](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP03(2019)063).
[19] CMS Collaboration, Observation of long-range near-side angular correlations in proton-proton collisions at the LHC, J. High Energy Phys. 09 (2010) 091, [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP09\(2010\)091](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP09(2010)091), arXiv:1009.4122.
[20] CMS Collaboration, Observation of long-range, near-side angular correlations in pPb collisions at the LHC, Phys. Lett. B 718 (2013) 795, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2012.11.025>, arXiv:1210.5482.
[21] ALICE Collaboration, Enhanced production of multi-strange hadrons in high-multiplicity proton-proton collisions, Nat. Phys. 13 (2017) 535, <https://doi.org/10.1038/nphys4111>, arXiv:1606.07424.
[22] CMS Collaboration, Evidence for collective multiparticle correlations in p-Pb collisions, Phys. Rev. Lett. 115 (2015) 012301, <https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevlett.115.012301>, arXiv:1502.05382.
[23] ATLAS Collaboration, Observation of associated near-side and away-side long-range correlations in $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV proton-lead collisions with the ATLAS detector, Phys. Rev. Lett. 110 (2013) 182302, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.110.182302>, arXiv:1212.5198.
[24] ATLAS Collaboration, Measurements of long-range azimuthal anisotropies and associated Fourier coefficients for pp collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ and 13 TeV and p+Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV with the ATLAS detector, Phys. Rev. C 96 (2017) 024908, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.96.024908>, arXiv:1609.06213.
[25] ATLAS Collaboration, Measurement of azimuthal anisotropy of muons from charm and bottom hadrons in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector, Phys. Rev. Lett. 124 (2020) 082301, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.124.082301>, arXiv:1909.01650.
[26] K. Dusling, W. Li, B. Schenke, Novel collective phenomena in high-energy proton-proton and proton-nucleus collisions, Int. J. Mod. Phys. E 25 (2016) 1630002, <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218301316300022>, arXiv:1509.07939.
[27] R. Vogt, Cold nuclear matter effects on J/ψ and Υ production at the LHC, Phys. Rev. C 81 (2010) 044903, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.81.044903>, arXiv:1003.3497.
[28] M. Strickland, Thermal bottomonium suppression, AIP Conf. Proc. 1520 (2013) 179, <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4795953>, arXiv:1207.5327.
[29] F. Arleo, S. Peigné, Heavy-quarkonium suppression in p-A collisions from parton energy loss in cold QCD matter, J. High Energy Phys. 03 (2013) 122, [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP03\(2013\)122](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP03(2013)122), arXiv:1212.0434.
[30] B. Krouppa, A. Rothkopf, M. Strickland, Bottomonium suppression using a lattice QCD vetted potential, Phys. Rev. D 97 (2018) 016017, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.97.016017>, arXiv:1710.02319.
[31] B. Chen, J. Zhao, Bottomonium continuous production from unequilibrium bottom quarks in ultrarelativistic heavy ion collisions, Phys. Lett. B 772 (2017) 819, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2017.07.054>, arXiv:1704.05622.
[32] X. Du, R. Rapp, M. He, Color screening and regeneration of bottomonia in high-energy heavy-ion collisions, Phys. Rev. C 96 (2017) 054901, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.96.054901>, arXiv:1706.08670.
[33] CMS Collaboration, Indications of suppression of excited Υ states in PbPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV, Phys. Rev. Lett. 107 (2011) 052302, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.107.052302>, arXiv:1105.4894.
[34] CMS Collaboration, Suppression of $\Upsilon(1S)$, $\Upsilon(2S)$ and $\Upsilon(3S)$ production in PbPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV, Phys. Lett. B 770 (2017) 357, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2017.04.031>, arXiv:1611.01510.

- [35] CMS Collaboration, Suppression of excited Υ states relative to the ground state in Pb-Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV, Phys. Rev. Lett. 120 (2018) 142301, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.120.142301>, arXiv:1706.05984.
- [36] CMS Collaboration, Measurement of nuclear modification factors of $\Upsilon(1S)$, $\Upsilon(2S)$, and $\Upsilon(3S)$ mesons in pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV, Phys. Lett. B 790 (2019) 270, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2019.01.006>, arXiv:1805.09215.
- [37] B. Krouppa, M. Strickland, Predictions for bottomonia suppression in 5.023 tev Pb-Pb collisions, Universe 2 (2016) 16, <https://doi.org/10.3390/universe2030016>, arXiv:1605.03561.
- [38] CMS Collaboration, Measurement of prompt and nonprompt J/ψ production in pp and pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV, Eur. Phys. J. C 77 (2017) 269, <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-4828-3>, arXiv:1702.01462.
- [39] A.M. Sirunyan, et al., CMS, Measurement of prompt $\psi(2S)$ production cross sections in proton-lead and proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV, Phys. Lett. B 790 (2019) 509, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2019.01.058>, arXiv:1805.02248.
- [40] E.G. Ferreira, Excited charmonium suppression in proton-nucleus collisions as a consequence of comovers, Phys. Lett. B 749 (2015) 98, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2015.07.066>, arXiv:1411.0549.
- [41] LHCb Collaboration, Study of Υ production and cold nuclear matter effects in pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5$ TeV, J. High Energy Phys. 07 (2014) 094, [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07\(2014\)094](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07(2014)094), arXiv:1405.5152.
- [42] ALICE Collaboration, Production of inclusive $\Upsilon(1S)$ and $\Upsilon(2S)$ in p-Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV, Phys. Lett. B 740 (2015) 105, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2014.11.041>, arXiv:1410.2234.
- [43] ATLAS Collaboration, Measurement of quarkonium production in proton-lead and proton-proton collisions at 5.02 TeV with the ATLAS detector, Eur. Phys. J. C 78 (2018) 171, <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-018-5624-4>, arXiv:1709.03089.
- [44] CMS Collaboration, Event activity dependence of $Y(nS)$ production in $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV pPb and $\sqrt{s} = 2.76$ TeV pp collisions, J. High Energy Phys. 04 (2014) 103, [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP04\(2014\)103](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP04(2014)103), arXiv:1312.6300.
- [45] CMS Collaboration, Investigation into the event-activity dependence of $\Upsilon(nS)$ relative production in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV, J. High Energy Phys. 11 (2020) 001, [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP11\(2020\)001](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP11(2020)001), arXiv:2007.04277.
- [46] LHCb Collaboration, Study of Υ production in pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 8.16$ TeV, J. High Energy Phys. 11 (2018) 194, [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP11\(2018\)194](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP11(2018)194), arXiv:1810.07655.
- [47] ALICE Collaboration, Inclusive Υ production in p-Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 8.16$ TeV, Phys. Lett. B 806 (2020) 135486, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2020.135486>, arXiv:1910.14405.
- [48] CMS Collaboration, Performance of CMS muon reconstruction in pp collision events at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV, J. Instrum. 7 (2012) P10002, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/7/10/P10002>, arXiv:1206.4071.
- [49] CMS Collaboration, The CMS experiment at the CERN LHC, J. Instrum. 3 (2008) S08004, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08004>.
- [50] CMS Collaboration, Performance of the CMS level-1 trigger in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 13$ TeV, J. Instrum. 15 (2020) P10017, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/15/10/P10017>, arXiv:2006.10165.
- [51] CMS Collaboration, The CMS trigger system, J. Instrum. 12 (2017) P01020, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/12/01/P01020>, arXiv:1609.02366.
- [52] CMS Collaboration (CMS), CMS Luminosity Calibration for the pp Reference Run at $\sqrt{s} = 5.02$ TeV, CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-LUM-16-001, 2016, <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2235781>.
- [53] CMS Collaboration (CMS), Luminosity Calibration for the 2013 Proton-Lead and Proton-Proton Data Taking, CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-LUM-13-002, 2014, <http://cds.cern.ch/record/1643269>.
- [54] CMS Collaboration (CMS), Technical proposal for the Phase-II upgrade of the Compact Muon Solenoid, CMS Technical proposal CERN-LHCC-2015-010, CMS-TDR-15-02, CERN, 2015, <http://cds.cern.ch/record/2020886>.
- [55] R. Kalman, A new approach to linear filtering and prediction problems, J. Basic Eng. D 82 (1960) 35, <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.3662552>.
- [56] T. Sjöstrand, S. Ask, J.R. Christiansen, R. Corke, N. Desai, P. Ilten, S. Mrenna, S. Prestel, C.O. Rasmussen, P.Z. Skands, An introduction to PYTHIA 8.2, Comput. Phys. Commun. 191 (2015) 159, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpc.2015.01.024>, arXiv:1410.3012.
- [57] CMS Collaboration, Measurement of the $Y(1S)$, $Y(2S)$ and $Y(3S)$ polarizations in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 7$ TeV, Phys. Rev. Lett. 110 (2013) 081802, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.110.081802>, arXiv:1209.2922.
- [58] LHCb Collaboration, Measurement of the Υ polarizations in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 7$ and 8 TeV, J. High Energy Phys. 12 (2017) 110, [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP12\(2017\)110](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP12(2017)110), arXiv:1709.01301.
- [59] S. Agostinelli, et al., GEANT4, GEANT4—a simulation toolkit, Nucl. Instrum. Methods A 506 (2003) 250, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9002\(03\)01368-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9002(03)01368-8).
- [60] M.J. Oreglia, A study of the reactions $\psi' \rightarrow \gamma\gamma\psi$, Ph.D. thesis, Stanford University, 1980, <http://www.slac.stanford.edu/cgi-wrap/getdoc/slac-r-236.pdf>, SLAC Report R-236 p.184.
- [61] Particle Data Group, M. Tanabashi, et al., Review of particle physics, Phys. Rev. D 98 (2018) 030001, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.98.030001>.
- [62] K.J. Eskola, H. Paukkunen, C.A. Salgado, EPS09: a new generation of NLO and LO nuclear parton distribution functions, J. High Energy Phys. 04 (2009) 065, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2009/04/065>, arXiv:0902.4154.
- [63] K. Kovarik, A. Kusina, T. Jezo, D.B. Clark, C. Keppel, F. Lyonnet, J.G. Morfin, F.I. Olness, J.F. Owens, I. Schienbein, J.Y. Yu, nCTEQ15 – global analysis of nuclear parton distributions with uncertainties in the CTEQ framework, Phys. Rev. D 93 (2016) 085037, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.93.085037>, arXiv:1509.00792.
- [64] N. Brambilla, et al., Heavy quarkonium: progress, puzzles, and opportunities, Eur. Phys. J. C 71 (2011) 1534, <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-010-1534-9>, arXiv:1010.5827.
- [65] HEPData record for this analysis, <https://doi.org/10.17182/hepdata.88291.2021>.

The CMS Collaboration

A. Tumasyan

Yerevan Physics Institute, Yerevan, Armenia

W. Adam, F. Ambroggi, T. Bergauer, M. Dragicevic, J. Erö, A. Escalante Del Valle, M. Flechl, R. Frühwirth¹, M. Jeitler¹, N. Krammer, I. Krätschmer, D. Liko, T. Madlener, I. Mikulec, N. Rad, J. Schieck¹, R. Schöfbeck, M. Spanring, W. Waltenberger, C.-E. Wulz¹, M. Zarucki

Institut für Hochenergiephysik, Vienna, Austria

V. Drugakov, V. Mossolov, J. Suarez Gonzalez

Institute for Nuclear Problems, Minsk, Belarus

M.R. Darwish, E.A. De Wolf, D. Di Croce, T. Janssen, T. Kello², A. Lelek, M. Pieters, H. Rejeb Sfar, H. Van Haevermaet, P. Van Mechelen, S. Van Putte, N. Van Remortel

Universiteit Antwerpen, Antwerpen, Belgium

1	F. Blekman, E.S. Bols, S.S. Chhibra, J. D'Hondt, J. De Clercq, D. Lontkovskyi, S. Lowette, I. Marchesini,	67
2	S. Moortgat, Q. Python, S. Tavernier, W. Van Doninck, P. Van Mulders	68
3		69
4	<i>Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussel, Belgium</i>	70
5		71
6	D. Beghin, B. Bilin, B. Clerbaux, G. De Lentdecker, H. Delannoy, B. Dorney, L. Favart, A. Grebenyuk,	72
7	A.K. Kalsi, L. Moureaux, A. Popov, N. Postiau, E. Starling, L. Thomas, C. Vander Velde, P. Vanlaer,	73
8	D. Vannerom	74
9		75
10	<i>Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium</i>	76
11		77
12	T. Cornelis, D. Dobur, I. Khvastunov ³ , M. Niedziela, C. Roskas, K. Skovpen, M. Tytgat, W. Verbeke,	78
13	B. Vermassen, M. Vit	79
14		80
15	<i>Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium</i>	81
16		82
17	G. Bruno, C. Caputo, P. David, C. Delaere, M. Delcourt, A. Giammanco, V. Lemaitre, J. Prisciandaro,	83
18	A. Saggio, P. Vischia, J. Zobec	84
19		85
20	<i>Université Catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium</i>	86
21		87
22	G.A. Alves, G. Correia Silva, C. Hensel, A. Moraes	88
23		89
24	<i>Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Físicas, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil</i>	90
25		91
26	E. Belchior Batista Das Chagas, W. Carvalho, J. Chinellato ⁴ , E. Coelho, E.M. Da Costa, G.G. Da Silveira ⁵ ,	92
27	D. De Jesus Damiao, C. De Oliveira Martins, S. Fonseca De Souza, H. Malbouisson, J. Martins ⁶ ,	93
28	D. Matos Figueiredo, M. Medina Jaime ⁷ , M. Melo De Almeida, C. Mora Herrera, L. Mundim, H. Nogima,	94
29	W.L. Prado Da Silva, P. Rebello Teles, L.J. Sanchez Rosas, A. Santoro, A. Sznajder, M. Thiel,	95
30	E.J. Tonelli Manganote ⁴ , F. Torres Da Silva De Araujo, A. Vilela Pereira	96
31		97
32	<i>Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil</i>	98
33		99
34		100
35	C.A. Bernardes, L. Calligaris, T.R. Fernandez Perez Tomei, E.M. Gregores, D.S. Lemos, P.G. Mercadante,	101
36	S.F. Novaes, Sandra S. Padula	102
37		103
38	^a <i>Universidade Estadual Paulista, São Paulo, Brazil</i>	104
39	^b <i>Universidade Federal do ABC, São Paulo, Brazil</i>	105
40		106
41	A. Aleksandrov, G. Antchev, R. Hadjiiska, P. Iaydjiev, M. Misheva, M. Rodozov, M. Shopova, G. Sultanov	107
42		108
43	<i>Institute for Nuclear Research and Nuclear Energy, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia, Bulgaria</i>	109
44		110
45	M. Bonchev, A. Dimitrov, T. Ivanov, L. Litov, B. Pavlov, P. Petkov, A. Petrov	111
46		112
47	<i>University of Sofia, Sofia, Bulgaria</i>	113
48		114
49	W. Fang ² , X. Gao ² , L. Yuan	115
50		116
51	<i>Beihang University, Beijing, China</i>	117
52		118
53	M. Ahmad, Z. Hu, Y. Wang	119
54		120
55	<i>Department of Physics, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China</i>	121
56		122
57	G.M. Chen ⁸ , H.S. Chen ⁸ , M. Chen, C.H. Jiang, D. Leggat, H. Liao, Z.-A. Liu, A. Spiezia, J. Tao, E. Yazgan,	123
58	H. Zhang, S. Zhang ⁸ , J. Zhao	124
59		125
60	<i>Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing, China</i>	126
61		127
62	A. Agapitos, Y. Ban, G. Chen, A. Levin, J. Li, L. Li, Q. Li, Y. Mao, S.J. Qian, D. Wang, Q. Wang	128
63		129
64	<i>State Key Laboratory of Nuclear Physics and Technology, Peking University, Beijing, China</i>	130
65		131
66	M. Xiao	132

1	Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China, Zhejiang, China	67
2		68
3	C. Avila, A. Cabrera, C. Florez, C.F. González Hernández, M.A. Segura Delgado	69
4		70
5	<i>Universidad de Los Andes, Bogota, Colombia</i>	71
6		72
7	J. Mejia Guisao, J.D. Ruiz Alvarez, C.A. Salazar González, N. Vanegas Arbelaez	73
8		74
9	<i>Universidad de Antioquia, Medellin, Colombia</i>	75
10		76
11	D. Giljanović, N. Godinovic, D. Lelas, I. Puljak, T. Sculac	77
12		78
13	<i>University of Split, Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering and Naval Architecture, Split, Croatia</i>	79
14		80
15	Z. Antunovic, M. Kovac	81
16		82
17	<i>University of Split, Faculty of Science, Split, Croatia</i>	83
18		84
19	V. Brigljevic, D. Ferencek, K. Kadija, D. Majumder, B. Mesic, M. Roguljic, A. Starodumov⁹, T. Susa	85
20		86
21	<i>Institute Rudjer Boskovic, Zagreb, Croatia</i>	87
22		88
23	M.W. Ather, A. Attikis, E. Erodotou, A. Ioannou, M. Kolosova, S. Konstantinou, G. Mavromanolakis,	89
24	J. Mousa, C. Nicolaou, F. Ptochos, P.A. Razis, H. Rykaczewski, H. Saka, D. Tsiakkouri	90
25		91
26	<i>University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus</i>	92
27		93
28	M. Finger¹⁰, M. Finger Jr.¹⁰, A. Kveton, J. Tomsa	94
29		95
30	<i>Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic</i>	96
31		97
32	E. Ayala	98
33		99
34	<i>Escuela Politecnica Nacional, Quito, Ecuador</i>	100
35		101
36	E. Carrera Jarrin	102
37		103
38	<i>Universidad San Francisco de Quito, Quito, Ecuador</i>	104
39		105
40	Y. Assran^{11,12}, E. Salama^{12,13}	106
41		107
42	<i>Academy of Scientific Research and Technology of the Arab Republic of Egypt, Egyptian Network of High Energy Physics, Cairo, Egypt</i>	108
43		109
44	S. Bhowmik, A. Carvalho Antunes De Oliveira, R.K. Dewanjee, K. Ehataht, M. Kadastik, M. Raidal,	110
45	C. Veelken	111
46		112
47	<i>National Institute of Chemical Physics and Biophysics, Tallinn, Estonia</i>	113
48		114
49	P. Eerola, L. Forthomme, H. Kirschenmann, K. Osterberg, M. Voutilainen	115
50		116
51	<i>Department of Physics, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland</i>	117
52		118
53	E. Brücken, F. Garcia, J. Havukainen, J.K. Heikkilä, V. Karimäki, M.S. Kim, R. Kinnunen, T. Lampén,	119
54	K. Lassila-Perini, S. Laurila, S. Lehti, T. Lindén, H. Siikonen, E. Tuominen, J. Tuominiemi	120
55		121
56	<i>Helsinki Institute of Physics, Helsinki, Finland</i>	122
57		123
58	P. Luukka, T. Tuuva	124
59		125
60	<i>Lappeenranta University of Technology, Lappeenranta, Finland</i>	126
61		127
62	M. Besancon, F. Couderc, M. Dejardin, D. Denegri, B. Fabbro, J.L. Faure, F. Ferri, S. Ganjour, A. Givernaud,	128
63	P. Gras, G. Hamel de Monchenault, P. Jarry, C. Leloup, B. Lenzi, E. Locci, J. Malcles, J. Rander,	129
64	A. Rosowsky, M.Ö. Sahin, A. Savoy-Navarro¹⁴, M. Titov, G.B. Yu	130
65		131
66	<i>IRFU, CEA, Université Paris-Saclay, Gif-sur-Yvette, France</i>	132

1 S. Ahuja, C. Amendola, F. Beaudette, M. Bonanomi, P. Busson, C. Charlot, B. Diab, G. Falmagne, 67
 2 R. Granier de Cassagnac, I. Kucher, A. Lobanov, C. Martin Perez, M. Nguyen, C. Ochando, P. Paganini, 68
 3 J. Rembser, R. Salerno, J.B. Sauvan, Y. Sirois, A. Zabi, A. Zghiche 69
 4 70

5 *Laboratoire Leprince-Ringuet, CNRS/IN2P3, Ecole Polytechnique, Institut Polytechnique de Paris, Palaiseau, France* 71
 6 72

7 J.-L. Agram¹⁵, J. Andrea, D. Bloch, G. Bourgatte, J.-M. Brom, E.C. Chabert, C. Collard, E. Conte¹⁵, 73
 8 J.-C. Fontaine¹⁵, D. Gelé, U. Goerlach, C. Grimault, A.-C. Le Bihan, N. Tonon, P. Van Hove 74
 9 75

10 *Université de Strasbourg, CNRS, IPHC UMR 7178, Strasbourg, France* 76
 11 77

12 S. Gadrat 78
 13 79

14 *Centre de Calcul de l'Institut National de Physique Nucleaire et de Physique des Particules, CNRS/IN2P3, Villeurbanne, France* 80
 15 81

16 S. Beauceron, C. Bernet, G. Boudoul, C. Camen, A. Carle, N. Chanon, R. Chierici, D. Contardo, P. Depasse, 82
 17 H. El Mamouni, J. Fay, S. Gascon, M. Gouzevitch, B. Ille, Sa. Jain, I.B. Laktineh, H. Lattaud, A. Lesauvage, 83
 18 M. Lethuillier, L. Mirabito, S. Perries, V. Sordini, L. Torterotot, G. Touquet, M. Vander Donckt, S. Viret 84
 19 85

20 *Institut de Physique des 2 Infinis de Lyon (IP2I), Villeurbanne, France* 86
 21 87

22 A. Khvedelidze¹⁰ 88
 23 89

24 *Georgian Technical University, Tbilisi, Georgia* 90
 25 91

26 Z. Tsamalaidze¹⁰ 92
 27 93

28 *Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia* 94
 29 95

30 C. Autermann, L. Feld, K. Klein, M. Lipinski, D. Meuser, A. Pauls, M. Preuten, M.P. Rauch, J. Schulz, 96
 31 M. Teroerde 97
 32 98

33 *RWTH Aachen University, I. Physikalisches Institut, Aachen, Germany* 99
 34 100

35 M. Erdmann, B. Fischer, S. Ghosh, T. Hebbeker, K. Hoepfner, H. Keller, L. Mastrolorenzo, 101
 36 M. Merschmeyer, A. Meyer, P. Millet, G. Mocellin, S. Mondal, S. Mukherjee, D. Noll, A. Novak, T. Pook, 102
 37 A. Pozdnyakov, T. Quast, M. Radziej, Y. Rath, H. Reithler, J. Roemer, A. Schmidt, S.C. Schuler, A. Sharma, 103
 38 S. Wiedenbeck, S. Zaleski 104
 39 105

40 *RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut A, Aachen, Germany* 106
 41 107

42 G. Flügge, W. Haj Ahmad¹⁶, O. Hlushchenko, T. Kress, T. Müller, A. Nowack, C. Pistone, O. Pooth, D. Roy, 108
 43 H. Sert, A. Stahl¹⁷ 109
 44 110
 45 111

46 *RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut B, Aachen, Germany* 112
 47 113

48 M. Aldaya Martin, P. Asmuss, I. Babounikau, H. Bakhshiansohi, K. Beernaert, O. Behnke, 114
 49 A. Bermúdez Martínez, A.A. Bin Anuar, K. Borras¹⁸, V. Botta, A. Campbell, A. Cardini, P. Connor, 115
 50 S. Consuegra Rodríguez, C. Contreras-Campana, V. Danilov, A. De Wit, M.M. Defranchis, C. Diez Pardos, 116
 51 D. Domínguez Damiani, G. Eckerlin, D. Eckstein, T. Eichhorn, A. Elwood, E. Eren, L.I. Estevez Banos, 117
 52 E. Gallo¹⁹, A. Geiser, A. Grohsjean, M. Guthoff, M. Haranko, A. Harb, A. Jafari, N.Z. Jomhari, H. Jung, 118
 53 A. Kasem¹⁸, M. Kasemann, H. Kaveh, J. Keaveney, C. Kleinwort, J. Knolle, D. Krücker, W. Lange, T. Lenz, 119
 54 J. Lidrych, K. Lipka, W. Lohmann²⁰, R. Mankel, I.-A. Melzer-Pellmann, A.B. Meyer, M. Meyer, M. Missiroli, 120
 55 J. Mnich, A. Mussgiller, V. Myronenko, D. Pérez Adán, S.K. Pflitsch, D. Pitzl, A. Raspereza, A. Saibel, 121
 56 M. Savitskyi, V. Scheurer, P. Schütze, C. Schwanenberger, R. Shevchenko, A. Singh, R.E. Sosa Ricardo, 122
 57 H. Tholen, O. Turkot, A. Vagnerini, M. Van De Klundert, R. Walsh, Y. Wen, K. Wichmann, C. Wissing, 123
 58 O. Zenaiev, R. Zlebck 124
 59 125
 60 126
 61 127
 62 128

63 *Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Hamburg, Germany* 129
 64 130
 65 131
 66 132

1 R. Aggleton, S. Bein, L. Benato, A. Benecke, T. Dreyer, A. Ebrahimi, F. Feindt, A. Fröhlich, C. Garbers, 67
 2 E. Garutti, D. Gonzalez, P. Gunnellini, J. Haller, A. Hinzmann, A. Karavdina, G. Kasieczka, R. Klanner, 68
 3 R. Kogler, N. Kovalchuk, S. Kurz, V. Kutzner, J. Lange, T. Lange, A. Malara, J. Multhaupt, C.E.N. Niemeyer, 69
 4 A. Reimers, O. Rieger, P. Schleper, S. Schumann, J. Schwandt, J. Sonneveld, H. Stadie, G. Steinbrück, 70
 5 B. Vormwald, I. Zoi 71
 6

7 *University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany* 73
 8 74

9 M. Akbiyik, M. Baselga, S. Baur, T. Berger, E. Butz, R. Caspart, T. Chwalek, W. De Boer, A. Dierlamm, 75
 10 K. El Morabit, N. Faltermann, M. Giffels, A. Gottmann, F. Hartmann¹⁷, C. Heidecker, U. Husemann, 76
 11 M.A. Iqbal, S. Kudella, S. Maier, S. Mitra, M.U. Mozer, D. Müller, Th. Müller, M. Musich, A. Nürnberg, 77
 12 G. Quast, K. Rabbertz, D. Savoiu, D. Schäfer, M. Schnepf, M. Schröder, I. Shvetsov, H.J. Simonis, R. Ulrich, 78
 13 M. Wassmer, M. Weber, C. Wöhrmann, R. Wolf, S. Wozniowski 79
 14 80
 15 81

16 *Karlsruher Institut fuer Technologie, Karlsruhe, Germany* 82
 17 83

18 G. Anagnostou, P. Asenov, G. Daskalakis, T. Geralis, A. Kyriakis, D. Loukas, G. Paspalaki, A. Stakia 84
 19 85

20 *Institute of Nuclear and Particle Physics (INPP), NCSR Demokritos, Aghia Paraskevi, Greece* 86
 21 87

22 M. Diamantopoulou, G. Karathanasis, P. Kontaxakis, A. Manousakis-Katsikakis, A. Panagiotou, 88
 23 I. Papavergou, N. Saoulidou, K. Theofilatos, K. Vellidis, E. Vourliotis 89
 24 90

25 *National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece* 91
 26 92

27 G. Bakas, K. Kousouris, I. Papakrivopoulos, G. Tsipolitis, A. Zacharopoulou 93
 28 94

29 *National Technical University of Athens, Athens, Greece* 95
 30 96

31 I. Evangelou, C. Foudas, P. Gianneios, P. Katsoulis, P. Kokkas, S. Mallios, K. Manitaras, N. Manthos, 97
 32 I. Papadopoulos, J. Strologas, F.A. Triantis, D. Tsitsonis 98
 33 99

34 *University of Ioánnina, Ioánnina, Greece* 100
 35 101

36 M. Bartók²¹, R. Chudasama, M. Csanad, P. Major, K. Mandal, A. Mehta, G. Pasztor, O. Surányi, G.I. Veres 102
 37 103

38 *MTA-ELTE Lendület CMS Particle and Nuclear Physics Group, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary* 104
 39 105

40 G. Bencze, C. Hajdu, D. Horvath²², F. Sikler, V. Veszpremi, G. Vesztergombi[†] 106
 41 107

42 *Wigner Research Centre for Physics, Budapest, Hungary* 108
 43 109

44 N. Beni, S. Czellar, J. Karancsi²¹, J. Molnar, Z. Szillasi 110
 45 111

46 *Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary* 112
 47 113

48 P. Raics, D. Teyssier, Z.L. Trocsanyi, B. Ujvari 114
 49 115

50 *Institute of Physics, University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary* 116
 51 117

52 T. Csorgo, W.J. Metzger, F. Nemes, T. Novak 118
 53 119

54 *Karoly Robert Campus, MATE Institute of Technology, Gyongyos, Hungary* 120
 55 121

56 S. Choudhury, J.R. Komaragiri, P.C. Tiwari 122
 57 123

58 *Indian Institute of Science (IISc), Bangalore, India* 124
 59 125

59 S. Bahinipati²⁴, C. Kar, G. Kole, P. Mal, V.K. Muraleedharan Nair Bindhu, A. Nayak²⁵, D.K. Sahoo²⁴, 125
 60 S.K. Swain 126
 61 127

62 *National Institute of Science Education and Research, HBNI, Bhubaneswar, India* 128
 63 129

64 S. Bansal, S.B. Beri, V. Bhatnagar, S. Chauhan, N. Dhingra²⁶, R. Gupta, A. Kaur, M. Kaur, S. Kaur, 130
 65 P. Kumari, M. Lohan, M. Meena, K. Sandeep, S. Sharma, J.B. Singh, A.K. Viridi, G. Walia 131
 66 132

1 Panjab University, Chandigarh, India

2
3 A. Bhardwaj, B.C. Choudhary, R.B. Garg, M. Gola, S. Keshri, A. Kumar, M. Naimuddin, P. Priyanka,
4 K. Ranjan, A. Shah, R. Sharma

5
6 University of Delhi, Delhi, India

7
8 R. Bhardwaj²⁷, M. Bharti²⁷, R. Bhattacharya, S. Bhattacharya, U. Bhawandeep²⁷, D. Bhowmik, S. Dutta,
9 S. Ghosh, B. Gomber²⁸, M. Maity²⁹, K. Mondal, S. Nandan, A. Purohit, P.K. Rout, G. Saha, S. Sarkar,
10 M. Sharan, B. Singh²⁷, S. Thakur²⁷

11
12 Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, HBNI, Kolkata, India

13
14 P.K. Behera, S.C. Behera, P. Kalbhor, A. Muhammad, P.R. Pujahari, A. Sharma, A.K. Sikdar

15
16 Indian Institute of Technology Madras, Madras, India

17
18 D. Dutta, V. Jha, D.K. Mishra, P.K. Netrakanti, L.M. Pant, P. Shukla

19
20 Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, Mumbai, India

21
22 T. Aziz, M.A. Bhat, S. Dugad, G.B. Mohanty, N. Sur, R.K. Verma

23
24 Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-A, Mumbai, India

25
26 S. Banerjee, S. Bhattacharya, S. Chatterjee, P. Das, M. Guchait, S. Karmakar, S. Kumar, G. Majumder,
27 K. Mazumdar, N. Sahoo, S. Sawant

28
29 Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-B, Mumbai, India

30
31 S. Dube, B. Kansal, A. Kapoor, K. Kotheekar, S. Pandey, A. Rane, A. Rastogi, S. Sharma

32
33 Indian Institute of Science Education and Research (IISER), Pune, India

34
35 S. Chenarani, S.M. Etesami, M. Khakzad, M. Mohammadi Najafabadi, M. Naseri, F. Rezaei Hosseinabadi

36
37 Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM), Tehran, Iran

38
39 M. Felcini, M. Grunewald

40
41 University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland

42
43 M. Abbrescia^{a,b}, R. Aly^{a,b,30}, C. Calabria^{a,b}, A. Colaleo^a, D. Creanza^{a,c}, L. Cristella^{a,b}, N. De Filippis^{a,c},
44 M. De Palma^{a,b}, A. Di Florio^{a,b}, W. Elmetenawee^{a,b}, L. Fiore^a, A. Gelmi^{a,b}, G. Iaselli^{a,c}, M. Ince^{a,b},
45 S. Lezki^{a,b}, G. Maggi^{a,c}, M. Maggi^a, J.A. Merlin^a, G. Miniello^{a,b}, S. My^{a,b}, S. Nuzzo^{a,b}, A. Pompili^{a,b},
46 G. Pugliese^{a,c}, R. Radogna^a, A. Ranieri^a, G. Selvaggi^{a,b}, L. Silvestris^a, F.M. Simone^{a,b}, R. Venditti^a,
47 P. Verwilligen^a

48
49
50 ^a INFN Sezione di Bari, Bari, Italy

51 ^b Università di Bari, Bari, Italy

52 ^c Politecnico di Bari, Bari, Italy

53
54 G. Abbiendi^a, C. Battilana^{a,b}, D. Bonacorsi^{a,b}, L. Borgonovi^{a,b}, S. Braibant-Giacomelli^{a,b},
55 R. Campanini^{a,b}, P. Capiluppi^{a,b}, A. Castro^{a,b}, F.R. Cavallo^a, C. Ciocca^a, G. Codispoti^{a,b}, M. Cuffiani^{a,b},
56 G.M. Dallavalle^a, F. Fabbri^a, A. Fanfani^{a,b}, E. Fontanesi^{a,b}, P. Giacomelli^a, L. Giommi^{a,b}, C. Grandi^a,
57 L. Guiducci^{a,b}, F. Iemmi^{a,b}, S. Lo Meo^{a,31}, S. Marcellini^a, G. Masetti^a, F.L. Navarria^{a,b}, A. Perrotta^a,
58 F. Primavera^{a,b}, T. Rovelli^{a,b}, G.P. Siroli^{a,b}, N. Tosi^a

59
60
61 ^a INFN Sezione di Bologna, Bologna, Italy

62 ^b Università di Bologna, Bologna, Italy

63
64 S. Albergo^{a,b,32}, S. Costa^{a,b,32}, A. Di Mattia^a, R. Potenza^{a,b}, A. Tricomi^{a,b,32}, C. Tuve^{a,b}

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

G. Barbagli^a, A. Cassese^a, R. Ceccarelli^{a,b}, V. Ciulli^{a,b}, C. Civinini^a, R. D'Alessandro^{a,b}, F. Fiori^a,
 E. Focardi^{a,b}, G. Latino^{a,b}, P. Lenzi^{a,b}, M. Lizzo^{a,b}, M. Meschini^a, S. Paoletti^a, R. Seidita^{a,b},
 G. Sguazzoni^a, L. Viliiani^a

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

L. Benussi, S. Bianco, D. Piccolo

INFN Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, Frascati, Italy

M. Bozzo^{a,b}, F. Ferro^a, R. Mulargia^{a,b}, E. Robutti^a, S. Tosi^{a,b}^a INFN Sezione di Genova, Genova, Italy^b Università di Genova, Genova, Italy

A. Benaglia^a, A. Beschi^{a,b}, F. Brivio^{a,b}, V. Ciriolo^{a,b,17}, M.E. Dinardo^{a,b}, P. Dini^a, S. Gennai^a,
 A. Ghezzi^{a,b}, P. Govoni^{a,b}, L. Guzzi^{a,b}, M. Malberti^a, S. Malvezzi^a, D. Menasce^a, F. Monti^{a,b}, L. Moroni^a,
 M. Paganoni^{a,b}, D. Pedrini^a, S. Ragazzi^{a,b}, T. Tabarelli de Fatis^{a,b}, D. Valsecchi^{a,b,17}, D. Zuolo^{a,b}

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

S. Buontempo^a, N. Cavallo^{a,c}, A. De Iorio^{a,b}, A. Di Crescenzo^{a,b}, F. Fabozzi^{a,c}, F. Fienga^a, G. Galati^a,
 A.O.M. Iorio^{a,b}, L. Layer^{a,b}, L. Lista^{a,b}, S. Meola^{a,d,17}, P. Paolucci^{a,17}, B. Rossi^a, C. Sciacca^{a,b},
 E. Voevodina^{a,b}

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

P. Azzi^a, N. Bacchetta^a, D. Bisello^{a,b}, A. Boletti^{a,b}, A. Bragagnolo^{a,b}, R. Carlin^{a,b}, P. Checchia^a,
 P. De Castro Manzano^a, T. Dorigo^a, U. Dosselli^a, F. Gasparini^{a,b}, U. Gasparini^{a,b}, A. Gozzelino^a,
 S.Y. Hoh^{a,b}, M. Margoni^{a,b}, A.T. Meneguzzo^{a,b}, J. Pazzini^{a,b}, M. Presilla^b, P. Ronchese^{a,b}, R. Rossin^{a,b},
 F. Simonetto^{a,b}, A. Tiko^a, M. Tosi^{a,b}, M. Zanetti^{a,b}, P. Zotto^{a,b}, A. Zucchetta^{a,b}, G. Zumerle^{a,b}

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

A. Braghieri^a, D. Fiorina^{a,b}, P. Montagna^{a,b}, S.P. Ratti^{a,b}, V. Re^a, M. Ressegotti^{a,b}, C. Riccardi^{a,b},
 P. Salvini^a, I. Vai^a, P. Vitulo^{a,b}

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

M. Biasini^{a,b}, G.M. Bilei^a, D. Ciangottini^{a,b}, L. Fanò^{a,b}, P. Lariccia^{a,b}, R. Leonardi^{a,b}, E. Manoni^a,
 G. Mantovani^{a,b}, V. Mariani^{a,b}, M. Menichelli^a, A. Rossi^{a,b}, A. Santocchia^{a,b}, D. Spiga^a

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

K. Androsov^a, P. Azzurri^a, G. Bagliesi^a, V. Bertacchi^{a,c}, L. Bianchini^a, T. Boccali^a, R. Castaldi^a,
 M.A. Ciocci^{a,b}, R. Dell'Orso^a, S. Donato^a, L. Giannini^{a,c}, A. Giassi^a, M.T. Grippo^a, F. Ligabue^{a,c},
 E. Manca^{a,c}, G. Mandorli^{a,c}, A. Messineo^{a,b}, F. Palla^a, A. Rizzi^{a,b}, G. Rolandi^{a,c}, S. Roy Chowdhury^{a,c},
 A. Scribano^a, P. Spagnolo^a, R. Tenchini^a, G. Tonelli^{a,b}, N. Turini^{a,d}, A. Venturi^a, P.G. Verdini^a

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

^c Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Pisa, Italy

^d Università di Siena, Siena, Italy

F. Cavallari ^a, M. Cipriani ^{a,b}, D. Del Re ^{a,b}, E. Di Marco ^a, M. Diemoz ^a, E. Longo ^{a,b}, P. Meridiani ^a,
G. Organtini ^{a,b}, F. Pandolfi ^a, R. Paramatti ^{a,b}, C. Quaranta ^{a,b}, S. Rahatlou ^{a,b}, C. Rovelli ^a,
F. Santanastasio ^{a,b}, L. Soffi ^{a,b}, R. Tramontano ^{a,b}

^a INFN Sezione di Roma, Rome, Italy

^b Sapienza Università di Roma, Rome, Italy

N. Amapane ^{a,b}, R. Arcidiacono ^{a,c}, S. Argiro ^{a,b}, M. Arneodo ^{a,c}, N. Bartosik ^a, R. Bellan ^{a,b}, A. Bellora ^{a,b},
C. Biino ^a, A. Cappati ^{a,b}, N. Cartiglia ^a, S. Cometti ^a, M. Costa ^{a,b}, R. Covarelli ^{a,b}, N. Demaria ^a,
J.R. González Fernández ^a, B. Kiani ^{a,b}, F. Legger ^a, C. Mariotti ^a, S. Maselli ^a, E. Migliore ^{a,b}, V. Monaco ^{a,b},
E. Monteil ^{a,b}, M. Monteno ^a, M.M. Obertino ^{a,b}, G. Ortona ^a, L. Pacher ^{a,b}, N. Pastrone ^a, M. Pelliccioni ^a,
G.L. Pinna Angioni ^{a,b}, A. Romero ^{a,b}, M. Ruspa ^{a,c}, R. Salvatico ^{a,b}, V. Sola ^a, A. Solano ^{a,b}, D. Soldi ^{a,b},
A. Staiano ^a, D. Trocino ^{a,b}

^a INFN Sezione di Torino, Torino, Italy

^b Università di Torino, Torino, Italy

^c Università del Piemonte Orientale, Novara, Italy

S. Belforte ^a, V. Candelise ^{a,b}, M. Casarsa ^a, F. Cossutti ^a, A. Da Rold ^{a,b}, G. Della Ricca ^{a,b}, F. Vazzoler ^{a,b},
A. Zanetti ^a

^a INFN Sezione di Trieste, Trieste, Italy

^b Università di Trieste, Trieste, Italy

B. Kim, D.H. Kim, G.N. Kim, J. Lee, S.W. Lee, C.S. Moon, Y.D. Oh, S.I. Pak, S. Sekmen, D.C. Son, Y.C. Yang

Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Republic of Korea

H. Kim, D.H. Moon

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

B. Francois, T.J. Kim, J. Park

Hanyang University, Seoul, Republic of Korea

S. Cho, S. Choi, Y. Go, S. Ha, B. Hong, K. Lee, K.S. Lee, J. Lim, J. Park, S.K. Park, Y. Roh, J. Yoo

Korea University, Seoul, Republic of Korea

J. Goh

Kyung Hee University, Department of Physics, Seoul, Republic of Korea

H.S. Kim

Sejong University, Seoul, Republic of Korea

J. Almond, J.H. Bhyun, J. Choi, S. Jeon, J. Kim, J.S. Kim, H. Lee, K. Lee, S. Lee, K. Nam, M. Oh, S.B. Oh,
B.C. Radburn-Smith, U.K. Yang, H.D. Yoo, I. Yoon

Seoul National University, Seoul, Republic of Korea

D. Jeon, J.H. Kim, J.S.H. Lee, I.C. Park, I.J. Watson

University of Seoul, Seoul, Republic of Korea

Y. Choi, C. Hwang, Y. Jeong, J. Lee, Y. Lee, I. Yu

Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon, Republic of Korea

V. Veckalns ³³

1	Riga Technical University, Riga, Latvia	67
2		68
3	V. Dudenas, A. Juodagalvis, A. Rinkevicius, G. Tamulaitis, J. Vaitkus	69
4		70
5	Vilnius University, Vilnius, Lithuania	71
6		72
7	F. Mohamad Idris ³⁴ , W.A.T. Wan Abdullah, M.N. Yusli, Z. Zolkapli	73
8		74
9	National Centre for Particle Physics, Universiti Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia	75
10		76
11	J.F. Benitez, A. Castaneda Hernandez, J.A. Murillo Quijada, L. Valencia Palomo	77
12		78
13	Universidad de Sonora (UNISON), Hermosillo, Mexico	79
14		80
15	H. Castilla-Valdez, E. De La Cruz-Burelo, I. Heredia-De La Cruz ³⁵ , R. Lopez-Fernandez,	81
16	A. Sánchez Hernández	82
17		83
18	Centro de Investigacion y de Estudios Avanzados del IPN, Mexico City, Mexico	84
19		85
20	S. Carrillo Moreno, C. Oropeza Barrera, M. Ramírez García, F. Vazquez Valencia	86
21		87
22	Universidad Iberoamericana, Mexico City, Mexico	88
23		89
24	J. Eysermans, I. Pedraza, H.A. Salazar Ibarquen, C. Uribe Estrada	90
25		91
26	Benemerita Universidad Autonoma de Puebla, Puebla, Mexico	92
27		93
28	A. Morelos Pineda	94
29		95
30	Universidad Autónoma de San Luis Potosí, San Luis Potosí, Mexico	96
31		97
32	J. Mijuskovic ³ , N. Raicevic	98
33		99
34	University of Montenegro, Podgorica, Montenegro	100
35		101
36	D. Krofcheck	102
37		103
38	University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand	104
39		105
40	S. Bheesette, P.H. Butler, P. Lujan	106
41		107
42	University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand	108
43		109
44	A. Ahmad, M. Ahmad, M.I.M. Awan, Q. Hassan, H.R. Hoorani, W.A. Khan, M.A. Shah, M. Shoaib, M. Waqas	110
45		111
46	National Centre for Physics, Quaid-I-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan	112
47		113
48	V. Avati, L. Grzanka, M. Malawski	114
49		115
50	AGH University of Science and Technology Faculty of Computer Science, Electronics and Telecommunications, Krakow, Poland	116
51		117
52	H. Bialkowska, M. Bluj, B. Boimska, M. Górski, M. Kazana, M. Szleper, P. Zalewski	118
53		119
54	National Centre for Nuclear Research, Swierk, Poland	120
55		121
56	K. Bunkowski, A. Byszuk ³⁶ , K. Doroba, A. Kalinowski, M. Konecki, J. Krolikowski, M. Olszewski,	122
57	M. Walczak	123
58		124
59	Institute of Experimental Physics, Faculty of Physics, University of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland	125
60		126
61	M. Araujo, P. Bargassa, D. Bastos, A. Di Francesco, P. Faccioli, B. Galinhas, M. Gallinaro, J. Hollar,	127
62	N. Leonardo, T. Niknejad, J. Seixas, K. Shchelina, G. Strong, O. Toldaiev, J. Varela	128
63		129
64	Laboratório de Instrumentação e Física Experimental de Partículas, Lisboa, Portugal	130
65		131
66		132

1 S. Afanasiev, A. Baginyan, P. Bunin, M. Gavrilenko, A. Golunov, I. Golutvin, I. Gorbunov, V. Karjavine, 67
 2 I. Kashunin, A. Lanev, A. Malakhov, V. Matveev^{37,38}, V.V. Mitsyn, P. Moiseenz, V. Palichik, V. Perelygin, 68
 3 S. Shmatov, V. Smirnov, V. Trofimov, A. Zarubin 69
 4

5 *Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia* 70
 6 71

7 L. Chtchypounov, V. Golovtcov, Y. Ivanov, V. Kim³⁹, E. Kuznetsova⁴⁰, P. Levchenko, V. Murzin, 73
 8 V. Oreshkin, I. Smirnov, D. Sosnov, V. Sulimov, L. Uvarov, A. Vorobyev 74
 9 75

10 *Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, Gatchina (St. Petersburg), Russia* 76
 11 77

12 Yu. Andreev, A. Dermenev, S. Gninenko, N. Golubev, A. Karneyeu, M. Kirsanov, N. Krasnikov, 78
 13 A. Pashenkov, D. Tlisov, A. Toropin 79
 14 80

15 *Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia* 81
 16 82

17 T. Aushev 83
 18 84

19 *Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Moscow, Russia* 85
 20 86

21 V. Epshteyn, V. Gavrillov, N. Lychkovskaya, A. Nikitenko⁴¹, V. Popov, I. Pozdnyakov, G. Safronov, 87
 22 A. Spiridonov, A. Stepenov, M. Toms, E. Vlasov, A. Zhokin 88
 23 89

24 *National Research Center 'Kurchatov Institute', Moscow, Russia* 90
 25 91

26 M. Chadeeva⁴², P. Parygin, D. Philippov, E. Popova, V. Rusinov 92
 27 93

28 *National Research Nuclear University 'Moscow Engineering Physics Institute' (MEPhI), Moscow, Russia* 94
 29 95

30 V. Andreev, M. Azarkin, I. Dremin, M. Kirakosyan, A. Terkulov 96
 31 97

32 *P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia* 98
 33 99

34 A. Belyaev, E. Boos, A. Ershov, A. Gribushin, A. Kaminskiy⁴³, O. Kodolova, V. Korotkikh, I. Lokhtin, 100
 35 S. Obraztsov, S. Petrushanko, V. Savrin, A. Snigirev, I. Vardanyan 101
 36 102

37 *Skobeltsyn Institute of Nuclear Physics, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia* 103
 38 104

39 A. Barnyakov⁴⁴, V. Blinov⁴⁴, T. Dimova⁴⁴, L. Kardapoltsev⁴⁴, Y. Skovpen⁴⁴ 105
 40 106

41 *Novosibirsk State University (NSU), Novosibirsk, Russia* 107
 42 108

43 I. Azhgirey, I. Bayshev, S. Bitioukov, V. Kachanov, D. Konstantinov, P. Mandrik, V. Petrov, R. Ryutin, 109
 44 S. Slabospitskii, A. Sobol, S. Troshin, N. Tyurin, A. Uzunian, A. Volkov 110
 45 111

46 *Institute for High Energy Physics of National Research Centre 'Kurchatov Institute', Protvino, Russia* 112
 47 113

48 A. Babaev, A. Iuzhakov, V. Okhotnikov 114
 49 115

50 *National Research Tomsk Polytechnic University, Tomsk, Russia* 116
 51 117

52 V. Borchsh, V. Ivanchenko, E. Tcherniaev 118
 53 119

54 *Tomsk State University, Tomsk, Russia* 120
 55 121

56 P. Adzic⁴⁵, P. Cirkovic, M. Dordevic, P. Milenovic, J. Milosevic, M. Stojanovic 122
 57 123

58 *University of Belgrade: Faculty of Physics and VINCA Institute of Nuclear Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia* 124
 59 125

60 M. Aguilar-Benitez, J. Alcaraz Maestre, A. Álvarez Fernández, I. Bachiller, M. Barrio Luna, 126
 61 Cristina F. Bedoya, J.A. Brochero Cifuentes, C.A. Carrillo Montoya, M. Cepeda, M. Cerrada, N. Colino, 127
 62 B. De La Cruz, A. Delgado Peris, J.P. Fernández Ramos, J. Flix, M.C. Fouz, O. Gonzalez Lopez, S. Goy Lopez, 128
 63 J.M. Hernandez, M.I. Josa, D. Moran, Á. Navarro Tobar, A. Pérez-Calero Yzquierdo, J. Puerta Pelayo, 129
 64 I. Redondo, L. Romero, S. Sánchez Navas, M.S. Soares, A. Triossi, C. Willmott 130
 65 131

66 *Centro de Investigaciones Energéticas Medioambientales y Tecnológicas (CIEMAT), Madrid, Spain* 132

1 C. Albajar, J.F. de Trocóniz, R. Reyes-Almanza

2 *Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain*

3
4 B. Alvarez Gonzalez, J. Cuevas, C. Erice, J. Fernandez Menendez, S. Folgueras, I. Gonzalez Caballero,
5 E. Palencia Cortezon, C. Ramón Álvarez, V. Rodríguez Bouza, S. Sanchez Cruz

6
7 *Universidad de Oviedo, Instituto Universitario de Ciencias y Tecnologías Espaciales de Asturias (ICTEA), Oviedo, Spain*

8
9 I.J. Cabrillo, A. Calderon, B. Chazin Quero, J. Duarte Campderros, M. Fernandez, P.J. Fernández Manteca,
10 A. García Alonso, G. Gomez, C. Martinez Rivero, P. Martinez Ruiz del Arbol, F. Matorras, J. Piedra Gomez,
11 C. Prieels, F. Ricci-Tam, T. Rodrigo, A. Ruiz-Jimeno, L. Russo⁴⁶, L. Scodellaro, I. Vila, J.M. Vizán Garcia

12
13 *Instituto de Física de Cantabria (IFCA), CSIC-Universidad de Cantabria, Santander, Spain*

14
15 D.U.J. Sonnadara

16
17 *University of Colombo, Colombo, Sri Lanka*

18
19 W.G.D. Dharmaratna, N. Wickramage

20
21 *University of Ruhuna, Department of Physics, Matara, Sri Lanka*

22
23 T.K. Aarrestad, D. Abbaneo, B. Akgun, E. Auffray, G. Auzinger, J. Baechler, P. Baillon, A.H. Ball, D. Barney,
24 J. Bendavid, M. Bianco, A. Bocci, P. Bortignon, E. Bossini, E. Brondolin, T. Camporesi, A. Caratelli,
25 G. Cerminara, E. Chapon, G. Cucciati, D. d'Enterria, A. Dabrowski, N. Daci, V. Daponte, A. David,
26 O. Davignon, A. De Roeck, M. Deile, R. Di Maria, M. Dobson, M. Dünser, N. Dupont, A. Elliott-Peisert,
27 N. Emriskova, F. Fallavollita⁴⁷, D. Fasanella, S. Fiorendi, G. Franzoni, J. Fulcher, W. Funk, S. Giani, D. Gigi,
28 K. Gill, F. Glege, L. Gouskos, M. Gruchala, M. Guilbaud, D. Gulhan, J. Hegeman, C. Heidegger, Y. Iiyama,
29 V. Innocente, T. James, P. Janot, O. Karacheban²⁰, J. Kaspar, J. Kieseler, M. Krammer¹, N. Kratochwil,
30 C. Lange, P. Lecoq, K. Long, C. Lourenço, L. Malgeri, M. Mannelli, A. Massironi, F. Meijers, S. Mersi,
31 E. Meschi, F. Moortgat, M. Mulders, J. Ngadiuba, J. Niedziela, S. Nourbakhsh, S. Orfanelli, L. Orsini,
32 F. Pantaleo¹⁷, L. Pape, E. Perez, M. Peruzzi, A. Petrilli, G. Petrucciani, A. Pfeiffer, M. Pierini, F.M. Pitters,
33 D. Rabad, A. Racz, M. Rieger, M. Rovere, H. Sakulin, J. Salfeld-Nebgen, S. Scarfi, C. Schäfer, C. Schwick,
34 M. Selvaggi, A. Sharma, P. Silva, W. Snoeys, P. Sphicas⁴⁸, J. Steggemann, S. Summers, V.R. Tavolaro,
35 D. Treille, A. Tsirou, G.P. Van Onsem, A. Vartak, M. Verzetti, K.A. Wozniak, W.D. Zeuner

36
37
38
39
40
41 *CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland*

42
43 L. Caminada⁴⁹, K. Deiters, W. Erdmann, R. Horisberger, Q. Ingram, H.C. Kaestli, D. Kotlinski,
44 U. Langenegger, T. Rohe

45
46 *Paul Scherrer Institut, Villigen, Switzerland*

47
48 M. Backhaus, P. Berger, A. Calandri, N. Chernyavskaya, G. Dissertori, M. Dittmar, M. Donegà, C. Dorfer,
49 T.A. Gómez Espinosa, C. Grab, D. Hits, W. Luster, R.A. Manzoni, M.T. Meinhard, F. Micheli,
50 P. Musella, F. Nessi-Tedaldi, F. Pauss, V. Perovic, G. Perrin, L. Perrozzi, S. Pigazzini, M.G. Ratti,
51 M. Reichmann, C. Reissel, T. Reitspiess, B. Ristic, D. Ruini, D.A. Sanz Becerra, M. Schönenberger,
52 L. Shchutska, M.L. Vesterbacka Olsson, R. Wallny, D.H. Zhu

53
54
55 *ETH Zurich – Institute for Particle Physics and Astrophysics (IPA), Zurich, Switzerland*

56
57 C. Amsler⁵⁰, C. Botta, D. Brzhechko, M.F. Canelli, A. De Cosa, R. Del Burgo, B. Kilminster, S. Leontsinis,
58 V.M. Mikuni, I. Neutelings, G. Rauco, P. Robmann, K. Schweiger, Y. Takahashi, S. Wertz

59
60 *Universität Zürich, Zurich, Switzerland*

61
62 C.M. Kuo, W. Lin, A. Roy, T. Sarkar²⁹, S.S. Yu

63
64 *National Central University, Chung-Li, Taiwan*

1	P. Chang, Y. Chao, K.F. Chen, P.H. Chen, W.-S. Hou, Y.y. Li, R.-S. Lu, E. Paganis, A. Psallidas, A. Steen	67
2		68
3	<i>National Taiwan University (NTU), Taipei, Taiwan</i>	69
4		70
5	B. Asavapibhop, C. Asawatangtrakuldee, N. Srimanobhas, N. Suwonjandee	71
6		72
7	<i>Chulalongkorn University, Faculty of Science, Department of Physics, Bangkok, Thailand</i>	73
8	A. Bat, F. Boran, A. Celik ⁵¹ , S. Damarseckin ⁵² , Z.S. Demiroglu, F. Dolek, C. Dozen ⁵³ , I. Dumanoglu ⁵⁴ ,	74
9	G. Gokbulut, E.G. Guler ⁵⁵ , Y. Guler, I. Hos ⁵⁶ , C. Isik, E.E. Kangal ⁵⁷ , O. Kara, A. Kayis Topaksu, U. Kiminsu,	75
10	G. Onengut, K. Ozdemir ⁵⁸ , A.E. Simsek, U.G. Tok, S. Turkcapar, I.S. Zorbakir, C. Zorbilmez	76
11		77
12		78
13	<i>Çukurova University, Physics Department, Science and Art Faculty, Adana, Turkey</i>	79
14		80
15	B. Isildak ⁵⁹ , G. Karapinar ⁶⁰ , M. Yalvac ⁶¹	81
16		82
17	<i>Middle East Technical University, Physics Department, Ankara, Turkey</i>	83
18		84
19	I.O. Atakisi, E. Gülmez, M. Kaya ⁶² , O. Kaya ⁶³ , Ö. Özçelik, S. Tekten ⁶⁴ , E.A. Yetkin ⁶⁵	85
20		86
21	<i>Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey</i>	87
22		88
23	A. Cakir, K. Cankocak ⁵⁴ , Y. Komurcu, S. Sen ⁶⁶	89
24		90
25	<i>Istanbul Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey</i>	91
26		92
27	S. Cerci ⁶⁷ , B. Kaynak, S. Ozkorucuklu, D. Sunar Cerci ⁶⁷	93
28		94
29	<i>Istanbul University, Istanbul, Turkey</i>	95
30		96
31	B. Grynyov	97
32		98
33	<i>Institute for Scintillation Materials of National Academy of Science of Ukraine, Kharkov, Ukraine</i>	99
34		100
35	L. Levchuk	101
36		102
37	<i>National Scientific Center, Kharkov Institute of Physics and Technology, Kharkov, Ukraine</i>	103
38	E. Bhal, S. Bologna, J.J. Brooke, D. Burns ⁶⁸ , E. Clement, D. Cussans, H. Flacher, J. Goldstein, G.P. Heath,	104
39	H.F. Heath, L. Kreczko, B. Krikler, S. Paramesvaran, T. Sakuma, S. Seif El Nasr-Storey, V.J. Smith, J. Taylor,	105
40	A. Titterton	106
41		107
42	<i>University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom</i>	108
43		109
44	K.W. Bell, A. Belyaev ⁶⁹ , C. Brew, R.M. Brown, D.J.A. Cockerill, J.A. Coughlan, K. Harder, S. Harper,	110
45	J. Linacre, K. Manolopoulos, D.M. Newbold, E. Olaiya, D. Petyt, T. Reis, T. Schuh,	111
46	C.H. Shepherd-Themistocleous, A. Thea, I.R. Tomalin, T. Williams	112
47		113
48		114
49	<i>Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom</i>	115
50		116
51	R. Bainbridge, P. Bloch, S. Bonomally, J. Borg, S. Breeze, O. Buchmuller, A. Bundock, G.S. Chahal ⁷⁰ ,	117
52	D. Colling, P. Dauncey, G. Davies, M. Della Negra, P. Everaerts, G. Hall, G. Iles, M. Komm, J. Langford,	118
53	L. Lyons, A.-M. Magnan, S. Malik, A. Martelli, V. Milosevic, A. Morton, J. Nash ⁷¹ , V. Palladino, M. Pesaresi,	119
54	D.M. Raymond, A. Richards, A. Rose, E. Scott, C. Seez, A. Shtipliyski, M. Stoye, T. Strebler, A. Tapper,	120
55	K. Uchida, T. Virdee ¹⁷ , N. Wardle, S.N. Webb, D. Winterbottom, A.G. Zecchinelli, S.C. Zenz	121
56		122
57		123
58	<i>Imperial College, London, United Kingdom</i>	124
59		125
60	J.E. Cole, P.R. Hobson, A. Khan, P. Kyberd, C.K. Mackay, I.D. Reid, L. Teodorescu, S. Zahid	126
61		127
62	<i>Brunel University, Uxbridge, United Kingdom</i>	128
63		129
64	A. Brinkerhoff, K. Call, B. Caraway, J. Dittmann, K. Hatakeyama, C. Madrid, B. McMaster, N. Pastika,	130
65	C. Smith	131
66		132

1 Baylor University, Waco, TX, USA

2 R. Bartek, A. Dominguez, R. Uniyal, A.M. Vargas Hernandez

3 Catholic University of America, Washington, DC, USA

4 A. Buccilli, S.I. Cooper, S.V. Gleyzer, C. Henderson, P. Rumerio, C. West

5 The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, AL, USA

6 A. Albert, D. Arcaro, Z. Demiragli, D. Gastler, C. Richardson, J. Rohlf, D. Sperka, D. Spitzbart, I. Suarez,
7 L. Sulak, D. Zou

8 Boston University, Boston, MA, USA

9 G. Benelli, B. Burkley, X. Coubez¹⁸, D. Cutts, Y.t. Duh, M. Hadley, U. Heintz, J.M. Hogan⁷², K.H.M. Kwok,
10 E. Laird, G. Landsberg, K.T. Lau, J. Lee, M. Narain, S. Sagir⁷³, R. Syarif, E. Usai, W.Y. Wong, D. Yu, W. Zhang

11 Brown University, Providence, RI, USA

12 R. Band, C. Brainerd, R. Breedon, M. Calderon De La Barca Sanchez, M. Chertok, J. Conway, R. Conway,
13 P.T. Cox, R. Erbacher, C. Flores, G. Funk, J. Jay, F. Jensen, W. Ko[†], O. Kukral, R. Lander, M. Mulhearn,
14 D. Pellett, J. Pilot, M. Shi, D. Taylor, K. Tos, M. Tripathi, S. Tuli, G. Waegel, Z. Wang, F. Zhang

15 University of California, Davis, Davis, CA, USA

16 M. Bachtis, C. Bravo, R. Cousins, A. Dasgupta, A. Florent, J. Hauser, M. Ignatenko, N. Mccoll, W.A. Nash,
17 S. Regnard, D. Saltzberg, C. Schnaible, B. Stone, V. Valuev

18 University of California, Los Angeles, CA, USA

19 K. Burt, Y. Chen, R. Clare, J.W. Gary, S.M.A. Ghiasi Shirazi, G. Hanson, G. Karapostoli, O.R. Long,
20 N. Manganelli, M. Olmedo Negrete, M.I. Paneva, W. Si, S. Wimpenny, B.R. Yates, Y. Zhang

21 University of California, Riverside, Riverside, CA, USA

22 J.G. Branson, P. Chang, S. Cittolin, S. Cooperstein, N. Deelen, M. Derdzinski, J. Duarte, R. Gerosa,
23 D. Gilbert, B. Hashemi, D. Klein, V. Krutelyov, J. Letts, M. Masciovecchio, S. May, S. Padhi, M. Pieri,
24 V. Sharma, M. Tadel, F. Würthwein, A. Yagil, G. Zevi Della Porta

25 University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, USA

26 N. Amin, R. Bhandari, C. Campagnari, M. Citron, V. Dutta, J. Incandela, B. Marsh, H. Mei, A. Ovcharova,
27 H. Qu, J. Richman, U. Sarica, D. Stuart, S. Wang

28 University of California, Santa Barbara – Department of Physics, Santa Barbara, CA, USA

29 D. Anderson, A. Bornheim, O. Cerri, I. Dutta, J.M. Lawhorn, N. Lu, J. Mao, H.B. Newman, T.Q. Nguyen,
30 J. Pata, M. Spiropulu, J.R. Vlimant, S. Xie, Z. Zhang, R.Y. Zhu

31 California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA, USA

32 J. Alison, M.B. Andrews, T. Ferguson, T. Mudholkar, M. Paulini, M. Sun, I. Vorobiev, M. Weinberg

33 Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA

34 J.P. Cumalat, W.T. Ford, E. MacDonald, T. Mulholland, R. Patel, A. Perloff, K. Stenson, K.A. Ulmer,
35 S.R. Wagner

36 University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, CO, USA

37 J. Alexander, Y. Cheng, J. Chu, A. Datta, A. Frankenthal, K. Mcdermott, J.R. Patterson, D. Quach, A. Ryd,
38 S.M. Tan, Z. Tao, J. Thom, P. Wittich, M. Zientek

39 Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA

1 S. Abdullin, M. Albrow, M. Alyari, G. Apollinari, A. Apresyan, A. Apyan, S. Banerjee, L.A.T. Bauerdick, 67
 2 A. Beretvas, D. Berry, J. Berryhill, P.C. Bhat, K. Burkett, J.N. Butler, A. Canepa, G.B. Cerati, H.W.K. Cheung, 68
 3 F. Chlebana, M. Cremonesi, V.D. Elvira, J. Freeman, Z. Gecse, E. Gottschalk, L. Gray, D. Green, 69
 4 S. Grünendahl, O. Gutsche, J. Hanlon, R.M. Harris, S. Hasegawa, R. Heller, J. Hirschauer, B. Jayatilaka, 70
 5 S. Jindariani, M. Johnson, U. Joshi, T. Klijnsma, B. Klima, M.J. Kortelainen, B. Kreis, S. Lammel, J. Lewis, 71
 6 D. Lincoln, R. Lipton, M. Liu, T. Liu, J. Lykken, K. Maeshima, J.M. Marraffino, D. Mason, P. McBride, 72
 7 P. Merkel, S. Mrenna, S. Nahn, V. O'Dell, V. Papadimitriou, K. Pedro, C. Pena⁷⁴, F. Ravera, 74
 8 A. Reinsvold Hall, L. Ristori, B. Schneider, E. Sexton-Kennedy, N. Smith, A. Soha, W.J. Spalding, L. Spiegel, 75
 9 S. Stoynev, J. Strait, L. Taylor, S. Tkaczyk, N.V. Tran, L. Uplegger, E.W. Vaandering, R. Vidal, M. Wang, 76
 10 H.A. Weber, A. Woodard 77
 11
 12
 13

14 *Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, IL, USA* 80

15
 16 D. Acosta, P. Avery, D. Bourilkov, L. Cadamuro, V. Cherepanov, F. Errico, R.D. Field, D. Guerrero, 82
 17 B.M. Joshi, M. Kim, J. Konigsberg, A. Korytov, K.H. Lo, K. Matchev, N. Menendez, G. Mitselmakher, 83
 18 D. Rosenzweig, K. Shi, J. Wang, S. Wang, X. Zuo 84
 19

20 *University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, USA* 86

21
 22 Y.R. Joshi 87
 23

24 *Florida International University, Miami, FL, USA* 89

25
 26 T. Adams, A. Askew, R. Habibullah, S. Hagopian, V. Hagopian, K.F. Johnson, R. Khurana, T. Kolberg, 92
 27 G. Martinez, T. Perry, H. Prosper, C. Schiber, R. Yohay, J. Zhang 93
 28

29 *Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL, USA* 95

30
 31 M.M. Baarmand, M. Hohlmann, D. Noonan, M. Rahmani, M. Saunders, F. Yumiceva 96
 32

33 *Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, FL, USA* 97

34
 35 M.R. Adams, L. Apanasevich, R.R. Betts, R. Cavanaugh, X. Chen, S. Dittmer, O. Evdokimov, C.E. Gerber, 100
 36 D.A. Hangal, D.J. Hofman, V. Kumar, C. Mills, G. Oh, T. Roy, M.B. Tonjes, N. Varelas, J. Viinikainen, 101
 37 H. Wang, X. Wang, Z. Wu 102
 38

39 *University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC), Chicago, IL, USA* 105

40
 41 M. Alhousseini, B. Bilki⁵⁵, K. Dilsiz⁷⁵, S. Durgut, R.P. Gandrajula, M. Haytmyradov, V. Khristenko, 107
 42 O.K. Köseyan, J.-P. Merlo, A. Mestvirishvili⁷⁶, A. Moeller, J. Nachtman, H. Ogul⁷⁷, Y. Onel, F. Ozok⁷⁸, 108
 43 A. Penzo, C. Snyder, E. Tiras, J. Wetzel, K. Yi⁷⁹ 109
 44
 45

46 *The University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA, USA* 112

47
 48 B. Blumenfeld, A. Cocoros, N. Eminizer, A.V. Gritsan, W.T. Hung, S. Kyriacou, P. Maksimovic, C. Mantilla, 114
 49 J. Roskes, M. Swartz, T.Á. Vámi 115
 50

51 *Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA* 117

52
 53 C. Baldenegro Barrera, P. Baringer, A. Bean, S. Boren, A. Bylinkin, T. Isidori, S. Khalil, J. King, G. Krintiras, 119
 54 A. Kropivnitskaya, C. Lindsey, W. Mcbrayer, N. Minafra, M. Murray, C. Rogan, C. Royon, S. Sanders, 120
 55 E. Schmitz, J.D. Tapia Takaki, Q. Wang, J. Williams, G. Wilson 121
 56

57 *The University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS, USA* 123

58
 59 S. Duric, A. Ivanov, K. Kaadze, D. Kim, Y. Maravin, D.R. Mendis, T. Mitchell, A. Modak, A. Mohammadi 125
 60

61 *Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS, USA* 127

62
 63 F. Rebassoo, D. Wright 128
 64

65 *Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA, USA* 130

66 131

1	A. Baden, O. Baron, A. Belloni, S.C. Eno, Y. Feng, N.J. Hadley, S. Jabeen, G.Y. Jeng, R.G. Kellogg,	67
2	A.C. Mignerey, S. Nabili, M. Seidel, A. Skuja, S.C. Tonwar, L. Wang, K. Wong	68
3		69
4	<i>University of Maryland, College Park, MD, USA</i>	70
5		71
6	D. Abercrombie, B. Allen, R. Bi, S. Brandt, W. Busza, I.A. Cali, M. D'Alfonso, G. Gomez Ceballos,	72
7	M. Goncharov, P. Harris, D. Hsu, M. Hu, M. Klute, D. Kovalskyi, Y.-J. Lee, P.D. Luckey, B. Maier,	73
8	A.C. Marini, C. McGinn, C. Mironov, S. Narayanan, X. Niu, C. Paus, D. Rankin, C. Roland, G. Roland, Z. Shi,	74
9	G.S.F. Stephans, K. Sumorok, K. Tatar, D. Velicanu, J. Wang, T.W. Wang, B. Wyslouch	75
10		76
11	<i>Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA</i>	77
12		78
13	R.M. Chatterjee, A. Evans, S. Guts [†] , P. Hansen, J. Hiltbrand, Sh. Jain, Y. Kubota, Z. Lesko, J. Mans,	79
14	M. Revering, R. Rusack, R. Saradhy, N. Schroeder, N. Strobbe, M.A. Wadud	80
15		81
16	<i>University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, USA</i>	82
17		83
18	J.G. Acosta, S. Oliveros	84
19		85
20	<i>University of Mississippi, Oxford, MS, USA</i>	86
21		87
22	K. Bloom, S. Chauhan, D.R. Claes, C. Fangmeier, L. Finco, F. Golf, R. Kamalieddin, I. Kravchenko, J.E. Siado,	88
23	G.R. Snow [†] , B. Stieger, W. Tabb	89
24		90
25	<i>University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, NE, USA</i>	91
26		92
27	G. Agarwal, C. Harrington, I. Iashvili, A. Kharchilava, C. McLean, D. Nguyen, A. Parker, J. Pekkanen,	93
28	S. Rappoccio, B. Roozbahani	94
29		95
30	<i>State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, NY, USA</i>	96
31		97
32	G. Alverson, E. Barberis, C. Freer, Y. Haddad, A. Hortiangtham, G. Madigan, B. Marzocchi, D.M. Morse,	98
33	V. Nguyen, T. Orimoto, L. Skinnari, A. Tishelman-Charny, T. Wamorkar, B. Wang, A. Wisecarver, D. Wood	99
34		100
35	<i>Northeastern University, Boston, MA, USA</i>	101
36		102
37	S. Bhattacharya, J. Bueghly, G. Fedi, A. Gilbert, T. Gunter, K.A. Hahn, N. Odell, M.H. Schmitt, K. Sung,	103
38	M. Velasco	104
39		105
40	<i>Northwestern University, Evanston, IL, USA</i>	106
41		107
42	R. Bucci, N. Dev, R. Goldouzian, M. Hildreth, K. Hurtado Anampa, C. Jessop, D.J. Karmgard, K. Lannon,	108
43	W. Li, N. Loukas, N. Marinelli, I. Mcalister, F. Meng, Y. Musienko ³⁷ , R. Ruchti, P. Siddireddy, G. Smith,	109
44	S. Taroni, M. Wayne, A. Wightman, M. Wolf	110
45		111
46	<i>University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN, USA</i>	112
47		113
48		114
49	J. Alimena, B. Bylsma, B. Cardwell, L.S. Durkin, B. Francis, C. Hill, W. Ji, A. Lefeld, T.Y. Ling, B.L. Winer	115
50		116
51	<i>The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA</i>	117
52		118
53	G. Dezoort, P. Elmer, J. Hardenbrook, N. Haubrich, S. Higginbotham, A. Kalogeropoulos, S. Kwan, D. Lange,	119
54	M.T. Lucchini, J. Luo, D. Marlow, K. Mei, I. Ojalvo, J. Olsen, C. Palmer, P. Piroué, D. Stickland, C. Tully	120
55		121
56	<i>Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, USA</i>	122
57		123
58	S. Malik, S. Norberg	124
59		125
60	<i>University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez, PR, USA</i>	126
61		127
62	A. Barker, V.E. Barnes, R. Chawla, S. Das, L. Gutay, M. Jones, A.W. Jung, B. Mahakud, D.H. Miller,	128
63	G. Negro, N. Neumeister, C.C. Peng, S. Piperov, H. Qiu, J.F. Schulte, N. Trevisani, F. Wang, R. Xiao, W. Xie	129
64		130
65	<i>Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, USA</i>	131
66		132

1 T. Cheng, J. Dolen, N. Parashar

2 *Purdue University Northwest, Hammond, IN, USA*

3
4 A. Baty, U. Behrens, S. Dildick, K.M. Ecklund, S. Freed, F.J.M. Geurts, M. Kilpatrick, A. Kumar, W. Li,
5 B.P. Padley, R. Redjimi, J. Roberts, J. Rorie, W. Shi, A.G. Stahl Leiton, Z. Tu, A. Zhang

6
7 *Rice University, Houston, TX, USA*

8
9 A. Bodek, P. de Barbaro, R. Demina, J.L. Dulemba, C. Fallon, T. Ferbel, M. Galanti, A. Garcia-Bellido,
10 O. Hindrichs, A. Khukhunaishvili, E. Ranken, R. Taus

11
12 *University of Rochester, Rochester, NY, USA*

13
14 B. Chiarito, J.P. Chou, A. Gandrakota, Y. Gershtein, E. Halkiadakis, A. Hart, M. Heindl, E. Hughes,
15 S. Kaplan, I. Laflotte, A. Lath, R. Montalvo, K. Nash, M. Osherson, S. Salur, S. Schnetzer, S. Somalwar,
16 R. Stone, S. Thomas

17
18 *Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, Piscataway, NJ, USA*

19 H. Acharya, A.G. Delannoy, S. Spanier

20
21 *University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN, USA*

22
23 O. Bouhali⁸⁰, M. Dalchenko, A. Delgado, R. Eusebi, J. Gilmore, T. Huang, T. Kamon⁸¹, H. Kim, S. Luo,
24 S. Malhotra, D. Marley, R. Mueller, D. Overton, L. Perniè, D. Rathjens, A. Safonov

25
26 *Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, USA*

27
28 N. Akchurin, J. Damgov, F. De Guio, V. Hegde, S. Kunori, K. Lamichhane, S.W. Lee, T. Mengke,
29 S. Muthumuni, T. Peltola, S. Undleeb, I. Volobouev, Z. Wang, A. Whitbeck

30
31 *Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX, USA*

32
33 S. Greene, A. Gurrola, R. Janjam, W. Johns, C. Maguire, A. Melo, H. Ni, K. Padeken, F. Romeo, P. Sheldon,
34 S. Tuo, J. Velkovska, M. Verweij

35
36 *Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN, USA*

37
38 M.W. Arenton, P. Barria, B. Cox, G. Cummings, J. Hakala, R. Hirosky, M. Joyce, A. Ledovskoy, C. Neu,
39 B. Tannenwald, Y. Wang, E. Wolfe, F. Xia

40
41 *University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA, USA*

42
43 R. Harr, P.E. Karchin, N. Poudyal, J. Sturdy, P. Thapa

44
45 *Wayne State University, Detroit, MI, USA*

46
47 K. Black, T. Bose, J. Buchanan, C. Caillol, D. Carlsmith, S. Dasu, I. De Bruyn, L. Dodd, C. Galloni, H. He,
48 M. Herndon, A. Hervé, U. Hussain, A. Lanaro, A. Loeliger, R. Loveless, J. Madhusudanan Sreekala,
49 A. Mallampalli, D. Pinna, T. Ruggles, A. Savin, V. Sharma, W.H. Smith, D. Teague, S. Trembath-Reichert

50
51 *University of Wisconsin – Madison, Madison, WI, USA*

52
53 † Deceased.

54
55 ¹ Also at TU Wien, Wien, Austria.

56
57 ² Also at Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium.

58
59 ³ Also at IRFU, CEA, Université Paris-Saclay, Gif-sur-Yvette, France.

60
61 ⁴ Also at Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, Brazil.

62
63 ⁵ Also at Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, Brazil.

64
65 ⁶ Also at UFMS, Nova Andradina, Brazil.

66
67 ⁷ Also at Universidade Federal de Pelotas, Pelotas, Brazil.

68
69 ⁸ Also at University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China.

70
71 ⁹ Also at National Research Center 'Kurchatov Institute', Moscow, Russia.

72
73 ¹⁰ Also at Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia.

1	¹¹ Also at Suez University, Suez, Egypt.	67
2	¹² Now at British University in Egypt, Cairo, Egypt.	68
3	¹³ Now at Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt.	69
4	¹⁴ Also at Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana, USA.	70
5	¹⁵ Also at Université de Haute Alsace, Mulhouse, France.	71
6	¹⁶ Also at Erzincan Binali Yildirim University, Erzincan, Turkey.	72
7	¹⁷ Also at CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland.	73
8	¹⁸ Also at RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut A, Aachen, Germany.	74
9	¹⁹ Also at University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany.	75
10	²⁰ Also at Brandenburg University of Technology, Cottbus, Germany.	76
11	²¹ Also at Institute of Physics, University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary.	77
12	²² Also at Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary.	78
13	²³ Also at MTA-ELTE Lendület CMS Particle and Nuclear Physics Group, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary.	79
14	²⁴ Also at IIT Bhubaneswar, Bhubaneswar, India.	80
15	²⁵ Also at Institute of Physics, Bhubaneswar, India.	81
16	²⁶ Also at G.H.G. Khalsa College, Punjab, India.	82
17	²⁷ Also at Shoolini University, Solan, India.	83
18	²⁸ Also at University of Hyderabad, Hyderabad, India.	84
19	²⁹ Also at University of Visva-Bharati, Santiniketan, India.	85
20	³⁰ Now at INFN Sezione di Bari, Università di Bari, Politecnico di Bari, Bari, Italy.	86
21	³¹ Also at Italian National Agency for New Technologies, Energy and Sustainable Economic Development, Bologna, Italy.	87
22	³² Also at Centro Siciliano di Fisica Nucleare e di Struttura Della Materia, Catania, Italy.	88
23	³³ Also at Riga Technical University, Riga, Latvia.	89
24	³⁴ Also at Malaysian Nuclear Agency, MOSTI, Kajang, Malaysia.	90
25	³⁵ Also at Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología, Mexico City, Mexico.	91
26	³⁶ Also at Warsaw University of Technology, Institute of Electronic Systems, Warsaw, Poland.	92
27	³⁷ Also at Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia.	93
28	³⁸ Now at National Research Nuclear University 'Moscow Engineering Physics Institute' (MEPhI), Moscow, Russia.	94
29	³⁹ Also at St. Petersburg Polytechnic University, St. Petersburg, Russia.	95
30	⁴⁰ Also at University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, USA.	96
31	⁴¹ Also at Imperial College, London, United Kingdom.	97
32	⁴² Also at P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia.	98
33	⁴³ Also at INFN Sezione di Padova, Università di Padova, Padova, Italy, Università di Trento, Trento, Italy, Padova, Italy.	99
34	⁴⁴ Also at Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, Novosibirsk, Russia.	100
35	⁴⁵ Also at Faculty of Physics, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia.	101
36	⁴⁶ Also at Università degli Studi di Siena, Siena, Italy.	102
37	⁴⁷ Also at INFN Sezione di Pavia, Università di Pavia, Pavia, Italy.	103
38	⁴⁸ Also at National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece.	104
39	⁴⁹ Also at Universität Zürich, Zurich, Switzerland.	105
40	⁵⁰ Also at Stefan Meyer Institute for Subatomic Physics, Vienna, Austria.	106
41	⁵¹ Also at Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Burdur, Turkey.	107
42	⁵² Also at Şırnak University, Şırnak, Turkey.	108
43	⁵³ Also at Department of Physics, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China.	109
44	⁵⁴ Also at Near East University, Research Center of Experimental Health Science, Nicosia, Turkey.	110
45	⁵⁵ Also at Beykent University, Istanbul, Turkey.	111
46	⁵⁶ Also at Istanbul Aydin University, Application and Research Center for Advanced Studies, Istanbul, Turkey.	112
47	⁵⁷ Also at Mersin University, Mersin, Turkey.	113
48	⁵⁸ Also at Piri Reis University, Istanbul, Turkey.	114
49	⁵⁹ Also at Ozyegin University, Istanbul, Turkey.	115
50	⁶⁰ Also at Izmir Institute of Technology, Izmir, Turkey.	116
51	⁶¹ Also at Bozok Universitetesi Rektörlüğü, Yozgat, Turkey.	117
52	⁶² Also at Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey.	118
53	⁶³ Also at Milli Savunma University, Istanbul, Turkey.	119
54	⁶⁴ Also at Kafkas University, Kars, Turkey.	120
55	⁶⁵ Also at Istanbul Bilgi University, Istanbul, Turkey.	121
56	⁶⁶ Also at Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.	122
57	⁶⁷ Also at Adiyaman University, Adiyaman, Turkey.	123
58	⁶⁸ Also at Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussel, Belgium.	124
59	⁶⁹ Also at School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southampton, Southampton, United Kingdom.	125
60	⁷⁰ Also at IPPP Durham University, Durham, United Kingdom.	126
61	⁷¹ Also at Monash University, Faculty of Science, Clayton, Australia.	127
62	⁷² Also at Bethel University, St. Paul, Minneapolis, USA.	128
63	⁷³ Also at Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University, Karaman, Turkey.	129
64		130
65		131
66		132

1	⁷⁴ Also at California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California, USA.	67
2	⁷⁵ Also at Bingol University, Bingol, Turkey.	68
3	⁷⁶ Also at Georgian Technical University, Tbilisi, Georgia.	69
4	⁷⁷ Also at Sinop University, Sinop, Turkey.	70
5	⁷⁸ Also at Mimar Sinan University, Istanbul, Istanbul, Turkey.	71
6	⁷⁹ Also at Nanjing Normal University Department of Physics, Nanjing, China.	72
7	⁸⁰ Also at Texas A&M University at Qatar, Doha, Qatar.	73
8	⁸¹ Also at Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Republic of Korea.	74
9		75
10		76
11		77
12		78
13		79
14		80
15		81
16		82
17		83
18		84
19		85
20		86
21		87
22		88
23		89
24		90
25		91
26		92
27		93
28		94
29		95
30		96
31		97
32		98
33		99
34		100
35		101
36		102
37		103
38		104
39		105
40		106
41		107
42		108
43		109
44		110
45		111
46		112
47		113
48		114
49		115
50		116
51		117
52		118
53		119
54		120
55		121
56		122
57		123
58		124
59		125
60		126
61		127
62		128
63		129
64		130
65		131
66		132

UNCORRECTED PROOF