Contents lists available at SciVerse ScienceDirect

Physics Letters B

www.elsevier.com/locate/physletb

Multi-strange baryon production in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV with ALICE $\stackrel{\text{\tiny{trian}}}{=}$

ALICE Collaboration

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 6 April 2012 Received in revised form 3 May 2012 Accepted 8 May 2012 Available online 11 May 2012 Editor: L. Rolandi

Keywords: Multi-strange baryons p_T spectra Mid-rapidity Proton-proton LHC ALICE

ABSTRACT

A measurement of the multi-strange Ξ^- and Ω^- baryons and their antiparticles by the ALICE experiment at the CERN Large Hadron Collider (LHC) is presented for inelastic proton–proton collisions at a centreof-mass energy of 7 TeV. The transverse momentum (p_T) distributions were studied at mid-rapidity (|y| < 0.5) in the range of $0.6 < p_T < 8.5$ GeV/*c* for Ξ^- and $\overline{\Xi}^+$ baryons, and in the range of $0.8 < p_T < 5$ GeV/*c* for Ω^- and $\overline{\Omega}^+$. Baryons and antibaryons were measured as separate particles and we find that the baryon to antibaryon ratio of both particle species is consistent with unity over the entire range of the measurement. The statistical precision of the current data has allowed us to measure a difference between the mean p_T of Ξ^- ($\overline{\Xi}^+$) and Ω^- ($\overline{\Omega}^+$). Particle yields, mean p_T , and the spectra in the intermediate p_T range are not well described by the PYTHIA Perugia 2011 tune Monte Carlo event generator, which has been tuned to reproduce the early LHC data. The discrepancy is largest for Ω^- ($\overline{\Omega}^+$). This PYTHIA tune approaches the p_T spectra of Ξ^- and $\overline{\Xi}^+$ baryons below $p_T < 0.85$ GeV/*c* and describes the Ξ^- and $\overline{\Xi}^+$ spectra above $p_T > 6.0$ GeV/*c*. We also illustrate the difference between the experimental data and model by comparing the corresponding ratios of $(\Omega^- + \overline{\Omega}^+)/(\Xi^- + \overline{\Xi}^+)$ as a function of transverse mass.

© 2012 CERN. Published by Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

The multi-strange baryons, Ω^- (*sss*) and Ξ^- (*dss*), are particularly important in high energy particle and nuclear physics due to their dominant strange quark (*s*-quark) content. The initial state colliding projectiles contain no strange valence quark, therefore all particles with non-zero strangeness quantum number are created in the course of the collision. Moreover, the energy of the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) and its high luminosity allow for an abundant production of strange hadrons. These two factors make multi-strange baryons a valuable probe in understanding particle production mechanisms in high energy collisions.

We present a measurement of Ω^- and $\overline{\Omega}^+$ baryon transverse momentum (p_T) spectra and yields in proton–proton (pp) collisions at a centre-of-mass energy (\sqrt{s}) of 7 TeV, a measurement of Ξ^- and $\overline{\Xi}^+$ yields and spectra at the same energy, and a comparison of these data to a recent pp event generator, PYTHIA Perugia 2011 central tune (P2011). The measurements were obtained using the ALICE experiment [1] at the LHC.

ALICE is a general purpose detector designed to study both pp and Pb–Pb collisions at TeV-scale energies. A six-layer silicon inner tracking system (ITS) and a large-volume time projection chamber (TPC) enable charged particle reconstruction with excellent momentum and spatial resolution in full azimuth down to p_T of 100 MeV/*c*.

2. Data sample and cascade reconstruction

Multi-strange baryons are studied in a sample of approximately 130 million minimum bias $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV pp events, collected during the 2010 data taking. The sample is corrected for trigger inefficiencies and biases to recover a normalized sample of inelastic (INEL) events, as described in [2]. The events are selected within 10 cm of the detector's centre along the beam direction, with vertex resolution in the transverse plane of a few hundred micrometres. The event vertex range is selected to maximize particle trajectory (track) reconstruction efficiency within the ITS and TPC volume.

 Ξ^- and $\overline{\Xi}^+$ (Ξ^{\pm}), as well as Ω^- and $\overline{\Omega}^+$ (Ω^{\pm}) candidates are reconstructed at mid-rapidity (|y| < 0.5) via their characteristic weak decay topology, $\Xi^{-}(\overline{\Xi}^{+}) \rightarrow \Lambda(\overline{\Lambda}) + \pi^{-}(\pi^{+})$, and $\Omega^{-}(\overline{\Omega}^{+}) \rightarrow \Lambda(\overline{\Lambda}) + K^{-}(K^{+})$, as described in detail in [3]. The branching ratios for these decay channels are 67.8% for \varOmega^{\pm} baryons and 99.9% for Ξ^{\pm} . Charged particles, compatible with kaon, pion and proton hypotheses, are identified using their energy loss in the TPC. The topology of the Ω^- and Ξ^- weak decay is cascade-like and consists of a V-shaped decay of the daughter Λ baryon (Λ baryon hypothesis is identified as a "V0") plus a negatively charged track (h⁻). The same applies to antibaryons, however in that case the decay products are the $\overline{\Lambda}$ daughter particles and a positively charged track (h⁺). In general, the acceptance and efficiency depend on both y and p_{T} . We chose the y interval such that our efficiency and acceptance depend only on p_{T} . Candidates are selected by placing restrictions on the topology of the



^{0370-2693/} \odot 2012 CERN. Published by Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2012.05.011

Table 1

Selection criteria parameters for V0 (Λ) and cascades (Ξ^{\pm} and Ω^{\pm}) presented in this Letter. If a criterion for Ξ^{\pm} and Ω^{\pm} finding differs, the criterion for Ω^{\pm} hypothesis is in parentheses. DCA stands for "distance of closest approach," and PV for "primary event vertex." The fiducial volume is defined by the coordinate of the decay vertex position, the transverse radius, R_{2D} . θ is the angle between the momentum vector of the reconstructed V0 or cascade, and the line segment bound by the decay and primary vertices. For cascades, the curvature of the particle's trajectory is neglected.

V0 finding criteria	
DCA (h^{\pm} to PV)	> 0.04 (0.03) cm
DCA (h^- to h^+)	< 1.6 standard deviations
Λ mass (m_{V0})	$1.110 < m_{V0} < 1.122 \text{ GeV}/c^2$
Fiducial volume (R_{2D})	$1.4 < R_{2D} < 100$ cm
V0 pointing angle	$\cos \theta_{\rm V0} > 0.97$
Cascade finding criteria	
DCA $(\pi^{\pm} (K^{\pm})$ to PV)	> 0.05 cm
DCA (V0 to PV)	> 0.07 cm
DCA (π^{\pm} (K $^{\pm}$) to V0)	< 1.6 (1.0) cm
Fiducial volume (R_{2D})	$0.8 (0.6) < R_{2D} < 100 \text{ cm}$
Cascade pointing angle	$\cos heta_{casc} > 0.97$

decay. These have been optimized to obtain maximum mass signal significance and are listed in Table 1.

The resulting invariant mass distributions for both species hypotheses are shown in Fig. 1. The signal extraction method is described in detail in [3]. The signal is extracted using a bin-counting method and then corrected for detector efficiency and acceptance using PYTHIA Perugia 0 [4] generated Monte Carlo events propagated through ALICE using GEANT3 [5].

3. Systematic uncertainties

There are two types of systematic uncertainties in the resulting particle spectra: p_T -dependent systematic uncertainties that are due to the efficiency determination and the signal quality at a given p_T , and the p_T -independent uncertainties due to normalization and other factors explained below.

The point-to-point systematic uncertainties vary between 1–4% for Ξ^{\pm} , and 1–9% for Ω^{\pm} , with minimum uncertainty found at $p_{\rm T} = 1.5$ –4.0 GeV/*c* for both species. The $p_{\rm T}$ -independent systematic uncertainties stem from several sources and reflect the following:

• the uncertainty in determination of the material thickness traversed by the particles (material budget), 4%;

- the use of FLUKA [6,7] to correct [8] the antiproton absorption cross section in GEANT3 [5], 1%;
- the uncertainty in TPC particle identification via energy loss, 1.5%;
- the uncertainty on the track selection in the TPC, through the restriction on the number of TPC pad plane clusters used in particle reconstruction, 3%;
- in the case of Ω[±], the removal of cascades that fit the Ξ[±] baryon hypothesis, 1%.

The limited $p_{\rm T}$ -coverage and determination of the total number of inelastic events used for yield normalization lead to an additional uncertainty in the particle yields and mean $p_{\rm T}$ ($\langle p_{\rm T} \rangle$) values. The INEL normalization [2] leads to a +7.0% and -3.5% uncertainty on the yield for all measured particles, while the limited $p_{\rm T}$ coverage causes a 4.5% uncertainty on the $\langle p_{\rm T} \rangle$ of all species, 5.5% uncertainty on the yield of Ξ^{\pm} baryons, and 6.5% on the yield of Ω^{\pm} . While the systematic uncertainties (both $p_{\rm T}$ -dependent and $p_{\rm T}$ -independent) associated with each spectrum point affect the determination of $\langle p_{\rm T} \rangle$, the systematic uncertainty on the $\langle p_{\rm T} \rangle$ for all species is dominated by the 4.5% error due to the limited $p_{\rm T}$ coverage. Similarly, the systematic uncertainty on the yields is dominated by the uncertainties due to low- $p_{\rm T}$ extrapolation and event normalization.

4. Results

4.1. Corrected p_T spectra and Tsallis fits

The corrected multi-strange baryon yields per p_T bin per unit rapidity $(1/N_{\text{INEL}} \times d^2 N/dy \, dp_T)$ are shown in Fig. 2(a). They span from $p_T = 0.6$ to $p_T = 8.5$ GeV/*c* in the case of Ξ^- and $\overline{\Xi}^+$ baryons and from $p_T = 0.8$ to $p_T = 5$ GeV/*c* for Ω^- and $\overline{\Omega}^+$ baryons. The Tsallis function is used for fitting the spectra, as the measured p_T range covers both soft-physics and fragmentation particle production regions. The functional form is shown below:

$$\frac{d^2 N}{dy \, dp_{\rm T}} = \frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{nT[nT+m_0(n-2)]} \times \frac{dN}{dy} \times p_{\rm T} \times \left(1 + \frac{m_{\rm T} - m_0}{nT}\right)^{-r}$$

where *T*, *n*, and dN/dy (dN/dy representing the particle yield per unit rapidity) are fit parameters, $m_{\rm T} = \sqrt{m_0^2 + p_{\rm T}^2}$, and m_0 denotes the particle mass.

The function is grounded in Tsallis statistics [9]; it approximates an exponential component (represented by the *T* parameter), as well as a power-law dependence for the high- p_T tail. In Table 2,



Fig. 1. The invariant mass distributions of \mathcal{Z}^- (a) and Ω^- (b) baryon candidates (solid histograms) and their antiparticles (dashed histograms). Also marked (in shaded blocks) background sampling regions used in the signal extraction. The entire measured p_T range is presented.



Fig. 2. (a) Ξ^- and Ω^- baryon (solid circles and squares, respectively) and their antiparticle (open symbols) spectra, shown with Tsallis fits. (b) Experimental data to Monte Carlo (PYTHIA Perugia 2011) comparison. The errors are added in quadrature. The normalization uncertainty is shown as a black band.

we list the fit results for each particle and antiparticle and the corresponding extrapolated dN/dy and $\langle p_T \rangle$.

The central values of the fit parameters, listed in Table 2, are obtained using the statistical error only. The low- p_T extrapolation of the yield from the Tsallis fit is ~ 23% for Ξ^{\pm} and ~ 26% for Ω^{\pm} . The value of $\langle p_T \rangle$ for each particle was computed using the fit over the entire p_T range including the extrapolation. The antiparticle to particle ratios were found to be compatible with unity at all p_T .

4.2. Excitation functions

Our measurements of multi-strange baryons can be placed within the broader context of existing pp collision data. We compare to multi-strange baryon yields in pp collisions measured by the STAR Collaboration at $\sqrt{s} = 0.2$ TeV [10], and also to the data obtained by ALICE and CMS at $\sqrt{s} = 0.9$ TeV [3,11]. There are also data from $p\bar{p}$ collisions, obtained by the CDF [12] and UA5 [13] Collaborations. We omit the comparison to these data due to a significantly different kinematic range of the experiments. For STAR, ALICE, and CMS data, an increase in dN/dy as a function of collision energy is observed, presented in Fig. 3(a). We note that the CMS Collaboration used non-single-diffractive events (NSD) to normalize the yield, while in ALICE a normalization to the inelastic events (INEL) was used. For a direct comparison at LHC energies, the INEL Ξ^{\pm} yield has to be scaled up by 26% to get the yield normalized to NSD events [2]. After scaling, the Ξ^{\pm} yields per unit of rapidity obtained by ALICE agree with those published by CMS [11]. For Ξ^- baryons and antibaryons, we also observe a slight rise in mean $p_{\rm T}$ with collision energy, as seen in Fig. 3(b). The



Fig. 3. (a) dN/dy and (b) $\langle p_T \rangle$ of Ξ^{\pm} and Ω^{\pm} as a function of collision energy. The STAR and CMS data are normalized to NSD (see text) events, STAR Ξ^{\pm} and Ω^{\pm} are represented by open rhombuses and stars, respectively. CMS Ξ^{\pm} measurements are shown as open triangles, and ALICE Ξ^{\pm} and Ω^{\pm} as filled circles and squares. Multi-strange baryons produced using PYTHIA Perugia 2011 simulation (Ξ^{\pm} baryons as a long-dashed curve and Ω^{\pm} baryons as a dashed curve) are plotted for reference. The uncertainties are added in quadrature.

 $\langle p_{\rm T} \rangle$ of Ω^{\pm} baryons at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV is consistent with 0.2 TeV data, where Ω^{\pm} and $\Xi^{\pm} \langle p_{\rm T} \rangle$ were consistent within large experimental error. Due to the precision of the current measurements, a significant separation between the $\langle p_{\rm T} \rangle$ of Ω^{\pm} and Ξ^{\pm} is observed in $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV pp collisions.

4.3. $(\Omega^- + \overline{\Omega}^+)/(\Xi^- + \overline{\Xi}^+)$ ratio

The composition of Ξ^- and Ω^- baryons differs only by one valence quark flavour: the *d*-quark in Ξ^- is replaced by the *s*-quark in Ω^- . To investigate possible differences in the production mechanism of multi-strange baryons with and without the non-strange quark, we study the ratio of $(\Omega^- + \overline{\Omega}^+)$ to $(\Xi^- + \overline{\Xi}^+)$ baryons as a function of p_T . The dependence on particle mass is reduced by constructing spectra as a function of $(m_T - m_0)$ for each baryon species. To increase the statistical significance of the measurement, for this ratio, the particle and antiparticle spectra are combined. The ratio of the combined spectra, $(\Omega^- + \overline{\Omega}^+)/(\Xi^- + \overline{\Xi}^+)$, is shown in Fig. 4. We observe an increase in the ratio up to $(m_T - m_0) \sim 1.5$ GeV (which corresponds roughly to p_T of 3 GeV/*c* for either of the baryons), with a possible slope change at a higher $(m_T - m_0)$. The ratio was composed to investigate the possible sat-

Table 2

Tsallis fit parameters, yields, and $\langle p_T \rangle$ for each particle species at |y| < 0.5, as well as yields and $\langle p_T \rangle$ extracted from PYTHIA Perugia 2011 [4] simulations. Statistical and then systematic uncertainties for the experimental values are listed. Sufficient statistics were generated to have less than 1% error on all model values.

Particle	T (MeV)	n	χ^2/NDF	$dN/dy \times 10^3 data$	$\langle p_{\mathrm{T}} angle$ (GeV/c) data	dN/dy ×10 ³ P2011	⟨ <i>p</i> _T ⟩ (GeV/ <i>c</i>) P2011
Ξ^{-}	$344\pm5\pm10$	$10.8\pm0.4\pm0.8$	17.4/15	$8.0\pm0.1^{+0.7}_{-0.5}$	$1.21 \pm 0.01 \pm 0.06$	5.38	1.02
$\overline{\Xi}^+$	$339\pm5\pm9$	$10.4\pm0.4\pm0.5$	14.4/15	$7.8\pm0.1^{+0.7}_{-0.5}$	$1.21 \pm 0.01 \pm 0.06$	5.21	1.02
Ω^{-}	$460\pm40\pm60$	$20\pm9\pm8$	8.8/5	$0.67\pm0.03^{+0.08}_{-0.07}$	$1.47 \pm 0.03 \pm 0.09$	0.276	1.14
$\overline{\Omega}^+$	$430\pm30\pm40$	$14\pm5\pm6$	7.0/5	$0.68\pm0.03^{+0.08}_{-0.06}$	$1.44 \pm 0.03 \pm 0.08$	0.266	1.16



Fig. 4. $(\Omega^- + \overline{\Omega}^+)$ to $(\Xi^- + \overline{\Xi}^+)$ ratio in $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV pp events as a function of $(m_{\rm T} - m_0)$. Experimental data (closed symbols: data points; dashed curve: ratio of Tsallis fits), and PYTHIA Perugia 2011 simulation (solid curve). Errors on experimental points were added in quadrature.

uration of the *s*-quark production with respect to production of the non-strange quarks, which would be indicated by the flattening of the $(\Omega^- + \overline{\Omega}^+)/(\Xi^- + \overline{\Xi}^+)$ ratio. We found that the currently available data does not allow for a firm conclusion.

4.4. Comparisons to PYTHIA Perugia 2011

The production of strangeness in pp collisions is not well described by the currently available models. In particular, we compare the obtained data to particle spectra from PYTHIA [14], an event generator based on the leading order (LO) perturbative Quantum Chromo-Dynamics (pQCD). PYTHIA is available in different tunes, for example those listed in [4], each reflecting a distinct aspect of particle production inferred from experimental data. Several tunes were tested, among them PYTHIA Z1, Z2 [15], and Perugia 0 [4] tunes. These tunes were several times to an order of magnitude below the measured multi-strange spectra and yields (up to a factor 4 for Ξ^{\pm} , 15 for Ω^{\pm}) and thus were abandoned.

In this Letter, we use the central PYTHIA Perugia 2011 (P2011), one of the more recent PYTHIA 6.4 tunes, which describes the 7 TeV pp charged particle spectra reasonably well. P2011 is tuned to the multiplicity and charged particle $p_{\rm T}$ distributions from 2010 LHC data (as were other tunes tested), utilizes the CTEQ5L parton distribution function, and differs from other PYTHIA tunes by a significant increase in multi-strange baryon yields. This is achieved mainly by removing the baryon suppression inherently present in the built-in "pop corn" meson creation mechanism, but also by tuning the relative u and d vs. *s*-quark production rates, and adjusting the suppression of the diquark-antiquark hadron production scale [4]. The "pop corn" mechanism, used to describe the hadron production in e^+e^- collisions via chromoelectric flux tubes [16], suppresses baryon production by favouring soft quarkantiquark pairing into mesons [17]. The mechanism was removed in order to approximate more closely the multi-strange yields from LEP experiments [4].

Although the charged-particle multiplicities are reasonably described, as mentioned above, PYTHIA tunes tend to be several times to an order of magnitude below measured multi-strange values. P2011 significantly underestimates multi-strange particle yields, as seen in Table 2, and does not reproduce the spectral shapes of either Ξ^- or Ω^- baryons, with two exceptions. The

model describes the high $p_{\rm T}$ tail of the Ξ^{\pm} distribution and approaches the Ξ^{\pm} distribution below $p_{\rm T} < 0.85$ GeV/*c*, as shown in Fig. 2(b).

P2011 also underpredicts $\langle p_{\rm T} \rangle$ of multi-strange baryons at all energies (Fig. 3(b)), and incorrectly models the increase in dN/dy as a function of centre-of-mass energy (Fig. 3(a)). Indeed, in experimental data dN/dy increases by nearly a factor of three from $\sqrt{s} = 0.2$ TeV collisions to those at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV (factor 35 increase in energy), while P2011 predicts a more modest gain. In both experimental data and P2011, a power-law increase of Ξ^- baryon yield is seen as a function of \sqrt{s} . Moreover, P2011 does not reproduce the relative Ω^{\pm}/Ξ^{\pm} spectral shape, nor the absolute value, although the ratio does increase with increased $p_{\rm T}$, as shown in Fig. 4.

5. Conclusions

Our precise measurements of Ξ^- , $\overline{\Xi}^+$, Ω^- , and $\overline{\Omega}^+$ in $\sqrt{s} =$ 7 TeV pp collisions are a benchmark for improving future modelling efforts, including valuable checks on possible hadron production mechanisms, such as the flux-tube mechanism. In addition, the p_T reach of the data to model comparison is the highest ever achieved for multi-strange baryons. The relative production of doubly-strange vs. triply-strange baryons introduces a further constraint on the p_T dependence of particle production from flavourdifferentiated quarks. These considerations may enable a better insight into pp collision dynamics, which in turn will serve as a reference for better understanding of fundamental interactions underlying particle creation mechanisms in pp collisions.

Acknowledgements

The ALICE Collaboration would like to thank all its engineers and technicians for their invaluable contributions to the construction of the experiment and the CERN accelerator teams for the outstanding performance of the LHC complex.

The ALICE Collaboration acknowledges the following funding agencies for their support in building and running the ALICE detector:

Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation from Lisbon and Swiss Fonds Kidagan, Armenia;

Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq), Financiadora de Estudos e Projetos (FINEP), Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo (FAPESP);

National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC), the Chinese Ministry of Education (CMOE) and the Ministry of Science and Technology of China (MSTC);

Ministry of Education and Youth of the Czech Republic;

Danish Natural Science Research Council, the Carlsberg Foundation and the Danish National Research Foundation;

The European Research Council under the European Community's Seventh Framework Programme;

Helsinki Institute of Physics and the Academy of Finland;

French CNRS-IN2P3, the 'Region Pays de Loire', 'Region Alsace', 'Region Auvergne' and CEA, France;

German BMBF and the Helmholtz Association;

General Secretariat for Research and Technology, Ministry of Development, Greece;

Hungarian OTKA and National Office for Research and Technology (NKTH);

Department of Atomic Energy and Department of Science and Technology of the Government of India;

Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare (INFN) of Italy; MEXT Grant-in-Aid for Specially Promoted Research, Japan; Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna; National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF);

CONACYT, DGAPA, México, ALFA-EC and the HELEN Program (High-Energy Physics Latin-American–European Network);

Stichting voor Fundamenteel Onderzoek der Materie (FOM) and the Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek (NWO), Netherlands;

Research Council of Norway (NFR);

Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education;

National Authority for Scientific Research – NASR (Autoritatea Națională pentru Cercetare Științifică – ANCS);

Federal Agency of Science of the Ministry of Education and Science of Russian Federation, International Science and Technology Center, Russian Academy of Sciences, Russian Federal Agency of Atomic Energy, Russian Federal Agency for Science and Innovations and CERN-INTAS;

Ministry of Education of Slovakia;

Department of Science and Technology, South Africa;

CIEMAT, EELA, Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia of Spain, Xunta de Galicia (Consellería de Educación), CEADEN, Cubaenergía, Cuba, and IAEA (International Atomic Energy Agency);

Swedish Research Council (VR) and Knut & Alice Wallenberg Foundation (KAW);

Ukraine Ministry of Education and Science;

United Kingdom Science and Technology Facilities Council (STFC);

The United States Department of Energy, the United States National Science Foundation, the State of Texas, and the State of Ohio.

Open access

This article is published Open Access at sciencedirect.com. It is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 3.0, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original authors and source are credited.

References

- K. Aamodt, et al., ALICE Collaboration, JINST 3 (2008) S08002, http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08002.
- [2] K. Aamodt, et al., ALICE Collaboration, Measurement of inelastic, single-, and double-diffraction cross sections in proton-proton collisions at LHC with ALICE, in preparation.
- [3] K. Aamodt, et al., ALICE Collaboration, Eur. Phys. J. C 71 (2011) 1594, http:// dx.doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-011-1594-5.
- [4] P.Z. Skands, Phys. Rev. D 82 (2010) 074018, arXiv:1005.3457v4, http://dx. doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.82.074018.
- [5] R. Brun, F. Carminati, S. Giani, GEANT detector description and simulation tool, CERN-W5013.
- [6] G. Battistoni, et al., AIP Conf. Proc. 896 (2007) 31, http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/ 1.2720455.
- [7] A. Ferrari, P.R. Sala, A. Fasso, J. Ranft, FLUKA: A multi-particle transport code (Program version 2005), CERN-2005-010.
- [8] K. Aamodt, et al., ALICE Collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett. 105 (2010) 072002, http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.105.072002.
- [9] C. Tsallis, J. Stat. Phys. 52 (1988) 479, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01016429.
- [10] B.I. Abelev, et al., STAR Collaboration, Phys. Rev. C 75 (2007) 064901, http:// dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.75.064901.
- [11] V. Khachatryan, et al., CMS Collaboration, JHEP 1105 (2011) 064, arXiv: 1102.4282, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/JHEP05(2011)064.
- [12] T. Aaltonen, et al., CDF Collaboration, Production of Λ , Ξ and Ω hyperons in $p\bar{p}$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 1.96$ TeV, arXiv:1101.2996.
- [13] R.E. Ansorge, et al., UA5 Collaboration, Nucl. Phys. B 328 (1989) 36, http://dx. doi.org/10.1016/0550-3213(89)90090-4.
- [14] T. Sjostrand, S. Mrenna, P.Z. Skands, JHEP 0605 (2006) 026, http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1088/1126-6708/2006/05/026.
- [15] R. Field, Acta Phys. Polon. B 42 (2011) 2631, arXiv:1110.5530, http://dx.doi.org/ 10.5506/APhysPolB.42.2631.
- [16] H.N.A. Casher, S. Nussinov, Phys. Rev. D 20 (1979) 179.
- [17] S.B. Chun, C.D. Buchanan, Phys. Lett. B 308 (1993) 153.

ALICE Collaboration

B. Abelev ^{68,*}, J. Adam ³³, D. Adamová ⁷³, A.M. Adare ¹²⁰, M.M. Aggarwal ⁷⁷, G. Aglieri Rinella ²⁹, A.G. Agocs ⁶⁰, A. Agostinelli ²¹, S. Aguilar Salazar ⁵⁶, Z. Ahammed ¹¹⁶, N. Ahmad ¹³, A. Ahmad Masoodi ¹³, S.U. Ahn ^{63,36}, A. Akindinov ⁴⁶, D. Aleksandrov ⁸⁸, B. Alessandro ⁹⁴, R. Alfaro Molina ⁵⁶, A. Alici ^{97,9}, A. Alkin ², E. Almaráz Aviña ⁵⁶, J. Alme ³¹, T. Alt ³⁵, V. Altini ²⁷, S. Altinpinar ¹⁴, I. Altsybeev ¹¹⁷, C. Andrei ⁷⁰, A. Andronic ⁸⁵, V. Anguelov ⁸², J. Anielski ⁵⁴, C. Anson ¹⁵, T. Antičić ⁸⁶, F. Antinori ⁹³, P. Antonioli ⁹⁷, L. Aphecetche ¹⁰², H. Appelshäuser ⁵², N. Arbor ⁶⁴, S. Arcelli ²¹, A. Arend ⁵², N. Armesto ¹², R. Arnaldi ⁹⁴, T. Aronsson ¹²⁰, I.C. Arsene ⁸⁵, M. Arslandok ⁵², A. Asryan ¹¹⁷, A. Augustinus ²⁹, R. Averbeck ⁸⁵, T.C. Awes ⁷⁴, J. Äystö ³⁷, M.D. Azmi ¹³, M. Bach ³⁵, A. Badalà ⁹⁹, Y.W. Baek ^{63,36}, R. Bailhache ⁵², R. Bala ⁹⁴, R. Baldini Ferroli ⁹, A. Baldisseri ¹¹, A. Baldit ⁶³, F. Baltasar Dos Santos Pedrosa ²⁹, J. Bán ⁴⁷, R.C. Baral ⁴⁸, R. Barbera ²³, F. Barile ²⁷, G.G. Barnaföldi ⁶⁰, L.S. Barnby ⁹⁰, V. Barret ⁶³, J. Bartke ¹⁰⁴, M. Basile ²¹, N. Bastid ⁶³, S. Basu ¹¹⁶, B. Bathen ⁵⁴, G. Batigne ¹⁰², B. Batyunya ⁵⁹, C. Baumann ⁵², I.G. Bearden ⁷¹, H. Beck ⁵², I. Belikov ⁵⁸, F. Bellini ²¹, R. Bellwied ¹¹⁰, E. Belmont-Moreno ⁵⁶, G. Bencedi ⁶⁰, S. Beole ²⁵, I. Berceanu ⁷⁰, A. Bercuci ⁷⁰, Y. Berdnikov ⁷⁵, D. Berenyi ⁶⁰, D. Berzano ⁹⁴, L. Betev ²⁹, A. Bhasin ⁸⁰, A.K. Bhati ⁷⁷, J. Bhom ¹¹⁴, N. Bianchi ⁶⁵, L. Bianco ⁷, D. Blau ⁸⁸, C. Blume ⁵², M. Boccioli ²⁹, N. Bock ¹⁵, S. Böttger ⁵¹, A. Bogdanov ⁶⁹, H. Bøggild ⁷¹, M. Bogolyubsky ⁴³, L. Boldizsár ⁶⁰, M. Bombara ³⁴, J. Book ⁵², H. Borel ¹¹, A. Borissov ¹¹⁹, S. Bose ⁸⁹, F. Bossú ²⁵, M. Botje ⁷², B. Boyer ⁴², E. Braidot ⁶⁷, P. Braun-Munzinger ⁸⁵, M. Bregant ¹⁰², T. Breitner ⁵¹, T. A. Browning ⁸³, M. Broz ³², R. Brun ² <page-header><page-header>

315

L. Leistam ²⁹, M. Lenhardt ¹⁰², V. Lenti ⁹⁸, H. León ⁵⁶, I. León Monzón ¹⁰⁶, H. León Vargas ⁵², P. Lévai ⁶⁰, J. Lien ¹⁴, R. Lietava ⁹⁰, S. Lindal ¹⁷, V. Lindenstruth ³⁵, C. Lippmann ^{85,29}, M.A. Lisa ¹⁵, L. Liu ¹⁴, P.I. Loenne ¹⁴, V.R. Loggins ¹¹⁹, V. Loginov ⁶⁹, S. Lohn ²⁹, D. Lohner ⁸², C. Loizides ⁶⁷, K.K. Loo ³⁷, X. Lopez ⁶³, E. López Torres ⁶, G. Løvhøiden ¹⁷, X.-G. Lu ⁸², P. Luettig ⁵², M. Lunardon ¹⁹, J. Luo ³⁹, G. Luparello ⁴⁵, L. Luquin ¹⁰², C. Luzzi ²⁹, K. Ma ³⁹, R. Ma ¹²⁰, D.M. Madagodahettige-Don ¹¹⁰, A. Maevskaya ⁴⁴, M. Mager ^{53,29}, D.P. Mahapatra ⁴⁸, A. Maire ^{58,82}, M. Malaev ⁷⁵, A. Maevskaya⁴⁴, M. Mager ^{53,29}, D.P. Mahapatra⁴⁸, A. Maire ^{58,82}, M. Malaev ⁷⁵, I. Maldonado Cervantes ⁵⁵, L. Malinina ^{59,i,ii}, D. Mal'Kevich ⁴⁶, P. Malzacher ⁸⁵, A. Mamonov ⁸⁷, L. Manceau ⁹⁴, L. Mangotra ⁸⁰, V. Manko ⁸⁸, F. Manso ⁶³, V. Manzari ⁹⁸, Y. Mao ³⁹, M. Marchisone ^{63,25}, J. Mareš ⁴⁹, G.V. Margagliotti ^{20,92}, A. Margotti ⁹⁷, A. Marín ⁸⁵, C.A. Marin Tobon ²⁹, C. Markert ¹⁰⁵, I. Martashvili ¹¹², P. Martinengo ²⁹, M.I. Martínez ¹, A. Martínez Davalos ⁵⁶, G. Martínez García ¹⁰², Y. Martynov², A. Mas ¹⁰², S. Masciocchi ⁸⁵, M. Masera ²⁵, A. Masoni ⁹⁶, L. Massacrier ^{109,102}, M. Mastromarco ⁹⁸, A. Mastroserio ^{27,29}, Z.L. Matthews ⁹⁰, A. Matyja ^{104,102}, D. Mayani ⁵⁵, C. Mayer ¹⁰⁴, J. Mazer ¹¹², M.A. Mazzoni ⁹⁵, F. Meddi ²², A. Menchaca-Rocha ⁵⁶, J. Mercado Pérez ⁸², M. Meres ³², Y. Miake ¹¹⁴, L. Milano ²⁵, J. Milosevic ^{17,i,iii}, A. Mischke ⁴⁵, A.N. Mishra ⁸¹, D. Miśkowiec ^{85,29}, C. Mitu ⁵⁰, J. Mlynarz ¹¹⁹, A.K. Mohanty ²⁹, B. Mohanty ¹¹⁶, L. Molnar ²⁹, L. Montaño Zetina ⁸, M. Monteno ⁹⁴, F. Montes ⁷, T. Moon ¹²³, M. Morando ¹⁹, D.A. Moreira De Godov ¹⁰⁷, S. Moretto ¹⁹, A. Morsch ²⁹ J. Mlynarz ¹¹⁹, A.K. Mohanty ²⁹, B. Mohanty ¹¹⁶, L. Molnar ²⁹, L. Montaño Zetina ⁸, M. Monteno ⁹⁴, E. Montes ⁷, T. Moon ¹²³, M. Morando ¹⁹, D.A. Moreira De Godoy ¹⁰⁷, S. Moretto ¹⁹, A. Morsch ²⁹, V. Muccifora ⁶⁵, E. Mudnic ¹⁰³, S. Muhuri ¹¹⁶, M. Mukherjee ¹¹⁶, H. Müller ²⁹, M.G. Munhoz ¹⁰⁷, L. Musa ²⁹, A. Musso ⁹⁴, B.K. Nandi ⁴⁰, R. Nania ⁹⁷, E. Nappi ⁹⁸, C. Nattrass ¹¹², N.P. Naumov ⁸⁷, S. Navin ⁹⁰, T.K. Nayak ¹¹⁶, S. Nazarenko ⁸⁷, G. Nazarov ⁸⁷, A. Nedosekin ⁴⁶, B.S. Nielsen ⁷¹, T. Niida ¹¹⁴, S. Nikolaev ⁸⁸, V. Nikolic ⁸⁶, V. Nikulin ⁷⁵, S. Nikulin ⁸⁸, B.S. Nilsen ⁷⁶, M.S. Nilsson ¹⁷, F. Noferini ^{97,9}, P. Nomokonov ⁵⁹, G. Nooren ⁴⁵, N. Novitzky ³⁷, A. Nyanin ⁸⁸, A. Nyatha ⁴⁰, C. Nygaard ⁷¹, J. Nystrand ¹⁴, A. Ochirov ¹¹⁷, H. Oeschler ^{53,29}, S.K. Oh ³⁶, S. Oh ¹²⁰, J. Oleniacz ¹¹⁸, C. Oppedisano ⁹⁴, A. Ortiz Velasquez ^{28,55}, G. Ortona ²⁵, A. Oskarsson ²⁸, P. Ostrowski ¹¹⁸, J. Otwinowski ⁸⁵, K. Oyama ⁸², K. Ozawa ¹¹³, Y. Pachmayer ⁸², M. Pachr ³³, F. Padilla ²⁵, P. Pagano ²⁴, G. Paić ⁵⁵, F. Painke ³⁵, C. Pajares ¹², S.K. Pal ¹¹⁶, S. Pal ¹¹, A. Palaha ⁹⁰, A. Palmeri ⁹⁹, V. Panikvan ¹²¹, G.S. Pappalardo ⁹⁹, W.I. Park ⁸⁵, A. Passfeld ⁵⁴ S. Pal¹¹, A. Palaha⁹⁰, A. Palmeri⁹⁹, V. Papikyan¹²¹, G.S. Pappalardo⁹⁹, W.J. Park⁸⁵, A. Passfeld⁵⁴, B. Pastirčák⁴⁷, D.I. Patalakha⁴³, V. Paticchio⁹⁸, A. Pavlinov¹¹⁹, T. Pawlak¹¹⁸, T. Peitzmann⁴⁵, H. Pereira Da Costa ¹¹, E. Pereira De Oliveira Filho ¹⁰⁷, D. Peresunko ⁸⁸, C.E. Pérez Lara ⁷², E. Perez Lezama ⁵⁵, D. Perini ²⁹, D. Perrino ²⁷, W. Peryt ¹¹⁸, A. Pesci ⁹⁷, V. Peskov ^{29,55}, Y. Pestov ³, V. Petráček ³³, M. Petran ³³, M. Petris ⁷⁰, P. Petrov ⁹⁰, M. Petrovici ⁷⁰, C. Petta ²³, S. Piano ⁹², A. Piccotti ⁹⁴, M. Pikna ³², P. Pillot ¹⁰², O. Pinazza ²⁹, L. Pinsky ¹¹⁰, N. Pitz ⁵², D.B. Piyarathna ¹¹⁰, M. Płoskoń ⁶⁷, J. Pluta ¹¹⁸, T. Pocheptsov ⁵⁹, S. Pochybova ⁶⁰, P.L.M. Podesta-Lerma ¹⁰⁶, M.G. Poghosyan ^{29,25}, K. Polák ⁴⁹, B. Polichtchouk ⁴³, A. Pop ⁷⁰, S. Porteboeuf-Houssais ⁶³, V. Pospíšil ³³, B. Potukuchi ⁸⁰, S.K. Prasad ¹¹⁹, R. Preghenella ^{97,9}, F. Prino ⁹⁴, C.A. Pruneau ¹¹⁹, I. Pshenichnov ⁴⁴, S. Puchagin ⁸⁷, G. Puddu ¹⁸, R. Preghenella^{37,9}, F. Prino³⁴, C.A. Pruneau¹¹⁹, I. Pshenichnov⁴⁴, S. Puchagin³⁷, G. Puddu¹⁸, J. Pujol Teixido⁵¹, A. Pulvirenti^{23,29}, V. Punin⁸⁷, M. Putiš³⁴, J. Putschke^{119,120}, E. Quercigh²⁹, H. Qvigstad¹⁷, A. Rachevski⁹², A. Rademakers²⁹, S. Radomski⁸², T.S. Räihä³⁷, J. Rak³⁷, A. Rakotozafindrabe¹¹, L. Ramello²⁶, A. Ramírez Reyes⁸, S. Raniwala⁸¹, R. Raniwala⁸¹, S.S. Räsänen³⁷, B.T. Rascanu⁵², D. Rathee⁷⁷, K.F. Read¹¹², J.S. Real⁶⁴, K. Redlich^{100,57}, P. Reichelt⁵², M. Reicher⁴⁵, R. Renfordt⁵², A.R. Reolon⁶⁵, A. Reshetin⁴⁴, F. Rettig³⁵, J.-P. Revol²⁹, K. Reygers⁸², L. Riccati⁹⁴, R.A. Ricci⁶⁶, T. Richert²⁸, M. Richter¹⁷, P. Riedler²⁹, W. Riegler²⁹, F. Riggi^{23,99}, B. Rodrigues Fernandes Rabacal²⁹, M. Rodríguez Cahuantzi¹, A. Rodriguez Manso⁷², K. Røed¹⁴, D. Rohr³⁵, D. Röhrich¹⁴, R. Romita⁸⁵, F. Ronchetti⁶⁵, P. Rosnet⁶³, S. Rossegger²⁹, A. Rossi^{29,19}, P. Roy⁸⁹, C. Roy⁵⁸, A.J. Rubio Montero⁷, R. Rui²⁰, E. Ryabinkin⁸⁸, A. Rybicki¹⁰⁴, S. Sadovsky⁴³, K. Šafařík²⁹, C. Roy ⁵⁸, A.J. Rubio Montero ⁷, R. Rui ²⁰, E. Ryabinkin ⁸⁸, A. Rybicki ¹⁰⁴, S. Sadovsky ⁴³, K. Safařík ²⁹, R. Sahoo ⁴¹, P.K. Sahu ⁴⁸, J. Saini ¹¹⁶, H. Sakaguchi ³⁸, S. Sakai ⁶⁷, D. Sakata ¹¹⁴, C.A. Salgado ¹², J. Salzwedel ¹⁵, S. Sambyal ⁸⁰, V. Samsonov ⁷⁵, X. Sanchez Castro ^{55,58}, L. Šándor ⁴⁷, A. Sandoval ⁵⁶, S. Sano ¹¹³, M. Sano ¹¹⁴, R. Santo ⁵⁴, R. Santoro ^{98,29}, J. Sarkamo ³⁷, E. Scapparone ⁹⁷, F. Scarlassara ¹⁹, R.P. Scharenberg ⁸³, C. Schiaua ⁷⁰, R. Schicker ⁸², C. Schmidt ⁸⁵, H.R. Schmidt ¹¹⁵, S. Schreiner ²⁹, S. Schuchmann ⁵², J. Schukraft ²⁹, Y. Schutz ^{29,102}, K. Schwarz ⁸⁵, K. Schweda ^{85,82}, G. Scioli ²¹, E. Scomparin ⁹⁴, R. Scott ¹¹², P.A. Scott ⁹⁰, G. Segato ¹⁹, I. Selyuzhenkov ⁸⁵, S. Senyukov ^{26,58}, J. Seo ⁸⁴, S. Serci ¹⁸, E. Serradilla ^{7,56}, A. Sevcenco ⁵⁰, A. Shabetai ¹⁰², G. Shabratova ⁵⁹, R. Shahoyan ²⁹, S. Sharma ⁸⁰, N. Sharma ⁷⁷, S. Rohni ⁸⁰, K. Shigaki ³⁸, M. Shimomura ¹¹⁴, K. Shtejer ⁶, Y. Sibiriak ⁸⁸, M. Siciliano ²⁵, E. Sicking ²⁹, S. Siddhanta ⁹⁶, T. Siemiarczuk ¹⁰⁰, D. Silvermyr ⁷⁴, C. Silvestre ⁶⁴, G. Simatovic ^{55,86}, G. Simonetti ²⁹, R. Singaraju ¹¹⁶, R. Singh ⁸⁰, S. Singha ¹¹⁶, T. Sinha ⁸⁹, B.C. Sinha ¹¹⁶, B. Sitar ³², M. Sitta ²⁶, G. Simonetti²⁹, R. Singaraju¹¹⁶, R. Singh⁸⁰, S. Singha¹¹⁶, T. Sinha⁸⁹, B.C. Sinha¹¹⁶, B. Sitar³², M. Sitta²⁶,

T.B. Skaali ¹⁷, K. Skjerdal ¹⁴, R. Smakal ³³, N. Smirnov ¹²⁰, R.J.M. Snellings ⁴⁵, C. Søgaard ⁷¹, R. Soltz ⁶⁸, H. Son ¹⁶, J. Song ⁸⁴, M. Song ¹²³, C. Soos ²⁹, F. Soramel ¹⁹, I. Sputowska ¹⁰⁴, M. Spyropoulou-Stassinaki ⁷⁸, B.K. Srivastava ⁸³, J. Stachel ⁸², I. Stan ⁵⁰, I. Stan ⁵⁰, G. Stefanek ¹⁰⁰, T. Steinbeck ³⁵, M. Steinpreis ¹⁵, E. Stenlund ²⁸, G. Steyn ⁷⁹, J.H. Stiller ⁸², D. Stocco ¹⁰², M. Stolpovskiy ⁴³, K. Strabykin ⁸⁷, P. Strmen ³², A.A.P. Suaide ¹⁰⁷, M.A. Subieta Vásquez ²⁵, T. Sugitate ³⁸, C. Suire ⁴², M. Sukhorukov ⁸⁷, R. Sultanov ⁴⁶, M. Šumbera ⁷³, T. Susa ⁸⁶, A. Szanto de Toledo ¹⁰⁷, I. Szarka ³², A. Szczepankiewicz ¹⁰⁴, A. Szostak ¹⁴, M. Szymanski ¹¹⁸, J. Takahashi ¹⁰⁸, J.D. Tapia Takaki ⁴², A. Tauro ²⁹, G. Tejeda Muñoz ¹, A. Telesca ²⁹, C. Terrevoli ²⁷, J. Thäder ⁸⁵, D. Thomas ⁴⁵, R. Tieulent ¹⁰⁹, A.R. Timmins ¹¹⁰, D. Tlusty ³³, A. Toia ³⁵, ²⁹, H. Torii ¹¹³, L. Toscano ⁹⁴, D. Truesdale ¹⁵, W.H. Trzaska ³⁷, T. Tsuji ¹¹³, A. Tumkin ⁸⁷, R. Turrisi ⁹³, T.S. Tveter ¹⁷, J. Ulery ⁵², K. Ullaland ¹⁴, J. Ulrich ^{61,51}, A. Uras ¹⁰⁹, J. Urbán ³⁴, G.M. Urciuoli ⁹⁵, G.L. Usai ¹⁸, M. Vajzer ^{33,73}, M. Vala ^{59,47}, L. Valencia Palomo ⁴², S. Vallero ⁸², N. van der Kolk ⁷², P. Vande Vyvre ²⁹, M. van Leeuwen ⁴⁵, L. Vannucci ⁶⁶, A. Vargas ¹, R. Varma ⁴⁰, M. Vasileiou ⁷⁸, A. Vasiliev ⁸⁸, V. Vickovic ¹⁰³, G. Viesti ¹⁹, O. Vikhlyantsev ⁸⁷, Z. Vilakazi ⁷⁹, O. Villalobos Baillie ⁹⁰, A. Vinogradov ⁸⁸, V. Vinogradov ⁸⁷, L. Vinogradov ¹¹⁷, T. Virgili ²⁴, Y.P. Viyogi ¹¹⁶, A. Vodopyanov ⁵⁹, S. Voloshin ¹¹⁹, K. Voloshin ⁴⁶, G. Volpe ^{27,29}, B. von Haller ²⁹, D. Vranic ⁸⁵, G. Øvrebekk ¹⁴, J. Vrláková ³⁴, B. Vulpescu ⁶³, A. Vyushin ⁸⁷, B. Wagner ¹⁴, V. Wagner ³³, R. Wan ^{58,39}, Y. Wang ³⁹, D. Wang ³⁹, M. Wang ³⁹, Y. Wang ⁸², K. Watanabe ¹¹⁴, M. Weber ¹¹⁰, J.P. Wessels ^{29,54}, U. Westerhoff ⁵⁴, J. Wicehula ¹¹⁵, J.

- ¹ Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, Puebla, Mexico
- ² Bogolyubov Institute for Theoretical Physics, Kiev, Ukraine
- ³ Budker Institute for Nuclear Physics, Novosibirsk, Russia
- ⁴ California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, CA, United States
- ⁵ Centre de Calcul de l'IN2P3, Villeurbanne, France
- ⁶ Centro de Aplicaciones Tecnológicas y Desarrollo Nuclear (CEADEN), Havana, Cuba
- ⁷ Centro de Investigaciones Energéticas Medioambientales y Tecnológicas (CIEMAT), Madrid, Spain
- ⁸ Centro de Investigación y de Estudios Avanzados (CINVESTAV), Mexico City and Mérida, Mexico
- ⁹ Centro Fermi Centro Studi e Ricerche e Museo Storico della Fisica "Enrico Fermi", Rome, Italy
- ¹⁰ Chicago State University, Chicago, United States
- ¹¹ Commissariat à l'Energie Atomique, IRFU, Saclay, France
- ¹² Departamento de Física de Partículas and IGFAE, Universidad de Santiago de Compostela, Santiago de Compostela, Spain
- ¹³ Department of Physics Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, India
- ¹⁴ Department of Physics and Technology, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway
- ¹⁵ Department of Physics, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, United States
- ¹⁶ Department of Physics, Sejong University, Seoul, South Korea
- ¹⁷ Department of Physics, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway
- ¹⁸ Dipartimento di Fisica dell'Università and Sezione INFN, Cagliari, Italy
- ¹⁹ Dipartimento di Fisica dell'Università and Sezione INFN, Padova, Italy
- ²⁰ Dipartimento di Fisica dell'Università and Sezione INFN, Trieste, Italy
- ²¹ Dipartimento di Fisica dell'Università and Sezione INFN, Bologna, Italy
- ²² Dipartimento di Fisica dell'Università 'La Sapienza' and Sezione INFN, Rome, Italy
- ²³ Dipartimento di Fisica e Astronomia dell'Università and Sezione INFN, Catania, Italy
- ²⁴ Dipartimento di Fisica 'E.R. Caianiello' dell'Università and Gruppo Collegato INFN, Salerno, Italy
- ²⁵ Dipartimento di Fisica Sperimentale dell'Università and Sezione INFN, Turin, Italy
- ²⁶ Dipartimento di Scienze e Tecnologie Avanzate dell'Università del Piemonte Orientale and Gruppo Collegato INFN, Alessandria, Italy
- ²⁷ Dipartimento Interateneo di Fisica 'M. Merlin' and Sezione INFN, Bari, Italy
- ²⁸ Division of Experimental High Energy Physics, University of Lund, Lund, Sweden
- ²⁹ European Organization for Nuclear Research (CERN), Geneva, Switzerland
- ³⁰ Fachhochschule Köln, Köln, Germany
- ³¹ Faculty of Engineering, Bergen University College, Bergen, Norway
- ³² Faculty of Mathematics, Physics and Informatics, Comenius University, Bratislava, Slovakia
- ³³ Faculty of Nuclear Sciences and Physical Engineering, Czech Technical University in Prague, Prague, Czech Republic
- ³⁴ Faculty of Science, P.J. Šafárik University, Košice, Slovakia
- ³⁵ Frankfurt Institute for Advanced Studies, Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt, Frankfurt, Germany
- ³⁶ Gangneung-Wonju National University, Gangneung, South Korea
- ³⁷ Helsinki Institute of Physics (HIP) and University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä, Finland
- ³⁸ Hiroshima University, Hiroshima, Japan
- ³⁹ Hua-Zhong Normal University, Wuhan, China
- ⁴⁰ Indian Institute of Technology, Mumbai, India
- ⁴¹ Indian Institute of Technology Indore (IIT), Indore, India
- ⁴² Institut de Physique Nucléaire d'Orsay (IPNO), Université Paris-Sud, CNRS-IN2P3, Orsay, France

⁴³ Institute for High Energy Physics, Protvino, Russia

- ⁴⁴ Institute for Nuclear Research, Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia
- ⁴⁵ Nikhef. National Institute for Subatomic Physics and Institute for Subatomic Physics of Utrecht University, Utrecht, Netherlands
- ⁴⁶ Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia
- ⁴⁷ Institute of Experimental Physics, Slovak Academy of Sciences, Košice, Slovakia
- ⁴⁸ Institute of Physics, Bhubaneswar, India
- ⁴⁹ Institute of Physics, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Prague, Czech Republic
- ⁵⁰ Institute of Space Sciences (ISS), Bucharest, Romania
- ⁵¹ Institut für Informatik, Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt, Frankfurt, Germany
- ⁵² Institut für Kernphysik, Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt, Frankfurt, Germany
- ⁵³ Institut für Kernphysik, Technische Universität Darmstadt, Darmstadt, Germany
- ⁵⁴ Institut für Kernphysik, Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster, Münster, Germany
- ⁵⁵ Instituto de Ciencias Nucleares, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico City, Mexico
- ⁵⁶ Instituto de Física, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico City, Mexico
- ⁵⁷ Institut of Theoretical Physics, University of Wroclaw, Poland
- ⁵⁸ Institut Pluridisciplinaire Hubert Curien (IPHC), Université de Strasbourg, CNRS-IN2P3, Strasbourg, France
- ⁵⁹ Joint Institute for Nuclear Research (JINR), Dubna, Russia
- ⁶⁰ KFKI Research Institute for Particle and Nuclear Physics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, Hungary
- ⁶¹ Kirchhoff-Institut für Physik, Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg, Heidelberg, Germany
- ⁶² Korea Institute of Science and Technology Information, Daejeon, South Korea
- 63 Laboratoire de Physique Corpusculaire (LPC), Clermont Université, Université Blaise Pascal, CNRS-IN2P3, Clermont-Ferrand, France
- ⁶⁴ Laboratoire de Physique Subatomique et de Cosmologie (LPSC), Université Joseph Fourier, CNRS-IN2P3, Institut Polytechnique de Grenoble, Grenoble, France ⁶⁵ Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, INFN, Frascati, Italy
- ⁶⁶ Laboratori Nazionali di Legnaro, INFN, Legnaro, Italy
- ⁶⁷ Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA, United States
- ⁶⁸ Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA, United States
- ⁶⁹ Moscow Engineering Physics Institute, Moscow, Russia
- ⁷⁰ National Institute for Physics and Nuclear Engineering, Bucharest, Romania
- ⁷¹ Niels Bohr Institute, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark
- ⁷² Nikhef, National Institute for Subatomic Physics, Amsterdam, Netherlands
- ⁷³ Nuclear Physics Institute, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Řež u Prahy, Czech Republic
- ⁷⁴ Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN, United States
- ⁷⁵ Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, Gatchina, Russia
- ⁷⁶ Physics Department, Creighton University, Omaha, NE, United States
- 77 Physics Department, Panjab University, Chandigarh, India
- ⁷⁸ Physics Department, University of Athens, Athens, Greece
- ⁷⁹ Physics Department, University of Cape Town, iThemba LABS, Cape Town, South Africa
- ⁸⁰ Physics Department, University of Jammu, Jammu, India
- ⁸¹ Physics Department, University of Rajasthan, Jaipur, India
- 82 Physikalisches Institut, Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg, Heidelberg, Germany
- ⁸³ Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, United States
- ⁸⁴ Pusan National University, Pusan, South Korea
- ⁸⁵ Research Division and ExtreMe Matter Institute EMMI, GSI Helmholtzzentrum für Schwerionenforschung, Darmstadt, Germany
- ⁸⁶ Rudjer Bošković Institute, Zagreb, Croatia
- ⁸⁷ Russian Federal Nuclear Center (VNIIEF), Sarov, Russia
- ⁸⁸ Russian Research Centre Kurchatov Institute, Moscow, Russia
- ⁸⁹ Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, Kolkata, India
- ⁹⁰ School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, United Kingdom
- ⁹¹ Sección Física, Departamento de Ciencias, Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, Lima, Peru
- 92 Sezione INFN, Trieste, Italy
- 93 Sezione INFN, Padova, Italy
- ⁹⁴ Sezione INFN, Turin, Italy
- 95 Sezione INFN, Rome, Italy
- 96 Sezione INFN, Cagliari, Italy
- ⁹⁷ Sezione INFN, Bologna, Italy
- 98 Sezione INFN, Bari, Italy
- 99 Sezione INFN, Catania, Italy
- ¹⁰⁰ Soltan Institute for Nuclear Studies, Warsaw, Poland
- ¹⁰¹ Nuclear Physics Group, STFC Daresbury Laboratory, Daresbury, United Kingdom ¹⁰² SUBATECH, Ecole des Mines de Nantes, Université de Nantes, CNRS-IN2P3, Nantes, France
- ¹⁰³ Technical University of Split FESB, Split, Croatia
- ¹⁰⁴ The Henryk Niewodniczanski Institute of Nuclear Physics, Polish Academy of Sciences, Cracow, Poland
- ¹⁰⁵ The University of Texas at Austin, Physics Department, Austin, TX, United States
- ¹⁰⁶ Universidad Autónoma de Sinaloa, Culiacán, Mexico
- ¹⁰⁷ Universidade de São Paulo (USP), São Paulo, Brazil
- ¹⁰⁸ Universidade Estadual de Campinas (UNICAMP), Campinas, Brazil
- ¹⁰⁹ Université de Lyon, Université Lyon 1, CNRS/IN2P3, IPN-Lyon, Villeurbanne, France
- ¹¹⁰ University of Houston, Houston, TX, United States
- ¹¹¹ University of Technology and Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna, Austria
- ¹¹² University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN, United States
- ¹¹³ University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan
- ¹¹⁴ University of Tsukuba, Tsukuba, Japan
- ¹¹⁵ Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany
- ¹¹⁶ Variable Energy Cyclotron Centre, Kolkata, India
- ¹¹⁷ V. Fock Institute for Physics, St. Petersburg State University, St. Petersburg, Russia
- ¹¹⁸ Warsaw University of Technology, Warsaw, Poland
- ¹¹⁹ Wayne State University, Detroit, MI, United States
- ¹²⁰ Yale University, New Haven, CT, United States
- ¹²¹ Yerevan Physics Institute, Yerevan, Armenia

¹²² Yildiz Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey
 ¹²³ Yonsei University, Seoul, South Korea
 ¹²⁴ Zentrum für Technologietransfer und Telekommunikation (ZTT), Fachhochschule Worms, Worms, Germany

- * Corresponding author. *E-mail address:* betty.abelev@aya.yale.edu (B. Abelev).
- ⁱ Deceased.
- ⁱⁱ Also at: M.V. Lomonosov Moscow State University, D.V. Skobeltsyn Institute of Nuclear Physics, Moscow, Russia.
 ⁱⁱⁱ Also at: "Vinča" Institute of Nuclear Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia.