EUROPEAN ORGANIZATION FOR NUCLEAR RESEARCH (CERN)

CERN-EP-2018-268
2019/08/27

CMS-HIN-14-014

Centrality and pseudorapidity dependence of the transverse energy density in pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{_{\mathrm{NN}}}} = 5.02\,\mathrm{TeV}$

The CMS Collaboration*

Abstract

The almost hermetic coverage of the CMS detector is used to measure the distribution of transverse energy, E_{T}, over 13.2 units of pseudorapidity, η, for pPb collisions at a center-of-mass energy per nucleon pair of $\sqrt{s_{_{\mathrm{NN}}}} = 5.02\,\mathrm{TeV}$. The huge angular acceptance exploits the fact that the CASTOR calorimeter at $-6.6 < \eta < -5.2$ is effectively present on both sides of the colliding system because of a switch in the proton-going and lead-going beam directions. This wide acceptance enables the study of correlations between well-separated angular regions and makes the measurement a particularly powerful test of event generators. For minimum bias pPb collisions the maximum value of $\mathrm{d}E_{\mathrm{T}}/\mathrm{d}\eta$ is 22 GeV, which implies an E_{T} per participant nucleon pair comparable to that of peripheral PbPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{_{\mathrm{NN}}}} = 2.76\,\mathrm{TeV}$. The increase of $\mathrm{d}E_{\mathrm{T}}/\mathrm{d}\eta$ with centrality is much stronger for the lead-going side than for the proton-going side. The η dependence of $\mathrm{d}E_{\mathrm{T}}/\mathrm{d}\eta$ is sensitive to the η range in which the centrality variable is defined. Several modern generators are compared to these results but none is able to capture all aspects of the η and centrality dependence of the data and the correlations observed between different η regions.

"Published in Physical Review C as `doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.100.024902`*."*

*See Appendix A for the list of collaboration members

1 Introduction

In a heavy ion or proton nucleus collision the total transverse energy, E_T, is a measure of the energy liberated by the deceleration, or “stopping power” of the colliding nucleons while dE_T/dy measures the total energy carried by the system of particles or medium, produced in the collision, which is moving with longitudinal rapidity y [1]. In heavy ion collisions the energy density, ϵ_{BJ}, of this medium at proper time τ_0 shortly after the impact of the two nuclei can be estimated using the Bjorken formula

$$\epsilon_{BJ} = \frac{dE_T}{dy}\frac{1}{\tau_0 A_\perp}, \tag{1}$$

where $A_\perp$ is the nuclear transverse area, i.e., the initial size of the medium [2]. The time τ_0 at which it is first appropriate to speak about an energy density is a model assumption. Some collaborations have chosen to report the product of energy density and proper time $\epsilon_{BJ}\tau_0$ [2, 3] while others have used $\tau_0 = 1\,\text{fm}/c$ as a reference value [4, 5].

For the top 5% most central lead-lead collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76\,\text{TeV}$, this formula gives energy densities up to $14\,\text{GeV/fm}^3$ at a time $\tau_0 = 1\,\text{fm}/c$ [4]. This value is above the expected threshold of $\epsilon > 1\,\text{GeV/fm}^3$ for the production of a quark-gluon plasma estimated from quantum chromodynamics, QCD, calculations performed on a lattice [6]. Collective phenomena such as azimuthal flow and strangeness enhancement have been observed in proton-lead (pPb) [7–9] and even high-multiplicity proton-proton (p p) collisions [10–15]. Given such evidence of collective motion and strangeness enhancement in small systems, it is relevant to study the energy densities achieved in pPb collisions to see if a quark-gluon plasma could be formed in pPb collisions.

The E_T spectra in proton-nucleus, pA and deuteron-nucleus, dA, collisions have been measured at center-of-mass energies ranging from $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.5$ to $200\,\text{GeV}$ with nuclei ranging from deuterium (atomic number $A = 2$) to uranium (U, $A = 238$) [16–19]. At $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.5\,\text{GeV}$, only a weak correlation is observed between the total E_T and the charged-particle multiplicity in the forward region [17]. At $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.5$, 20, and 30 GeV, the mean pseudorapidity η moves backward, i.e., in the ion-going direction, and the pseudorapidity width of the $dE_T/d\eta$ distribution decreases as the total E_T in the event increases [16–18].

In this paper, we report $dE_T/d\eta$ distributions measured in pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02\,\text{TeV}$ by the CMS experiment at the CERN LHC. This beam energy is 25 times larger than that for the previous highest energy measurements at RHIC [20]. The analysis combines measurements from both pPb and Pbp data taking to cover 13.2 units of η, i.e., $|\eta| < 6.6$ in the laboratory frame. Since the energy per nucleon of the proton beam is higher than that of the lead one, the nucleon-nucleon center-of-mass is at a pseudorapidity of $\eta_{lab} = 0.465$ in the laboratory frame of reference. For symmetric heavy ion collisions, the shape of $dE_T/d\eta$ *vs.* η has only a weak dependence on the η region, which is used to classify the centrality of the events [4]. To test if this is the case for the much smaller system created in pPb collisions, events are classified according to the E_T or charged-particle multiplicity in several different η regions, and the $dE_T/d\eta$ distributions produced by the different classification procedures are compared to each other.

The comparison of these collider data with modern event generator calculations is a significant motivation for this work. The data presented here reach into the forward region that is crucial for understanding the development of cosmic ray air showers. A significant uncertainty in cosmic ray physics arises from the simulation of very high energy hadron-air collisions [21]. This uncertainty has an important effect on the modeling of air showers and the energy calibration of modern cosmic ray observatories. For a proper description of the development of cosmic ray air showers it is crucial to understand the rapidity region within four units of the rapidity of the incoming proton or nucleus [22]. The data are compared in detail to calculations from three event generators: HIJING v2.1, EPOS-LHC and QGSJET II-04 [23–25].

2 The CMS apparatus

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 (ECAL), and a brass and scintillator hadron calorimeter (HCAL), each composed of a barrel and two endcap sections. Muons are measured in gas-ionization detectors embedded in the steel flux-return yoke outside the solenoid. The silicon detectors provide tracking in the region $|\eta| < 2.5$, ECAL and HCAL cover the pseudorapidity interval $|\eta| < 3.0$ while the muon system covers the region $|\eta| < 2.4$. In the forward region, the hadron forward (HF) calorimeters cover the region $3.0 < |\eta| < 5.2$.

Each HF calorimeter consists of 432 readout towers, containing long and short quartz fibers running parallel to the beam. By reading out the two sets of fibers separately, it is possible to distinguish showers generated by electrons and photons from those generated by hadrons. Very forward angles are covered at one end of CMS ($-6.6 < \eta < -5.2$) by the CASTOR calorimeter, and at both ends ($|\eta| > 8.3$) by the zero-degree calorimeters (ZDCs). Both CASTOR and the ZDCs consist of quartz plates or fibers embedded in tungsten absorbers. They are segmented longitudinally to allow the separation of electromagnetic and hadronic components of the showers produced by incoming particles. A more 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. [26].

Analysis in the midrapidity region is based upon objects produced by the CMS particle-flow algorithm [27], which reconstructs and identifies each individual particle-flow candidate with an optimized combination of information from the various elements of the CMS detector. The energy of photons is directly obtained from the ECAL measurement, corrected for the effects of the zero-suppression algorithm. The zero-suppression algorithm both speeds up the readout and reduces the volume of data that must be recorded. The energy of electrons is determined from a combination of the electron momentum at the primary interaction vertex, as determined by the tracker, the energy of the corresponding ECAL cluster, and the energy sum of all bremsstrahlung photons compatible with originating from the electron track. The energy of muons is obtained from the curvature of the corresponding track, reconstructed using information from both tracker and muon stations. For $|\eta| < 2.5$ the energy of charged hadrons is determined from a combination of their momentum measured in the tracker and the matching of ECAL and HCAL energy deposits. These energy deposits are corrected for the effects of the zero-suppression algorithm and the response function of the calorimeters to hadronic showers. Finally, the energy of neutral hadrons is obtained from the corresponding corrected ECAL and HCAL energy.

For the forward detectors, HF, CASTOR, and ZDC, there is no tracking information, therefore information from the calorimeter towers only is used for the analysis. The two HF calorimeters are each segmented into 13 rings in η. For this analysis, the first two rings, covering $3.00 < |\eta| < 3.15$, are excluded since they are partially located in the shadow of the endcap calorimeter. The subsequent ten rings of width $\delta\eta = 0.175$ are grouped into 5 pairs of consecutive rings. The last ring has a width of $\delta\eta = 0.3$. In total, the transverse energy is measured in these six η bins in each HF calorimeter. The calibration of the HF calorimeter is derived from test beam data, and radioactive sources and has an accuracy of 10% [28]. The energy flow in the HF calorimeter is measured by summing all energy deposits above the threshold of 4 GeV in a given ring. Since CASTOR has no η segmentation, all energy deposits within it are summed together. The absolute calibration of the CASTOR calorimeter is achieved by a combination of extrapolation from the HF region for 7 TeV pp data and simulation-based corrections. The accuracy of the energy scale is estimated to be 22%. The calibration of the ZDCs is based on electromagnetic interactions that produce single neutrons in the calorimeters with the energy E_{beam}/A [29].

3 Data taking and event selection

The data for this analysis were recorded during the CERN LHC 2013 pPb and Pbp data taking. During these runs, 31 nb^{-1} of data were collected by CMS, of which 1.14 nb^{-1} are used for this analysis. For this luminosity the statistical uncertainties on the data are very small compared to the systematic ones. For this paper the proton-going direction is defined to be towards positive rapidity, which implies that negative η is in the lead-going direction. The switch in the proton and lead beam directions allows the use of CASTOR for measuring E_{T} on both the lead- and proton-going sides of the collision. For this analysis, events are selected with an unbiased hardware trigger requiring only the presence of proton and lead bunches in the CMS detector. These bunches are detected by induction counters placed 175 m from the interaction point on each side of the experiment. Furthermore, the presence of at least one single reconstructed charged-particle track with $|\eta| < 2.4$ and $p_{\text{T}} > 400\,\text{MeV}/c$ is required. An offline selection reduces events from beam-gas or electromagnetic interactions [30]. Events are required to have at least one HF calorimeter tower with more than 3 GeV of total energy on both the positive and negative sides of the interaction point and at least one reconstructed primary vertex with at least two associated tracks. The effect of noise on the E_{T} measurement is estimated from a sample of events collected with a random trigger when no beams are present.

4 Event centrality

In heavy ion collisions the activity or violence of a collision can be classified by several theoretical constructs [1]: the number of nucleons that participate in the collision, N_{part}, by the number of collisions between participants, N_{coll}, and by the closest distance between the centers of the colliding nuclei, which is called the impact parameter, b. The term centrality is used as an estimator of the impact parameter of the collisions. It is generally defined in terms of the multiplicity of charged-particles or the E_{T} produced in a given η region. While in Monte Carlo (MC) simulations N_{part}, N_{coll}, and b are known, in data, these variables cannot be measured directly. These quantities are estimated using E_{T} or charged-particle multiplicity, which are both believed to scale monotonically with N_{part} or b.

The centrality of a particular event is defined to be the percentile of events with values of the estimator larger than for that particular event. A Glauber model is then used to relate the centrality to N_{part}, N_{coll}, and b [31].

For symmetric heavy ion collisions the correlation of centrality with N_{part} is strong [4], but for the much smaller pPb system the fluctuations of N_{part} with a given experimental observable are large [32]. For this paper three different measures of centrality are investigated:

- HF-Single: E_{T} deposited in the Pb-going side of HF, in $-5.0 < \eta < -4.0$,
- HF-Double: The sum of E_{T} deposited in both sides of HF, in $4.0 < |\eta| < 5.0$,
- N_{track}: number of reconstructed tracks with $p_{\text{T}} > 400\,\text{MeV}/c$ and $|\eta| < 2.4$.

When using the charged-particle multiplicity or E_{T} in given η regions to define centrality there is an obvious autocorrelation between the centrality and the multiplicity or E_{T} in that region. It is not known, however, how far these correlations extend over larger η regions. The near hermetic coverage of the CMS calorimeters, 13.2 units of η, allow for the most complete picture of energy production yet performed for proton-lead collisions at the LHC. In order to understand the correlation that can arise from a choice of the centrality variable, a study needs to be made over a large pseudorapidity range for several centrality classes.

5 Data analysis

The measured transverse energy densities are are presented for $|\eta| < 2.0$ in the tracker region, for $3.15 < |\eta| < 5.20$ in the HF calorimeter, and for $5.2 < |\eta| < 6.6$ in the CASTOR calorimeter. Because of a switch of the beam direction during the data taking, the CASTOR calorimeter can be used for both positive and negative η.

The transverse energy density is calculated using the following equation

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}E_{\mathrm{T}}}{\mathrm{d}\eta}(\eta) = \frac{C(\eta)}{N\Delta\eta} \sum_j E_{\mathrm{T}}^j(\text{if } E_{\mathrm{T}}^j > \text{noise}), \tag{2}$$

where N is the number of good events that pass the online and the offline event selection, $C(\eta)$ is a correction factor that accounts for the reconstruction and triggering inefficiencies, and the index j in the summation runs over all reconstructed particle-flow objects. The correction is deduced from simulations and is defined as

$$C(\eta) = \frac{\sum_k E_{\mathrm{T}}^k(\text{generated})}{\sum_j E_{\mathrm{T}}^j(\text{reconstructed})(\text{if } E_{\mathrm{T}}^j > \text{noise})}, \tag{3}$$

where the index k in the top summation runs over all generated particles. Using this definition $C(\eta)$ corrects the data from the detector level of the data to the stable-particle level, i.e., those particles with lifetimes $c\tau > 1\,\mathrm{cm}$. This correction accounts for the nonlinearity of the calorimeter response and the noise thresholds. The correction factor depends on the particle mix and average transverse momentum of the particles. The EPOS-LHC, HIJING and, QGSJET II generators are used to estimate $C(\eta)$. For the analysis of the reconstructed simulated events, the event selection and noise reduction requirements are the same as for the data analysis. Events are selected by requiring at least one stable particle to be within the HF η range, $3.2 < |\eta| < 5.2$, on both sides.

In order to focus on the centrality dependence of the transverse energy as a function of η, the events are divided into 10 bins of centrality, 0–10%, 10–20%, etc.. Here we consider 0–10% to be *central* and any other centrality to be *peripheral*. Using these definitions the ratio of peripheral to central $\mathrm{d}E_{\mathrm{T}}/\mathrm{d}\eta$ is defined as

$$S_{\mathrm{PC}}(\eta) = \frac{\frac{\mathrm{d}E_{\mathrm{T}}}{\mathrm{d}\eta}(\text{peripheral}, \eta)}{\frac{\mathrm{d}E_{\mathrm{T}}}{\mathrm{d}\eta}(\text{central}, \eta)}. \tag{4}$$

This can be written as

$$S_{\mathrm{PC}}(\eta) = \frac{\sum_i E_{\mathrm{T}}^i(\text{peripheral})}{\sum_i E_{\mathrm{T}}^i(\text{central})} \frac{N_{\text{peripheral}}}{N_{\text{central}}} \frac{C(\text{peripheral}, \eta)}{C(\text{central}, \eta)}. \tag{5}$$

Since S_{PC} represents a ratio of results for two data samples multiplied by a ratio of two correction factors, correlated uncertainties tend to cancel, which is a major advantage of this approach. This method of studying the centrality dependence, rather than the more traditional ratio of central to peripheral events, exploits the fact that the 0–10% centrality class has the smallest fractional uncertainties and so minimizes the correlated uncertainties when comparing data from different centrality classes.

6 Systematic uncertainties

In this analysis, there are several sources of systematic uncertainties on $\mathrm{d}E_{\mathrm{T}}/\mathrm{d}\eta$:

1. The differences in E_{T} spectra and particle composition between data and the MC simulation used to generate correction factors. The impact of these differences is estimated by generating MC samples with different particle mixes and E_{T} spectra. These effects are most important in the tracker, $|\eta| < 2.4$, and HF regions, $3.15 < |\eta| < 5.20$, and are less than 3%.

2. Uncertainties in the calorimeter energy scale. These are estimated by the differences in calibration from various methods. These contribute less than 1% in the tracker region, 10% for HF, and 22% for CASTOR.

3. Method of handling the noise in the calorimeters. These uncertainties are estimated by using different sets of noise reduction requirements in the analysis. These uncertainties are less than 3% in the tracker and HF regions, and are negligible for CASTOR.

4. Any asymmetries between the positive and negative sides of CMS, e.g., from dead channels, etc.. The data from pPb collisions at a given positive η are compared to those of Pbp events at the corresponding negative η. These uncertainties are up to 5.0% in the tracker region, and up to 3.5% in the HF region.

The uncertainties described above are evaluated separately in the tracker, HF, and CASTOR regions and summed in quadrature. For the CASTOR region the uncertainty in the energy scale dominates the total systematic uncertainty. Table 1 lists the systematic uncertainties on $\mathrm{d}E_{\mathrm{T}}/\mathrm{d}\eta$ and S_{PC} for each η region as a function centrality as defined by HF-Double. The systematic uncertainties are the smallest for the most central events. For S_{PC}, there is a high degree of cancellation between the uncertainties in different centrality classes. In particular the energy scale and forward/backward systematic uncertainties cancel almost completely while the uncertainties related to the simulation and noise reduction only partially cancel. The net result is that the systematic uncertainties in S_{PC} are considerably smaller than those in E_{T}.

7 Results

The most basic measurement of E_{T} production is performed for the minimum bias selection as a function of η. Figure 1 shows the resulting $\mathrm{d}E_{\mathrm{T}}/\mathrm{d}\eta$ versus η for data and for predictions from the EPOS-LHC, QGSJET II and HIJING models. The HIJING event generator is based on a two-component model for hadron production in high-energy nucleon and nuclear collisions. Hard parton scattering is assumed to be described by perturbative QCD, and soft interactions are approximated by string excitations with an effective cross section. For heavy nuclei, initial parton distributions are modified with respect to those of free protons. Also, multiple scatterings inside a nucleus lead to transverse momentum (p_{T}) broadening of both initial- and final-state

Table 1: Systematic uncertainties in $dE_T/d\eta$ and S_{PC} for the tracker region, the HF region, and the CASTOR region as a function of centrality defined by HF-Double. The S_{PC} ratio is by construction unity for 0 - 10% centrality and is not defined for minimum bias events.

	$dE_T/d\eta$ systematic (%)			S_{PC} systematic (%)		
Centrality	Tracker	HF	CASTOR	Tracker	HF	CASTOR
0–10%	3.7	10.1	22		—	
10–20%	3.8	10.1	22	1.0	1.1	1.3
20–30%	3.8	10.1	22	1.3	1.1	1.5
30–40%	3.8	10.1	22	1.3	1.2	4.1
40–50%	4.2	10.1	22	1.3	1.2	4.1
50–60%	4.5	10.1	22	1.3	1.2	4.1
60–70%	5.1	10.2	22	1.6	1.3	4.1
70–80%	7.0	10.4	23	3.5	1.3	4.1
Min. bias	4.2	10.1	22		—	

partons. Both the EPOS-LHC and QGSJET II models use Gribov–Regge theory to give a self consistent quantum mechanical treatment of the initial parton-level interactions without an arbitrary division into soft and hard interactions [33]. The EPOS-LHC generator also includes a phenomenological implementation of gluon saturation. After the initial interactions, this model uses a hydrodynamic approach to evolve regions of high energy density. The QGSJET II generator allows parton cascades to split and merge via pomeron-pomeron interactions, but does not include a hydrodynamic component. Saturation effects are produced via higher-order pomeron-pomeron interactions.

From Fig. 1 it can be seen that $dE_T/d\eta|_{\eta=0} \approx 22\,\text{GeV}$. This is 1/40 of the value observed for the 2.5% most central PbPb collisions [4]. However, since the cross sectional area of a pPb collision is much smaller than that of a central PbPb collision [34, 35], this result implies that the maximum energy density in pPb collisions is comparable to that achieved in PbPb collisions.

By comparing $dE_T/d\eta$ to $dN_{ch}/d\eta$, which was previously measured by our experiment in proton-lead collisions at the same energy [36], it is possible to calculate the transverse energy per charged-particle. At the center-of-mass pseudorapidity we find $E_T/N_{ch} = 1.31 \pm 0.07\,\text{GeV/particle}$ for minimum bias pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{_{NN}}} = 5.02\,\text{TeV}$. This is somewhat higher than the value of $1.0 \pm 0.1\,\text{GeV/particle}$ reported by PHENIX for dAu collisions at $\sqrt{s_{_{NN}}} = 200\,\text{GeV}$ [37].

Predictions from the EPOS-LHC model are close to the data over the entire pseudorapidity range while those from the HIJING model are consistent with the data for $\eta < -3$ and $\eta > 2$, but are significantly below the data at midrapidity, i.e., $|\eta| < 2$. Predictions from the QGSJET II generator are consistently above the data over the entire η range. The peak of the data distribution is around $\eta = -0.5$. Both EPOS-LHC and QGSJET II generators peak close to this value while HIJING has a maximum at $\eta = -2.5$.

Figure 2 shows the transverse energy density at midrapidity, $dE_T/d\eta|_{\eta=0}$, versus $\sqrt{s_{_{NN}}}$ for minimum bias pA and dA collisions for several experiments [18, 19, 38]. The data are averaged over a small region around the center-of-mass pseudorapidity, with a typical $|\eta - \eta_{cm}| < 0.5$. To account for the different system sizes the $dE_T/d\eta$ values are normalized to the number of participating pairs of nucleons in the collisions. For the CMS data N_{part} was estimated to be 8.0 ± 0.2 using the method described in [31]. Figure 2 also shows a compilation of results for central AA collisions from Ref. [19] with the addition of a recent ALICE PbPb data point [3]. Although the geometries and lifetimes of pA and AA collisions are very different, it is inter-



Figure 1: Transverse energy density versus η from minimum bias pPb collisions at . at $\sqrt{s_{NN}}$ = 5.02 TeV. The proton is moving towards positive η. The statistical uncertainties are smaller than the size of the data points and the total errors are dominated by the systematics. The systematic uncertainties are largely correlated point to point within the central and with the HF regions and so shown by gray bands there. The systematic uncertainties for the most forward and backward data points i.e. $\eta = \pm 5.9$ are uncorrelated with those of central and HF regions and so are shown as vertical bars. Predictions from the EPOS-LHC (red solid), QGSJET II (green dashed), and HIJING (blue dotted) event generators are also shown.

esting to note that the pPb minimum bias value of 5.33±0.25 GeV per participant pair is higher than the central AuAu result at $\sqrt{s_{_{NN}}} = 200$ GeV [19] and consistent with the peripheral PbPb result at 2.76 TeV [4].



Figure 2: Transverse energy density per participating nucleon-nucleon pair evaluated at η_{cm} versus $\sqrt{s_{_{NN}}}$ for minimum bias pAu, pU, dAu, and pPb collisions. For the CMS pPb data at $\sqrt{s_{_{NN}}} = 5.02$ TeV, N_{part} was estimated to be 8.0 ± 0.2 using the method described in [31]. The uncertainties are generally smaller than the size of the data points. Also shown are the corresponding results for central AuAu and PbPb collisions, as well as simulation for minimum bias pPb collisions from three event generators [3, 4, 18, 37–46].

The rate of increase of $dE_T/d\eta|_{\eta=0}$ with $\sqrt{s_{_{NN}}}$ is stronger for AA than for pA collisions. This is expected because of the increased stopping power, i.e., the ability to decelerate nucleons, of heavy nuclei compared to protons [47, 48]. The stopping power controls the total amount of energy available for particle production. The rapidity shift of the incoming nucleons is proportional to the beam rapidity for energies up to $\sqrt{s_{_{NN}}} = 63$ GeV, but then seems to saturate [48–51]. This limit to the deceleration may be the reason for the change in slope of the AA data near $\sqrt{s_{_{NN}}} \approx 10$ GeV. The pA data also seems to change slope in this region but unfortunately the sparsity of data with $\sqrt{s_{_{NN}}}$ between 5 and 20 GeV make it difficult to determine where this change happens in pA collisions.

For energies above $\sqrt{s_{_{NN}}} \approx 10$ GeV the scaled transverse energy density increases as a power law according to $s_{\rm NN}^{\gamma}$. Such an energy dependence has been previously observed for the charged-particle multiplicity density, $dN^{\pm}/d\eta$, near $\eta = 0$ [3, 19, 36]. Table 2 lists the results of fitting the energy dependence of the scaled $dN^{\pm}/d\eta$ and $dE_{\rm T}/d\eta$ for central events to a function of the form $s_{\rm NN}^{\gamma}$. The $E_{\rm T}$ rises more rapidly with energy than the charged-particle multiplicity. Again this is expected because the mean transverse momentum is also increasing with beam energy [52]. This difference in the energy dependence of $E_{\rm T}$ and multiplicity production is stronger for AA than for pA collisions. This suggests that the mean transverse momentum rises faster with energy in AA than in pA collisions.

Table 2: Values of exponents from fitting the energy dependence of $dN^{\pm}/d\eta$ [36] and $dE_{\rm T}/d\eta$ at midrapidity to a function of the form $s_{\rm NN}^{\gamma}$ for minimum bias proton-nucleus and central nucleus-nucleus collisions.

Collision	γ for $N_{\rm ch}$	γ for $E_{\rm T}$
pA	$0.103 \pm .005$	$0.135 \pm .003$
AA	$0.158 \pm .004$	$0.205 \pm .005$

Figure 2 also shows simulations of pPb interactions at various energies. Predictions from the EPOS-LHC model are consistent with the data from $\sqrt{s_{_{NN}}} = 20$ GeV to 5.02 TeV. The QGSJET model is consistent with the 20 and 200 GeV data, but is somewhat higher than the data at $\sqrt{s_{_{NN}}} = 5.02$ TeV. The HIJING generator has a similar energy dependence of the data, but is consistently below the experimental results.

Figure 3 shows $dE_{\rm T}/d\eta$ versus η for pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{_{NN}}} = 5.02$ TeV for several centralities and for three different definitions of centrality for both data and simulations. For 0–10% most central collisions, $dE_{\rm T}/d\eta|_{\eta=0}$ exceeds 50 GeV. For the top 10% central pPb collisions it is reasonable to assume a complete overlap of the incoming proton with the lead nucleus. Thus, the transverse area $A_{\perp}$ corresponds to the total proton-proton (p p) cross section, $\sigma_{\rm pp}^{\rm tot}$, at $\sqrt{s} = 5.02$ TeV. The TOTEM collaboration has measured $\sigma_{\rm pp}^{\rm tot}$ at 2.76, 7, 8, and 13 TeV [53–56]. Based on these results we estimate $\sigma_{\rm pp}^{\rm tot} = 94 \pm 1$ mb at $\sqrt{s} = 5.02$ TeV. Furthermore, the factor $dy/d\eta$ needed for Eq. (1) depends upon the particle mix and $p_{\rm T}$ spectra. This factor is evaluated using simulated events from the three MC generators and is found to be 1.12 ± 0.03. With these considerations Eq. (1) implies an energy density at a time $\tau_0 = 1\,{\rm fm}/c$ of the order of $4.5\,{\rm GeV/fm}^3$ for the top 10% pPb collisions. This is above the expected threshold for the production of a quark-gluon plasma estimated from lattice QCD calculations [6].

For peripheral events the peak of $dE_{\rm T}/d\eta$ is close to the nucleon-nucleon center-of-mass pseudorapidity, $\eta_{\rm cm} = 0.465$. The peak moves towards the Pb side as the centrality increases, reflecting the increased momentum from the lead-going nucleons. For the most central events, the peak of $dE_{\rm T}/d\eta$ is at $\eta \approx -1.0$, i.e., 1.4 units below $\eta_{\rm cm}$. This is very close to the pseudorapidity shift observed for central pU collisions at $\sqrt{s_{_{NN}}} = 20$ GeV [18], suggesting that the stopping power of heavy nuclei for protons is almost independent of the center-of-mass energy for energies above 20 GeV. For AA collisions a similar energy independence of the stopping power has been observed for $\sqrt{s_{_{NN}}}$ greater than 63 GeV [49–51].

All three event generators show a large increase of $dE_{\rm T}/d\eta|_{\eta=0}$ and a shift of $\langle\eta\rangle$ towards the lead-going side as the centrality increases. However, for the 0–10%, centrality selection the HIJING distribution peaks at significantly lower η than the data. Predictions from the EPOS-LHC



Figure 3: Transverse energy density versus η and centrality from 5.02 TeV pPb collisions for the HF-Double (left), HF-Single (center), and N_{track} (right) centrality definitions for data and for predictions from the EPOS-LHC, QGSJET II, and HIJING event generators, for 0–10% (upper), 40–50% (middle), and 70–80% (lower) central collisions. The uncertainties are dominated by the systematic components, which are largely correlated point-to-point in the central region and in HF, and which are shown by gray bands there.

model are closest to the data for $|\eta| < 2$, whereas the HIJING generator gives a better description of the data in the lead-going region, i.e., $\eta < -3$. In the proton-going region, i.e., $\eta > 3$, the two generators are closer to each other and the data. The QGSJET II predictions significantly exceed the data at all rapidities for the 0–10% most central collisions, but are close to the data for the 40–50% and 70–80% centrality classes. As the centrality increases, $\mathrm{d}E_\mathrm{T}/\mathrm{d}\eta|_{\eta=0}$ increases faster for the N_track centrality definition than for the HF-Single or HF-Double definitions. This effect results from the autocorrelation with the centrality definition.

Figure 4 shows $\mathrm{d}E_\mathrm{T}/\mathrm{d}\eta$ scaled by the number of participant nucleon pairs as a function of N_part for the far lead-going region $-6.6 < \eta < -5.2$, the midrapidity region $|\eta| < 0.8$, and the far proton-going region $5.2 < \eta < 6.6$. The centrality definition is based on the HF-Single selection, i.e., $-5.0 < \eta < -4.0$. It is clear that the centrality dependence of E_T production varies strongly with η. For $N_\mathrm{part} > 3$ we find that $\mathrm{d}E_\mathrm{T}/\mathrm{d}\eta$ per participant nucleon pair rises with N_part in the lead-going and midrapidity regions, but falls for the far proton-going region. This is consistent with the backward shift of the mean η with centrality observed in Fig. 3.

Figure 4 also shows model predictions from EPOS-LHC, QGSJET II, and HIJING. At midrapidity none of the generators is consistent with the data over the whole range of N_part. In particular, the QGSJET II model has a much stronger centrality dependence than the data. For the lead-going region all three generators are consistent with the data within errors. For the proton-going region, all three generators are above the data, but predictions from the QGSJET II model are closer to the data than those from either EPOS-LHC or HIJING.

Figure 5 shows S_PC as a function of η for three centrality ranges and for all three centrality definitions for data as well as for predictions from the EPOS-LHC, QGSJET II, and HIJING event generators. Note that as per the definition, for each centrality bin, say 40–50%, S_PC shows the ratio of the $\mathrm{d}E_\mathrm{T}/\mathrm{d}\eta$ in that "peripheral" bin to $\mathrm{d}E_\mathrm{T}/\mathrm{d}\eta$ for the 0–10% most central events. As expected, S_PC increases with centrality for all centrality definitions. The S_PC value tends to rise with η since the centrality dependence of E_T production is stronger on the lead-going side than on the proton-going side. This is presumably because particles moving in the lead direction are more likely to have multiple interactions than particles moving in the proton-going region.

The autocorrelation between the centrality definition and the measure of $\mathrm{d}E_\mathrm{T}/\mathrm{d}\eta$ suppresses $\mathrm{d}E_\mathrm{T}/\mathrm{d}\eta$ for peripheral events and enhances it for central events in the η region that is used for the centrality determination. These two effects naturally induce a dip in the ratio of peripheral to central distributions in that particular η region. This effect is strongest for S_PC in the 70–80% centrality class for the HF-Single and HF-Double centrality definitions. While the HF centrality is based on $4 < |\eta| < 5$, the impact of the autocorrelations is very clearly visible over one to two more units of η. In contrast, the N_track centrality definition uses all tracks with $|\eta| < 2.4$, resulting in a much smoother S_PC as a function of η.

The QGSJET II model gives the best description of S_PC in the 10–20% centrality range, however, it significantly underestimates the magnitude of S_PC in all other cases, implying that it significantly overestimates the increase of $\mathrm{d}E_\mathrm{T}/\mathrm{d}\eta$ with centrality. The HIJING and EPOS-LHC generators in general do a better job in describing the magnitude of S_PC with EPOS-LHC, giving the best description in the 70–80% centrality range. None of the models gives a complete description of the centrality dependence of the data.

The QGSJET II generator also underestimates the dips in S_PC as a function of η for both the HF-Double and HF-Single definitions, of centrality. This is most clearly seen for the HF-Double definition in the forward region where the data show significant dips but the QGSJET II distributions increase monotonically with η. The HIJING and EPOS-LHC models both produce dips



Figure 4: Transverse energy density per participating nucleon-nucleon pair versus N_{part} for different η ranges. The N_{part} values are based on the method described in [31]. The HF-Single method was used to define centrality. The total experimental uncertainties are shown by gray bands. The values of N_{part} were calculated using the method described in [31].



Figure 5: Ratio of peripheral to central E_T production, S_{PC}, as a function of η for three centrality ranges for HF-Double (left), HF-Single (middle), and N_{track} (right) for data, and for the EPOS-LHC, QGSJET II, and HIJING event generators. The systematic uncertainties are dominant and are of comparable size to the data points.

in the same η regions as the data for both HF centrality definitions but neither generator is able to predict the shape of S_{PC} over the full η range. This failure to reproduce the η dependence of S_{PC} suggests that the generators do not correctly model the correlations present in proton-lead collisions.

8 Summary

In this paper we report the centrality and pseudorapidity (η) dependence of transverse energy (E_T) production from pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{_{NN}}} = 5.02\,\text{TeV}$ over 13.2 units of η. The E_T per participant pair in minimum bias pPb events at $\sqrt{s_{_{NN}}} = 5.02\,\text{TeV}$ is comparable to that of peripheral PbPb collisions at 2.76 TeV. At midrapidity the energy density at a proper time $\tau_0 = 1\,\text{fm}/c$ is of order of $4.5\,\text{GeV/fm}^3$ for the top 10% most central pPb collisions, which is comparable to those observed in PbPb collisions. As the centrality of the collision increases, the total E_T increases dramatically and the mean η of the E_T distribution moves towards the lead-going side of the collision. For central collisions, the peak of $dE_T/d\eta$ is 1.4 units below the center-of-mass pseudorapidity. This pseudorapidity shift is almost the same as for pU collisions at $\sqrt{s_{_{NN}}} = 20\,\text{GeV}$.

The EPOS-LHC event generator gives a good description of the minimum bias $dE_T/d\eta$ distribution and peaks at an η value close to that of the data for all centralities. The centrality dependence of E_T production for QGSJET II is stronger than that of the data. This model is below the data for 70–80% peripheral events and almost a factor of two above the data for the 10% most central events. Near midrapidity the HIJING generator tends to underestimate the magnitude of $dE_T/d\eta$ and for central collisions predicts a peak that is at significantly lower η than in the data.

Similarly to what has been seen in particle production at lower energy [57], the $dE_T/d\eta$ per participating nucleon-nucleon pair increases with the number of nucleons that participate in the collisions (N_{part}) for η values on the lead side; it is rather independent of N_{part} near midrapidity; and it decreases with N_{part} for η values on the proton side. The η region used to define centrality has a strong impact on the nature of the events selected. There is a significant autocorrelation of the η range used to define centrality with $dE_T/d\eta$ both for data, and the EPOS-LHC, QGSJET II and HIJING event generators. None of the tested event generators are able to capture all aspects of the autocorrelations seen in data.

It is clear that cosmic ray event generators have difficulties modeling both the centrality and η dependence of proton-lead collisions. While the proton-lead system is significantly larger than the proton-nitrogen and proton-oxygen collisions occurring in air showers, these data illustrate the need for a better understanding of nuclear effects. Ultimately, protons colliding with light nuclei would be most valuable for this purpose.

Acknowledgments

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 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 and the CMS detector provided by the following funding agencies: BMBWF and FWF (Austria); FNRS and FWO (Belgium); CNPq, CAPES, FAPERJ, FAPERGS, and FAPESP (Brazil); MES (Bulgaria); CERN; CAS, MoST, and NSFC (China); COLCIENCIAS (Colombia); MSES and CSF (Croatia); RPF (Cyprus); SENESCYT (Ecuador); MoER, ERC IUT, and ERDF (Estonia); Academy of Finland, MEC, and HIP (Finland); CEA and CNRS/IN2P3 (France); BMBF, DFG, and HGF (Germany); GSRT (Greece); NKFIA (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); SEIDI, CPAN, PCTI, and FEDER (Spain); MOSTR (Sri Lanka); Swiss Funding Agencies (Switzerland); MST (Taipei); ThEPCenter, IPST, STAR, and NSTDA (Thailand); TUBITAK and TAEK (Turkey); NASU and SFFR (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 No. 675440 (European Union); the Leventis Foundation; the A. 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 Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (MEYS) of the Czech Republic; the Lendület ("Momentum") program and the János Bolyai Research Scholarship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, the New National Excellence Program ÚNKP, the NKFIA research grants 123842, 123959, 124845, 124850 and 125105 (Hungary); the Council of Science and Industrial Research, India; the HOMING PLUS program of the Foundation for Polish Science, cofinanced from European Union, Regional Development Fund, the Mobility Plus program of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education, the National Science Center (Poland), contracts Harmonia 2014/14/M/ST2/00428, Opus 2014/13/B/ST2/02543, 2014/15/B/ST2/03998, and 2015/19/B/ST2/02861, Sonata-bis 2012/07/E/ST2/01406; the National Priorities Research Program by Qatar National Research Fund; the Programa Estatal de Fomento de la Investigación Científica y Técnica de Excelencia María de Maeztu, grant MDM-2015-0509 and the Programa Severo Ochoa del Principado de Asturias; the Thalis and Aristeia programs cofinanced by EU-ESF and the Greek NSRF; the Rachadapisek Sompot Fund for Postdoctoral Fellowship, Chulalongkorn University and the Chulalongkorn Academic into Its 2nd Century Project Advancement Project (Thailand); the Welch Foundation, contract C-1845; and the Weston Havens Foundation (USA).

References

[1] W. Busza, K. Rajagopal, and W. van der Schee, "Heavy Ion Collisions: The Big Picture, and the Big Questions", *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **68** (2018) 339, `doi:10.1146/annurev-nucl-101917-020852`, `arXiv:1802.04801`.

[2] J. D. Bjorken, "Highly relativistic nucleus-nucleus collisions: The central rapidity region", *Phys. Rev. D* **27** (1983) 140, `doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.27.140`.

[3] ALICE Collaboration, "Measurement of transverse energy at midrapidity in Pb-Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{\mathrm{NN}}} = 2.76$ TeV", *Phys. Rev. C* **94** (2016) 034903, `doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.94.034903`, `arXiv:1603.04775`.

[4] CMS Collaboration, "Measurement of the pseudorapidity and centrality dependence of the transverse energy density in PbPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{\mathrm{NN}}} = 2.76$ TeV", *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109** (2012) 152303, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.152303, arXiv:1205.2488.

[5] NA49 Collaboration, "Transverse energy production in ^{208}Pb + Pb collisions at 158 GeV per nucleon", *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75** (1995) 3814–3817, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.75.3814.

[6] F. Karsch, "Lattice QCD at high temperature and density", in *Lectures on Quark Matter*, p. 209. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2002. arXiv:hep-lat/0106019. Lecture Notes in Physics, volume 583. doi:10.1007/3-540-45792-5_6.

[7] CMS Collaboration, "Evidence for collective multiparticle correlations in p-Pb Collisions", *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115** (2015) 012301, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.012301, arXiv:1502.05382.

[8] ATLAS Collaboration, "Measurement with the ATLAS detector of multi-particle azimuthal correlations in p+Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{\mathrm{NN}}}$ = 5.02 TeV", *Phys. Lett. B* **725** (2013) 60, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2013.06.057, arXiv:1303.2084.

[9] ALICE Collaboration, "Search for collectivity with azimuthal J/ψ-hadron correlations in high multiplicity p-Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{\mathrm{NN}}}$ = 5.02 and 8.16 TeV", *Phys. Lett. B* **780** (2018) 7, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2018.02.039, arXiv:1709.06807.

[10] CMS Collaboration, "Observation of long-range near-side angular correlations in proton-proton collisions at the LHC", *JHEP* **09** (2010) 091, doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2010)091, arXiv:1009.4122.

[11] CMS Collaboration, "Measurement of long-range near-side two-particle angular correlations in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV", *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116** (2016), no. 17, 172302, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.172302, arXiv:1510.03068.

[12] CMS Collaboration, "Evidence for collectivity in pp collisions at the LHC", *Phys. Lett. B* **765** (2017) 193, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2016.12.009, arXiv:1606.06198.

[13] ATLAS Collaboration, "Measurement of multi-particle azimuthal correlations in pp, p+Pb and low-multiplicity Pb+Pb collisions with the ATLAS detector", *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77** (2017) 428, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-4988-1, arXiv:1705.04176.

[14] ALICE Collaboration, "Multi-strange baryon production in p-Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{\mathrm{NN}}} = 5.02$ TeV", *Phys. Lett. B* **758** (2016) 389, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2016.05.027, arXiv:1512.07227.

[15] ATLAS Collaboration, "Observation of long-range elliptic azimuthal anisotropies in $\sqrt{s}$ =13 and 2.76 TeV pp collisions with the ATLAS detector", *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116** (2016), no. 17, 172301, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.172301, arXiv:1509.04776.

[16] E-802 Collaboration, "Measurement of energy emission from O+A and p+A collisions at 14.5 GeV/c per nucleon with a lead glass Array", *Phys. Lett. B* **197** (1987) 285, doi:10.1016/0370-2693(87)90385-6.

[17] E814 Collaboration, "Transverse energy and charged particle multiplicity in p nucleus collisions at 14.6 GeV/c", *Phys. Rev. C* **52** (1995) 2028, doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.52.2028.

[18] HELIOS Collaboration, "Transverse energy measurements in proton-nucleus interactions at high-energy", *Z. Phys. C* **58** (1993) 239, doi:10.1007/BF01560341.

[19] PHENIX Collaboration, "Transverse energy production and charged-particle multiplicity at midrapidity in various systems from $\sqrt{s_{\mathrm{NN}}} = 7.7$ to 200 GeV", *Phys. Rev. C* **93** (2016) 024901, doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.93.024901, arXiv:1509.06727.

[20] PHENIX Collaboration, "Transverse-energy distributions at midrapidity in p+p, d+Au, and Au+Au collisions at $\sqrt{s_{\mathrm{NN}}} = 62.4 - 200$ GeV and implications for particle-production models", *Phys. Rev. C* **89** (2014) 044905, doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.89.044905, arXiv:1312.6676.

[21] R. Ulrich, R. Engel, and M. Unger, "Hadronic multiparticle production at ultra-high energies and extensive air showers", *Phys. Rev. D* **83** (2011) 054026, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.83.054026, arXiv:1010.4310.

[22] L. Kheyn, "Shower center of gravity and hadronic interaction characteristics", *Astropart. Phys.* **92** (2017) 7, doi:10.1016/j.astropartphys.2017.04.003, arXiv:1202.4989.

[23] X.-N. Wang and M. Gyulassy, "HIJING: A Monte Carlo model for multiple jet production in pp, pA and AA collisions", *Phys. Rev. D* **44** (1991) 3501, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.44.3501.

[24] T. Pierog et al., "EPOS LHC: Test of collective hadronization with data measured at the CERN Large Hadron Collider", *Phys. Rev. C* **92** (2015) 034906, doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.92.034906, arXiv:1306.0121.

[25] S. Ostapchenko, "Monte Carlo treatment of hadronic interactions in enhanced pomeron scheme: I. QGSJET-II model", *Phys. Rev. D* **83** (2011) 014018, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.83.014018, arXiv:1010.1869.

[26] CMS Collaboration, "The CMS experiment at the CERN LHC", *JINST* **3** (2008) S08004, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08004.

[27] CMS Collaboration, "Particle-flow reconstruction and global event description with the CMS detector", *JINST* **12** (2017) P10003, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/12/10/P10003, arXiv:1706.04965.

[28] G. Bayatian et al., "Design, performance and calibration of the CMS forward calorimeter wedges", *Eur. Phys. J. C* **53** (2008) 139, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-007-0459-4.

[29] CMS Collaboration, "Status of zero degree calorimeter for CMS experiment", *AIP Conf. Proc.* **867** (2006) 258, doi:10.1063/1.2396962, arXiv:nucl-ex/0608052.

[30] CMS Collaboration, "Measurement of inclusive jet production and nuclear modifications in pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{\mathrm{NN}}} = 5.02$ TeV", *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76** (2016) 372, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-4205-7, arXiv:1601.02001.

[31] M. L. Miller, K. Reygers, S. J. Sanders, and P. Steinberg, "Glauber modeling in high energy nuclear collisions", *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **57** (2007) 205, doi:10.1146/annurev.nucl.57.090506.123020, arXiv:nucl-ex/0701025.

[32] CMS Collaboration, "Studies of dijet transverse momentum balance and pseudorapidity distributions in pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV", *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74** (2014) 2951, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-014-2951-y, arXiv:1401.4433.

[33] H. J. Drescher et al., "Parton based Gribov-Regge theory", *Phys. Rept.* **350** (2001) 93, doi:10.1016/S0370-1573(00)00122-8, arXiv:hep-ph/0007198.

[34] K. S. Krane, "Introductory nuclear physics". Wiley, 1987.

[35] I. Angeli and K. P. Marinova, "Table of experimental nuclear ground state charge radii: An update", *Atomic Data and Nuclear Data Tables* **99** (2013) 69, doi:10.1016/j.adt.2011.12.006.

[36] CMS Collaboration, "Pseudorapidity distributions of charged hadrons in proton-lead collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ and 8.16 TeV", *JHEP* **01** (2018) 045, doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2018)045, arXiv:1710.09355.

[37] PHENIX Collaboration, "Systematic studies of the centrality and $\sqrt{s_{NN}}$ dependence of the $dE_T/d\eta$ and $dN^{ch}/d\eta$ in heavy ion collisions at mid-rapidity", *Phys. Rev. C* **71** (2005) 034908, doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.71.034908, arXiv:nucl-ex/0409015. [Erratum: doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.71.049901].

[38] T. Abbott et al., "Systematics of mid-rapidity transverse energy distributions in limited apertures from p+Be to Au+Au collisions at relativistic energies", *Phys. Rev. C* **63** (2001) 064602, doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.63.064602. [Erratum: doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.64.029901].

[39] NA49 Collaboration, "Hadron production in nuclear collisions from the NA49 experiment at 158 GeV/c /A", *Nucl. Phys. A* **661** (1999) 45, doi:10.1016/S0375-9474(99)85007-6.

[40] NA49 Collaboration, "Recent results on spectra and yields from NA49", *Nucl. Phys. A* **715** (2003) 161, doi:10.1016/S0375-9474(02)01424-0, arXiv:nucl-ex/0208014.

[41] NA49 Collaboration, "Energy dependence of pion and kaon production in central Pb+Pb collisions", *Phys. Rev. C* **66** (2002) 054902, doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.66.054902, arXiv:nucl-ex/0205002.

[42] FOPI Collaboration, "Central collisions of Au on Au at 150, 250 and 400 MeV/nucleon", *Nucl. Phys. A* **612** (1997) 493, doi:10.1016/S0375-9474(96)00388-0, arXiv:nucl-ex/9610009.

[43] FOPI Collaboration, "Charged pion production in Au on Au collisions at 1 A GeV", *Z. Phys. A* **357** (1997) 215, doi:10.1007/s002180050236.

[44] FOPI Collaboration, "Proton and pion distributions in heavy-ion collisions at SIS energies", *Phys. Rev. C* **66** (2002) 034901, doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.66.034901.

[45] STAR Collaboration, "Measurements of transverse energy distributions in Au+Au collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$ GeV", *Phys. Rev. C* **70** (2004) 054907, doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.70.054907, arXiv:nucl-ex/0407003.

[46] E802 Collaboration, "Simultaneous multiplicity and forward energy characterization of particle spectra in Au+Au collisions at 11.6 A GeV/c", *Phys. Rev. C* **59** (1999) 2173, doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.59.2173.

[47] F. Videbaek and O. Hansen, "Baryon rapidity loss and mid-rapidity stacking in high-energy nucleus-nucleus collisions", *Phys. Rev. C* **52** (1995) 2684, doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.52.2684.

[48] W. Busza and A. S. Goldhaber, "Nuclear stopping power", *Phys. Lett. B* **139** (1984) 235, doi:10.1016/0370-2693(84)91070-0.

[49] BRAHMS Collaboration, "Nuclear stopping in Au+Au collisions at $\sqrt{s_{\mathrm{NN}}}$ = 200 GeV", *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93** (2004) 102301, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.93.102301, arXiv:nucl-ex/0312023.

[50] BRAHMS Collaboration, "Nuclear stopping and rapidity loss in Au+Au collisions at $\sqrt{s_{\mathrm{NN}}}$ = 62.4 GeV", *Phys. Lett. B* **677** (2009) 267, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2009.05.049, arXiv:0901.0872.

[51] CMS Collaboration, "Studies of the nuclear stopping power in PbPb collisions at 2.76 TeV with CMS", *Nucl. Phys. A* **904-905** (2013) 787c, doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysa.2013.02.134.

[52] STAR Collaboration, "Bulk properties of the medium produced in relativistic heavy-ion collisions from the beam energy scan program", *Phys. Rev. C* **96** (2017) 044904, doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.96.044904, arXiv:1701.07065.

[53] TOTEM Collaboration, "Luminosity-independent measurement of the proton-proton total cross section at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV", *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111** (2013), no. 1, 012001, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.111.012001.

[54] TOTEM Collaboration, "Measurement of elastic pp scattering at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV in the Coulomb-nuclear interference region: determination of the ρ-parameter and the total cross-section", *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76** (2016), no. 12, 661, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-4399-8, arXiv:1610.00603.

[55] TOTEM Collaboration, "Luminosity-independent measurements of total, elastic and inelastic cross-sections at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV", *Europhys. Lett.* **101** (2013), no. 2, 21004, doi:10.1209/0295-5075/101/21004.

[56] TOTEM Collaboration, "First measurement of elastic, inelastic and total cross-section at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV by TOTEM and overview of cross-section data at LHC energies", arXiv:1712.06153.

[57] W. Busza, "Structure and fine structure in multiparticle production data at high energies", *Acta Phys. Polon. B* **35** (2004) 2873, arXiv:nucl-ex/0410035.

A The CMS Collaboration

Yerevan Physics Institute, Yerevan, Armenia
A.M. Sirunyan, A. Tumasyan

Institut für Hochenergiephysik, Wien, Austria
W. Adam, F. Ambrogi, E. Asilar, T. Bergauer, J. Brandstetter, E. Brondolin, M. Dragicevic, J. Erö, A. Escalante Del Valle, M. Flechl, R. Frühwirth[1], V.M. Ghete, J. Hrubec, M. Jeitler[1], N. Krammer, I. Krätschmer, D. Liko, T. Madlener, I. Mikulec, N. Rad, H. Rohringer, J. Schieck[1], R. Schöfbeck, M. Spanring, D. Spitzbart, A. Taurok, W. Waltenberger, J. Wittmann, C.-E. Wulz[1], M. Zarucki

Institute for Nuclear Problems, Minsk, Belarus
V. Chekhovsky, V. Mossolov, J. Suarez Gonzalez

Universiteit Antwerpen, Antwerpen, Belgium
E.A. De Wolf, D. Di Croce, X. Janssen, J. Lauwers, M. Pieters, M. Van De Klundert, H. Van Haevermaet, P. Van Mechelen, N. Van Remortel

Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussel, Belgium
S. Abu Zeid, F. Blekman, J. D'Hondt, I. De Bruyn, J. De Clercq, K. Deroover, G. Flouris, D. Lontkovskyi, S. Lowette, I. Marchesini, S. Moortgat, L. Moreels, Q. Python, K. Skovpen, S. Tavernier, W. Van Doninck, P. Van Mulders, I. Van Parijs

Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium
D. Beghin, B. Bilin, H. Brun, B. Clerbaux, G. De Lentdecker, H. Delannoy, B. Dorney, G. Fasanella, L. Favart, R. Goldouzian, A. Grebenyuk, A.K. Kalsi, T. Lenzi, J. Luetic, N. Postiau, E. Starling, L. Thomas, C. Vander Velde, P. Vanlaer, D. Vannerom, Q. Wang

Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium
T. Cornelis, D. Dobur, A. Fagot, M. Gul, I. Khvastunov[2], D. Poyraz, C. Roskas, D. Trocino, M. Tytgat, W. Verbeke, B. Vermassen, M. Vit, N. Zaganidis

Université Catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium
H. Bakhshiansohi, O. Bondu, S. Brochet, G. Bruno, C. Caputo, P. David, C. Delaere, M. Delcourt, B. Francois, A. Giammanco, G. Krintiras, V. Lemaitre, A. Magitteri, A. Mertens, M. Musich, K. Piotrzkowski, A. Saggio, M. Vidal Marono, S. Wertz, J. Zobec

Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Fisicas, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
F.L. Alves, G.A. Alves, L. Brito, G. Correia Silva, C. Hensel, A. Moraes, M.E. Pol, P. Rebello Teles

Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
E. Belchior Batista Das Chagas, W. Carvalho, J. Chinellato[3], E. Coelho, E.M. Da Costa, G.G. Da Silveira[4], D. De Jesus Damiao, C. De Oliveira Martins, S. Fonseca De Souza, H. Malbouisson, D. Matos Figueiredo, M. Melo De Almeida, C. Mora Herrera, L. Mundim, H. Nogima, W.L. Prado Da Silva, L.J. Sanchez Rosas, A. Santoro, A. Sznajder, M. Thiel, E.J. Tonelli Manganote[3], F. Torres Da Silva De Araujo, A. Vilela Pereira

Universidade Estadual Paulista [a], Universidade Federal do ABC [b], São Paulo, Brazil
S. Ahuja[a], C.A. Bernardes[a], L. Calligaris[a], T.R. Fernandez Perez Tomei[a], E.M. Gregores[b], P.G. Mercadante[b], S.F. Novaes[a], SandraS. Padula[a], D. Romero Abad[b]

Institute for Nuclear Research and Nuclear Energy, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia, Bulgaria
A. Aleksandrov, R. Hadjiiska, P. Iaydjiev, A. Marinov, M. Misheva, M. Rodozov, M. Shopova, G. Sultanov

University of Sofia, Sofia, Bulgaria
A. Dimitrov, L. Litov, B. Pavlov, P. Petkov

Beihang University, Beijing, China
W. Fang[5], X. Gao[5], L. Yuan

Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing, China
M. Ahmad, J.G. Bian, G.M. Chen, H.S. Chen, M. Chen, Y. Chen, C.H. Jiang, D. Leggat, H. Liao, Z. Liu, F. Romeo, S.M. Shaheen, A. Spiezia, J. Tao, C. Wang, Z. Wang, E. Yazgan, H. Zhang, J. Zhao

State Key Laboratory of Nuclear Physics and Technology, Peking University, Beijing, China
Y. Ban, G. Chen, A. Levin, J. Li, L. Li, Q. Li, Y. Mao, S.J. Qian, D. Wang, Z. Xu

Tsinghua University, Beijing, China
Y. Wang

Universidad de Los Andes, Bogota, Colombia
C. Avila, A. Cabrera, C.A. Carrillo Montoya, L.F. Chaparro Sierra, C. Florez, C.F. González Hernández, M.A. Segura Delgado

University of Split, Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering and Naval Architecture, Split, Croatia
B. Courbon, N. Godinovic, D. Lelas, I. Puljak, T. Sculac

University of Split, Faculty of Science, Split, Croatia
Z. Antunovic, M. Kovac

Institute Rudjer Boskovic, Zagreb, Croatia
V. Brigljevic, D. Ferencek, K. Kadija, B. Mesic, A. Starodumov[6], T. Susa

University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus
M.W. Ather, A. Attikis, G. Mavromanolakis, J. Mousa, C. Nicolaou, F. Ptochos, P.A. Razis, H. Rykaczewski

Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic
M. Finger[7], M. Finger Jr.[7]

Escuela Politecnica Nacional, Quito, Ecuador
E. Ayala

Universidad San Francisco de Quito, Quito, Ecuador
E. Carrera Jarrin

Academy of Scientific Research and Technology of the Arab Republic of Egypt, Egyptian Network of High Energy Physics, Cairo, Egypt
M.A. Mahmoud[8,9], A. Mahrous[10], Y. Mohammed[8]

National Institute of Chemical Physics and Biophysics, Tallinn, Estonia
S. Bhowmik, A. Carvalho Antunes De Oliveira, R.K. Dewanjee, K. Ehataht, M. Kadastik, M. Raidal, C. Veelken

Department of Physics, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland
P. Eerola, H. Kirschenmann, J. Pekkanen, M. Voutilainen

Helsinki Institute of Physics, Helsinki, Finland
J. Havukainen, J.K. Heikkilä, T. Järvinen, V. Karimäki, R. Kinnunen, T. Lampén, K. Lassila-Perini, S. Laurila, S. Lehti, T. Lindén, P. Luukka, T. Mäenpää, H. Siikonen, E. Tuominen, J. Tuominiemi

Lappeenranta University of Technology, Lappeenranta, Finland
T. Tuuva

IRFU, CEA, Université Paris-Saclay, Gif-sur-Yvette, France
M. Besancon, F. Couderc, M. Dejardin, D. Denegri, J.L. Faure, F. Ferri, S. Ganjour, A. Givernaud, P. Gras, G. Hamel de Monchenault, P. Jarry, C. Leloup, E. Locci, J. Malcles, G. Negro, J. Rander, A. Rosowsky, M.Ö. Sahin, M. Titov

Laboratoire Leprince-Ringuet, Ecole polytechnique, CNRS/IN2P3, Université Paris-Saclay, Palaiseau, France
A. Abdulsalam[11], C. Amendola, I. Antropov, F. Beaudette, P. Busson, C. Charlot, R. Granier de Cassagnac, I. Kucher, S. Lisniak, A. Lobanov, J. Martin Blanco, M. Nguyen, C. Ochando, G. Ortona, P. Paganini, P. Pigard, R. Salerno, J.B. Sauvan, Y. Sirois, A.G. Stahl Leiton, A. Zabi, A. Zghiche

Université de Strasbourg, CNRS, IPHC UMR 7178, Strasbourg, France
J.-L. Agram[12], J. Andrea, D. Bloch, J.-M. Brom, E.C. Chabert, V. Cherepanov, C. Collard, E. Conte[12], J.-C. Fontaine[12], D. Gelé, U. Goerlach, M. Jansová, A.-C. Le Bihan, N. Tonon, P. Van Hove

Centre de Calcul de l'Institut National de Physique Nucleaire et de Physique des Particules, CNRS/IN2P3, Villeurbanne, France
S. Gadrat

Université de Lyon, Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, CNRS-IN2P3, Institut de Physique Nucléaire de Lyon, Villeurbanne, France
S. Beauceron, C. Bernet, G. Boudoul, N. Chanon, R. Chierici, D. Contardo, P. Depasse, H. El Mamouni, J. Fay, L. Finco, S. Gascon, M. Gouzevitch, G. Grenier, B. Ille, F. Lagarde, I.B. Laktineh, H. Lattaud, M. Lethuillier, L. Mirabito, A.L. Pequegnot, S. Perries, A. Popov[13], V. Sordini, M. Vander Donckt, S. Viret, S. Zhang

Georgian Technical University, Tbilisi, Georgia
T. Toriashvili[14]

Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia
D. Lomidze

RWTH Aachen University, I. Physikalisches Institut, Aachen, Germany
C. Autermann, L. Feld, M.K. Kiesel, K. Klein, M. Lipinski, M. Preuten, M.P. Rauch, C. Schomakers, J. Schulz, M. Teroerde, B. Wittmer, V. Zhukov[13]

RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut A, Aachen, Germany
A. Albert, D. Duchardt, M. Endres, M. Erdmann, T. Esch, R. Fischer, S. Ghosh, A. Güth, T. Hebbeker, C. Heidemann, K. Hoepfner, H. Keller, S. Knutzen, L. Mastrolorenzo, M. Merschmeyer, A. Meyer, P. Millet, S. Mukherjee, T. Pook, M. Radziej, H. Reithler, M. Rieger, F. Scheuch, A. Schmidt, D. Teyssier

RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut B, Aachen, Germany
G. Flügge, O. Hlushchenko, B. Kargoll, T. Kress, A. Künsken, T. Müller, A. Nehrkorn, A. Nowack, C. Pistone, O. Pooth, H. Sert, A. Stahl[15]

Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Hamburg, Germany
M. Aldaya Martin, T. Arndt, C. Asawatangtrakuldee, I. Babounikau, K. Beernaert, O. Behnke, U. Behrens, A. Bermúdez Martínez, D. Bertsche, A.A. Bin Anuar, K. Borras[16], V. Botta, A. Campbell, P. Connor, C. Contreras-Campana, F. Costanza, V. Danilov, A. De Wit, M.M. Defranchis, C. Diez Pardos, D. Domínguez Damiani, G. Eckerlin, T. Eichhorn, A. Elwood, E. Eren, E. Gallo[17], A. Geiser, J.M. Grados Luyando, A. Grohsjean, P. Gunnellini, M. Guthoff, M. Haranko, A. Harb, J. Hauk, H. Jung, M. Kasemann, J. Keaveney, C. Kleinwort, J. Knolle, D. Krücker, W. Lange, A. Lelek, T. Lenz, K. Lipka, W. Lohmann[18], R. Mankel, I.-A. Melzer-Pellmann, A.B. Meyer, M. Meyer, M. Missiroli, G. Mittag, J. Mnich, V. Myronenko, S.K. Pflitsch, D. Pitzl, A. Raspereza, M. Savitskyi, P. Saxena, P. Schütze, C. Schwanenberger, R. Shevchenko, A. Singh, N. Stefaniuk, H. Tholen, A. Vagnerini, G.P. Van Onsem, R. Walsh, Y. Wen, K. Wichmann, C. Wissing, O. Zenaiev

University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany
R. Aggleton, S. Bein, L. Benato, A. Benecke, V. Blobel, M. Centis Vignali, T. Dreyer, E. Garutti, D. Gonzalez, J. Haller, A. Hinzmann, A. Karavdina, G. Kasieczka, R. Klanner, R. Kogler, N. Kovalchuk, S. Kurz, V. Kutzner, J. Lange, D. Marconi, J. Multhaup, M. Niedziela, D. Nowatschin, A. Perieanu, A. Reimers, O. Rieger, C. Scharf, P. Schleper, S. Schumann, J. Schwandt, J. Sonneveld, H. Stadie, G. Steinbrück, F.M. Stober, M. Stöver, D. Troendle, A. Vanhoefer, B. Vormwald

Karlsruher Institut fuer Technologie, Karlsruhe, Germany
M. Akbiyik, C. Barth, M. Baselga, S. Baur, E. Butz, R. Caspart, T. Chwalek, F. Colombo, W. De Boer, A. Dierlamm, N. Faltermann, B. Freund, M. Giffels, M.A. Harrendorf, F. Hartmann[15], S.M. Heindl, U. Husemann, F. Kassel[15], I. Katkov[13], S. Kudella, H. Mildner, S. Mitra, M.U. Mozer, Th. Müller, M. Plagge, G. Quast, K. Rabbertz, M. Schröder, I. Shvetsov, G. Sieber, H.J. Simonis, R. Ulrich, S. Wayand, M. Weber, T. Weiler, S. Williamson, C. Wöhrmann, R. Wolf

Institute of Nuclear and Particle Physics (INPP), NCSR Demokritos, Aghia Paraskevi, Greece
G. Anagnostou, G. Daskalakis, T. Geralis, A. Kyriakis, D. Loukas, G. Paspalaki, I. Topsis-Giotis

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece
G. Karathanasis, S. Kesisoglou, P. Kontaxakis, A. Panagiotou, N. Saoulidou, E. Tziaferi, K. Vellidis

National Technical University of Athens, Athens, Greece
K. Kousouris, I. Papakrivopoulos, G. Tsipolitis

University of Ioánnina, Ioánnina, Greece
I. Evangelou, C. Foudas, P. Gianneios, P. Katsoulis, P. Kokkas, S. Mallios, N. Manthos, I. Papadopoulos, E. Paradas, J. Strologas, F.A. Triantis, D. Tsitsonis

MTA-ELTE Lendület CMS Particle and Nuclear Physics Group, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary
M. Bartók[19], M. Csanad, N. Filipovic, P. Major, M.I. Nagy, G. Pasztor, O. Surányi, G.I. Veres

Wigner Research Centre for Physics, Budapest, Hungary
G. Bencze, C. Hajdu, D. Horvath[20], Á. Hunyadi, F. Sikler, T.Á. Vámi, V. Veszpremi, G. Vesztergombi[†]

Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary
N. Beni, S. Czellar, J. Karancsi[21], A. Makovec, J. Molnar, Z. Szillasi

Institute of Physics, University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary
P. Raics, Z.L. Trocsanyi, B. Ujvari

Indian Institute of Science (IISc), Bangalore, India
S. Choudhury, J.R. Komaragiri, P.C. Tiwari

National Institute of Science Education and Research, HBNI, Bhubaneswar, India
S. Bahinipati[22], C. Kar, P. Mal, K. Mandal, A. Nayak[23], D.K. Sahoo[22], S.K. Swain

Panjab University, Chandigarh, India
S. Bansal, S.B. Beri, V. Bhatnagar, S. Chauhan, R. Chawla, N. Dhingra, R. Gupta, A. Kaur, A. Kaur, M. Kaur, S. Kaur, R. Kumar, P. Kumari, M. Lohan, A. Mehta, K. Sandeep, S. Sharma, J.B. Singh, G. Walia

University of Delhi, Delhi, India
A. Bhardwaj, B.C. Choudhary, R.B. Garg, M. Gola, S. Keshri, Ashok Kumar, S. Malhotra, M. Naimuddin, P. Priyanka, K. Ranjan, Aashaq Shah, R. Sharma

Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, HBNI, Kolkata, India
R. Bhardwaj[24], M. Bharti, R. Bhattacharya, S. Bhattacharya, U. Bhawandeep[24], D. Bhowmik, S. Dey, S. Dutt[24], S. Dutta, S. Ghosh, K. Mondal, S. Nandan, A. Purohit, P.K. Rout, A. Roy, S. Roy Chowdhury, S. Sarkar, M. Sharan, B. Singh, S. Thakur[24]

Indian Institute of Technology Madras, Madras, India
P.K. Behera

Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, Mumbai, India
R. Chudasama, D. Dutta, V. Jha, V. Kumar, P.K. Netrakanti, L.M. Pant, P. Shukla

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-A, Mumbai, India
T. Aziz, M.A. Bhat, S. Dugad, G.B. Mohanty, N. Sur, B. Sutar, RavindraKumar Verma

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-B, Mumbai, India
S. Banerjee, S. Bhattacharya, S. Chatterjee, P. Das, M. Guchait, Sa. Jain, S. Kumar, M. Maity[25], G. Majumder, K. Mazumdar, N. Sahoo, T. Sarkar[25]

Indian Institute of Science Education and Research (IISER), Pune, India
S. Chauhan, S. Dube, V. Hegde, A. Kapoor, K. Kothekar, S. Pandey, A. Rane, S. Sharma

Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM), Tehran, Iran
S. Chenarani[26], E. Eskandari Tadavani, S.M. Etesami[26], M. Khakzad, M. Mohammadi Najafabadi, M. Naseri, F. Rezaei Hosseinabadi, B. Safarzadeh[27], M. Zeinali

University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland
M. Felcini, M. Grunewald

INFN Sezione di Bari [a], Università di Bari [b], Politecnico di Bari [c], Bari, Italy
M. Abbrescia[a,b], C. Calabria[a,b], A. Colaleo[a], D. Creanza[a,c], L. Cristella[a,b], N. De Filippis[a,c], M. De Palma[a,b], A. Di Florio[a,b], F. Errico[a,b], L. Fiore[a], A. Gelmi[a,b], G. Iaselli[a,c], S. Lezki[a,b], G. Maggi[a,c], M. Maggi[a], G. Miniello[a,b], S. My[a,b], S. Nuzzo[a,b], A. Pompili[a,b], G. Pugliese[a,c], R. Radogna[a], A. Ranieri[a], G. Selvaggi[a,b], A. Sharma[a], L. Silvestris[a,15], R. Venditti[a], P. Verwilligen[a], G. Zito[a]

INFN Sezione di Bologna [a], Università di Bologna [b], Bologna, Italy
G. Abbiendi[a], C. Battilana[a,b], D. Bonacorsi[a,b], L. Borgonovi[a,b], S. Braibant-Giacomelli[a,b], L. Brigliadori[a,b], R. Campanini[a,b], P. Capiluppi[a,b], A. Castro[a,b], F.R. Cavallo[a], S.S. Chhibra[a,b],

C. Ciocca[a], G. Codispoti[a,b], M. Cuffiani[a,b], G.M. Dallavalle[a], F. Fabbri[a], A. Fanfani[a,b], P. Giacomelli[a], C. Grandi[a], L. Guiducci[a,b], S. Marcellini[a], G. Masetti[a], A. Montanari[a], F.L. Navarria[a,b], A. Perrotta[a], A.M. Rossi[a,b], T. Rovelli[a,b], G.P. Siroli[a,b], N. Tosi[a]

INFN Sezione di Catania [a], Università di Catania [b], Catania, Italy
S. Albergo[a,b], A. Di Mattia[a], R. Potenza[a,b], A. Tricomi[a,b], C. Tuve[a,b]

INFN Sezione di Firenze [a], Università di Firenze [b], Firenze, Italy
G. Barbagli[a], K. Chatterjee[a,b], V. Ciulli[a,b], C. Civinini[a], R. D'Alessandro[a,b], E. Focardi[a,b], G. Latino, P. Lenzi[a,b], M. Meschini[a], S. Paoletti[a], L. Russo[a,28], G. Sguazzoni[a], D. Strom[a], L. Viliani[a]

INFN Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, Frascati, Italy
L. Benussi, S. Bianco, F. Fabbri, D. Piccolo, F. Primavera[15]

INFN Sezione di Genova [a], Università di Genova [b], Genova, Italy
F. Ferro[a], F. Ravera[a,b], E. Robutti[a], S. Tosi[a,b]

INFN Sezione di Milano-Bicocca [a], Università di Milano-Bicocca [b], Milano, Italy
A. Benaglia[a], A. Beschi[b], L. Brianza[a,b], F. Brivio[a,b], V. Ciriolo[a,b,15], S. Di Guida[a,d,15], M.E. Dinardo[a,b], S. Fiorendi[a,b], S. Gennai[a], A. Ghezzi[a,b], P. Govoni[a,b], M. Malberti[a,b], S. Malvezzi[a], A. Massironi[a,b], D. Menasce[a], L. Moroni[a], M. Paganoni[a,b], D. Pedrini[a], S. Ragazzi[a,b], T. Tabarelli de Fatis[a,b]

INFN Sezione di Napoli [a], Università di Napoli 'Federico II' [b], Napoli, Italy, Università della Basilicata [c], Potenza, Italy, Università G. Marconi [d], Roma, Italy
S. Buontempo[a], N. Cavallo[a,c], A. Di Crescenzo[a,b], F. Fabozzi[a,c], F. Fienga[a], G. Galati[a], A.O.M. Iorio[a,b], W.A. Khan[a], L. Lista[a], S. Meola[a,d,15], P. Paolucci[a,15], C. Sciacca[a,b], E. Voevodina[a,b]

INFN Sezione di Padova [a], Università di Padova [b], Padova, Italy, Università di Trento [c], Trento, Italy
P. Azzi[a], N. Bacchetta[a], D. Bisello[a,b], A. Boletti[a,b], A. Bragagnolo, R. Carlin[a,b], P. Checchia[a], M. Dall'Osso[a,b], P. De Castro Manzano[a], T. Dorigo[a], U. Dosselli[a], F. Gasparini[a,b], U. Gasparini[a,b], A. Gozzelino[a], S. Lacaprara[a], P. Lujan, M. Margoni[a,b], A.T. Meneguzzo[a,b], P. Ronchese[a,b], R. Rossin[a,b], F. Simonetto[a,b], A. Tiko, E. Torassa[a], M. Zanetti[a,b], P. Zotto[a,b], G. Zumerle[a,b]

INFN Sezione di Pavia [a], Università di Pavia [b], Pavia, Italy
A. Braghieri[a], A. Magnani[a], 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,b], P. Vitulo[a,b]

INFN Sezione di Perugia [a], Università di Perugia [b], Perugia, Italy
L. Alunni Solestizi[a,b], M. Biasini[a,b], G.M. Bilei[a], C. Cecchi[a,b], D. Ciangottini[a,b], L. Fanò[a,b], P. Lariccia[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]

INFN Sezione di Pisa [a], Università di Pisa [b], Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa [c], Pisa, Italy
K. Androsov[a], P. Azzurri[a], G. Bagliesi[a], L. Bianchini[a], T. Boccali[a], L. Borrello, R. Castaldi[a], M.A. Ciocci[a,b], R. Dell'Orso[a], G. Fedi[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], P. Spagnolo[a], R. Tenchini[a], G. Tonelli[a,b], A. Venturi[a], P.G. Verdini[a]

INFN Sezione di Roma [a], Sapienza Università di Roma [b], Rome, Italy
L. Barone[a,b], F. Cavallari[a], M. Cipriani[a,b], N. Daci[a], D. Del Re[a,b], E. Di Marco[a,b], M. Diemoz[a],

S. Gelli[a,b], E. Longo[a,b], B. Marzocchi[a,b], P. Meridiani[a], G. Organtini[a,b], F. Pandolfi[a], R. Paramatti[a,b], F. Preiato[a,b], S. Rahatlou[a,b], C. Rovelli[a], F. Santanastasio[a,b]

INFN Sezione di Torino [a], Università di Torino [b], Torino, Italy, Università del Piemonte Orientale [c], Novara, Italy
N. Amapane[a,b], R. Arcidiacono[a,c], S. Argiro[a,b], M. Arneodo[a,c], N. Bartosik[a], R. Bellan[a,b], C. Biino[a], N. Cartiglia[a], F. Cenna[a,b], S. Cometti, M. Costa[a,b], R. Covarelli[a,b], N. Demaria[a], B. Kiani[a,b], 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], 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. Sacchi[a,b], K. Shchelina[a,b], V. Sola[a], A. Solano[a,b], D. Soldi, A. Staiano[a]

INFN Sezione di Trieste [a], Università di Trieste [b], Trieste, Italy
S. Belforte[a], V. Candelise[a,b], M. Casarsa[a], F. Cossutti[a], G. Della Ricca[a,b], F. Vazzoler[a,b], A. Zanetti[a]

Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea
D.H. Kim, G.N. Kim, M.S. Kim, J. Lee, S. Lee, S.W. Lee, C.S. Moon, Y.D. Oh, S. Sekmen, D.C. Son, Y.C. Yang

Chonnam National University, Institute for Universe and Elementary Particles, Kwangju, Korea
H. Kim, D.H. Moon, G. Oh

Hanyang University, Seoul, Korea
J. Goh, T.J. Kim

Korea University, Seoul, Korea
S. Cho, S. Choi, Y. Go, D. Gyun, S. Ha, B. Hong, Y. Jo, K. Lee, K.S. Lee, S. Lee, J. Lim, S.K. Park, Y. Roh

Sejong University, Seoul, Korea
H.S. Kim

Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea
J. Almond, J. Kim, J.S. Kim, H. Lee, K. Lee, K. Nam, S.B. Oh, B.C. Radburn-Smith, S.h. Seo, U.K. Yang, H.D. Yoo, G.B. Yu

University of Seoul, Seoul, Korea
D. Jeon, H. Kim, J.H. Kim, J.S.H. Lee, I.C. Park

Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon, Korea
Y. Choi, C. Hwang, J. Lee, I. Yu

Vilnius University, Vilnius, Lithuania
V. Dudenas, A. Juodagalvis, J. Vaitkus

National Centre for Particle Physics, Universiti Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
I. Ahmed, Z.A. Ibrahim, M.A.B. Md Ali[29], F. Mohamad Idris[30], W.A.T. Wan Abdullah, M.N. Yusli, Z. Zolkapli

Centro de Investigacion y de Estudios Avanzados del IPN, Mexico City, Mexico
H. Castilla-Valdez, E. De La Cruz-Burelo, M.C. Duran-Osuna, I. Heredia-De La Cruz[31], R. Lopez-Fernandez, J. Mejia Guisao, R.I. Rabadan-Trejo, G. Ramirez-Sanchez, R Reyes-Almanza, A. Sanchez-Hernandez

Universidad Iberoamericana, Mexico City, Mexico
S. Carrillo Moreno, C. Oropeza Barrera, F. Vazquez Valencia

Benemerita Universidad Autonoma de Puebla, Puebla, Mexico
J. Eysermans, I. Pedraza, H.A. Salazar Ibarguen, C. Uribe Estrada

Universidad Autónoma de San Luis Potosí, San Luis Potosí, Mexico
A. Morelos Pineda

University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand
D. Krofcheck

University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand
S. Bheesette, P.H. Butler

National Centre for Physics, Quaid-I-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan
A. Ahmad, M. Ahmad, M.I. Asghar, Q. Hassan, H.R. Hoorani, A. Saddique, M.A. Shah, M. Shoaib, M. Waqas

National Centre for Nuclear Research, Swierk, Poland
H. Bialkowska, M. Bluj, B. Boimska, T. Frueboes, M. Górski, M. Kazana, K. Nawrocki, M. Szleper, P. Traczyk, P. Zalewski

Institute of Experimental Physics, Faculty of Physics, University of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland
K. Bunkowski, A. Byszuk[32], K. Doroba, A. Kalinowski, M. Konecki, J. Krolikowski, M. Misiura, M. Olszewski, A. Pyskir, M. Walczak

Laboratório de Instrumentação e Física Experimental de Partículas, Lisboa, Portugal
P. Bargassa, C. Beirão Da Cruz E Silva, A. Di Francesco, P. Faccioli, B. Galinhas, M. Gallinaro, J. Hollar, N. Leonardo, L. Lloret Iglesias, M.V. Nemallapudi, J. Seixas, G. Strong, O. Toldaiev, D. Vadruccio, J. Varela

Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia
A. Baginyan, A. Golunov, I. Golutvin, V. Karjavin, I. Kashunin, V. Korenkov, A. Lanev, A. Malakhov, V. Matveev[33,34], V.V. Mitsyn, P. Moisenz, V. Palichik, V. Perelygin, S. Shmatov, N. Skatchkov, V. Smirnov, V. Trofimov, B.S. Yuldashev[35], A. Zarubin

Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, Gatchina (St. Petersburg), Russia
V. Golovtsov, Y. Ivanov, V. Kim[36], E. Kuznetsova[37], P. Levchenko, V. Murzin, V. Oreshkin, I. Smirnov, D. Sosnov, V. Sulimov, L. Uvarov, S. Vavilov, A. Vorobyev

Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia
Yu. Andreev, A. Dermenev, S. Gninenko, N. Golubev, A. Karneyeu, M. Kirsanov, N. Krasnikov, A. Pashenkov, D. Tlisov, A. Toropin

Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia
V. Epshteyn, V. Gavrilov, N. Lychkovskaya, V. Popov, I. Pozdnyakov, G. Safronov, A. Spiridonov, A. Stepennov, V. Stolin, M. Toms, E. Vlasov, A. Zhokin

Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Moscow, Russia
T. Aushev, A. Bylinkin

P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia
V. Andreev, M. Azarkin[34], I. Dremin[34], M. Kirakosyan[34], S.V. Rusakov, A. Terkulov

Skobeltsyn Institute of Nuclear Physics, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia
A. Baskakov, A. Belyaev, E. Boos, A. Ershov, A. Gribushin, L. Khein, O. Kodolova, V. Korotkikh, I. Lokhtin, O. Lukina, I. Miagkov, S. Obraztsov, S. Petrushanko, V. Savrin, A. Snigirev, I. Vardanyan

Novosibirsk State University (NSU), Novosibirsk, Russia
V. Blinov[38], T. Dimova[38], L. Kardapoltsev[38], D. Shtol[38], Y. Skovpen[38]

Institute for High Energy Physics of National Research Centre 'Kurchatov Institute', Protvino, Russia
I. Azhgirey, I. Bayshev, S. Bitioukov, D. Elumakhov, A. Godizov, V. Kachanov, A. Kalinin, D. Konstantinov, P. Mandrik, V. Petrov, R. Ryutin, S. Slabospitskii, A. Sobol, S. Troshin, N. Tyurin, A. Uzunian, A. Volkov

National Research Tomsk Polytechnic University, Tomsk, Russia
A. Babaev, S. Baidali

University of Belgrade, Faculty of Physics and Vinca Institute of Nuclear Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia
P. Adzic[39], P. Cirkovic, D. Devetak, M. Dordevic, J. Milosevic

Centro de Investigaciones Energéticas Medioambientales y Tecnológicas (CIEMAT), Madrid, Spain
J. Alcaraz Maestre, A. Álvarez Fernández, I. Bachiller, M. Barrio Luna, J.A. Brochero Cifuentes, M. Cerrada, N. Colino, B. De La Cruz, A. Delgado Peris, C. Fernandez Bedoya, J.P. Fernández Ramos, J. Flix, M.C. Fouz, O. Gonzalez Lopez, S. Goy Lopez, J.M. Hernandez, M.I. Josa, D. Moran, A. Pérez-Calero Yzquierdo, J. Puerta Pelayo, I. Redondo, L. Romero, M.S. Soares, A. Triossi

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain
C. Albajar, J.F. de Trocóniz

Universidad de Oviedo, Oviedo, Spain
J. Cuevas, C. Erice, J. Fernandez Menendez, S. Folgueras, I. Gonzalez Caballero, J.R. González Fernández, E. Palencia Cortezon, V. Rodríguez Bouza, S. Sanchez Cruz, P. Vischia, J.M. Vizan Garcia

Instituto de Física de Cantabria (IFCA), CSIC-Universidad de Cantabria, Santander, Spain
I.J. Cabrillo, A. Calderon, B. Chazin Quero, J. Duarte Campderros, M. Fernandez, P.J. Fernández Manteca, A. García Alonso, J. Garcia-Ferrero, G. Gomez, A. Lopez Virto, J. Marco, C. Martinez Rivero, P. Martinez Ruiz del Arbol, F. Matorras, J. Piedra Gomez, C. Prieels, T. Rodrigo, A. Ruiz-Jimeno, L. Scodellaro, N. Trevisani, I. Vila, R. Vilar Cortabitarte

CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland
D. Abbaneo, B. Akgun, E. Auffray, P. Baillon, A.H. Ball, D. Barney, J. Bendavid, M. Bianco, A. Bocci, C. Botta, T. Camporesi, M. Cepeda, G. Cerminara, E. Chapon, Y. Chen, G. Cucciati, D. d'Enterria, A. Dabrowski, V. Daponte, A. David, A. De Roeck, N. Deelen, M. Dobson, T. du Pree, M. Dünser, N. Dupont, A. Elliott-Peisert, P. Everaerts, F. Fallavollita[40], D. Fasanella, G. Franzoni, J. Fulcher, W. Funk, D. Gigi, A. Gilbert, K. Gill, F. Glege, D. Gulhan, J. Hegeman, V. Innocente, A. Jafari, P. Janot, O. Karacheban[18], J. Kieseler, A. Kornmayer, M. Krammer[1], C. Lange, P. Lecoq, C. Lourenço, L. Malgeri, M. Mannelli, F. Meijers, J.A. Merlin, S. Mersi, E. Meschi, P. Milenovic[41], F. Moortgat, M. Mulders, J. Ngadiuba, S. Orfanelli, L. Orsini, F. Pantaleo[15], L. Pape, E. Perez, M. Peruzzi, A. Petrilli, G. Petrucciani, A. Pfeiffer, M. Pierini,

F.M. Pitters, D. Rabady, A. Racz, T. Reis, G. Rolandi[42], M. Rovere, H. Sakulin, C. Schäfer, C. Schwick, M. Seidel, M. Selvaggi, A. Sharma, P. Silva, P. Sphicas[43], A. Stakia, J. Steggemann, M. Tosi, D. Treille, A. Tsirou, V. Veckalns[44], W.D. Zeuner

Paul Scherrer Institut, Villigen, Switzerland
L. Caminada[45], K. Deiters, W. Erdmann, R. Horisberger, Q. Ingram, H.C. Kaestli, D. Kotlinski, U. Langenegger, T. Rohe, S.A. Wiederkehr

ETH Zurich - Institute for Particle Physics and Astrophysics (IPA), Zurich, Switzerland
M. Backhaus, L. Bäni, P. Berger, N. Chernyavskaya, G. Dissertori, M. Dittmar, M. Donegà, C. Dorfer, C. Grab, C. Heidegger, D. Hits, J. Hoss, T. Klijnsma, W. Lustermann, R.A. Manzoni, M. Marionneau, M.T. Meinhard, F. Micheli, P. Musella, F. Nessi-Tedaldi, J. Pata, F. Pauss, G. Perrin, L. Perrozzi, S. Pigazzini, M. Quittnat, D. Ruini, D.A. Sanz Becerra, M. Schönenberger, L. Shchutska, V.R. Tavolaro, K. Theofilatos, M.L. Vesterbacka Olsson, R. Wallny, D.H. Zhu

Universität Zürich, Zurich, Switzerland
T.K. Aarrestad, C. Amsler[46], D. Brzhechko, M.F. Canelli, A. De Cosa, R. Del Burgo, S. Donato, C. Galloni, T. Hreus, B. Kilminster, I. Neutelings, D. Pinna, G. Rauco, P. Robmann, D. Salerno, K. Schweiger, C. Seitz, Y. Takahashi, A. Zucchetta

National Central University, Chung-Li, Taiwan
Y.H. Chang, K.y. Cheng, T.H. Doan, Sh. Jain, R. Khurana, C.M. Kuo, W. Lin, A. Pozdnyakov, S.S. Yu

National Taiwan University (NTU), Taipei, Taiwan
P. Chang, Y. Chao, K.F. Chen, P.H. Chen, W.-S. Hou, Arun Kumar, Y.y. Li, R.-S. Lu, E. Paganis, A. Psallidas, A. Steen, J.f. Tsai

Chulalongkorn University, Faculty of Science, Department of Physics, Bangkok, Thailand
B. Asavapibhop, N. Srimanobhas, N. Suwonjandee

Çukurova University, Physics Department, Science and Art Faculty, Adana, Turkey
M.N. Bakirci[47], A. Bat, F. Boran, S. Cerci[48], S. Damarseckin, Z.S. Demiroglu, F. Dolek, C. Dozen, I. Dumanoglu, E. Eskut, S. Girgis, G. Gokbulut, Y. Guler, E. Gurpinar, I. Hos[49], C. Isik, E.E. Kangal[50], O. Kara, U. Kiminsu, M. Oglakci, G. Onengut, K. Ozdemir[51], A. Polatoz, D. Sunar Cerci[48], U.G. Tok, S. Turkcapar, I.S. Zorbakir, C. Zorbilmez

Middle East Technical University, Physics Department, Ankara, Turkey
B. Isildak[52], G. Karapinar[53], M. Yalvac, M. Zeyrek

Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey
I.O. Atakisi, E. Gülmez, M. Kaya[54], O. Kaya[55], S. Ozkorucuklu[56], S. Tekten, E.A. Yetkin[57]

Istanbul Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey
M.N. Agaras, S. Atay, A. Cakir, K. Cankocak, Y. Komurcu, S. Sen[58]

Institute for Scintillation Materials of National Academy of Science of Ukraine, Kharkov, Ukraine
B. Grynyov

National Scientific Center, Kharkov Institute of Physics and Technology, Kharkov, Ukraine
L. Levchuk

University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom
F. Ball, L. Beck, J.J. Brooke, D. Burns, E. Clement, D. Cussans, O. Davignon, H. Flacher,

J. Goldstein, G.P. Heath, H.F. Heath, L. Kreczko, D.M. Newbold[59], S. Paramesvaran, B. Penning, T. Sakuma, D. Smith, V.J. Smith, J. Taylor, A. Titterton

Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom
A. Belyaev[60], C. Brew, R.M. Brown, D. Cieri, D.J.A. Cockerill, J.A. Coughlan, K. Harder, S. Harper, J. Linacre, E. Olaiya, D. Petyt, C.H. Shepherd-Themistocleous, A. Thea, I.R. Tomalin, T. Williams, W.J. Womersley

Imperial College, London, United Kingdom
G. Auzinger, R. Bainbridge, P. Bloch, J. Borg, S. Breeze, O. Buchmuller, A. Bundock, S. Casasso, D. Colling, L. Corpe, P. Dauncey, G. Davies, M. Della Negra, R. Di Maria, Y. Haddad, G. Hall, G. Iles, T. James, M. Komm, C. Laner, L. Lyons, A.-M. Magnan, S. Malik, A. Martelli, J. Nash[61], A. Nikitenko[6], V. Palladino, M. Pesaresi, A. Richards, A. Rose, E. Scott, C. Seez, A. Shtipliyski, G. Singh, M. Stoye, T. Strebler, S. Summers, A. Tapper, K. Uchida, T. Virdee[15], N. Wardle, D. Winterbottom, J. Wright, S.C. Zenz

Brunel University, Uxbridge, United Kingdom
J.E. Cole, P.R. Hobson, A. Khan, P. Kyberd, C.K. Mackay, A. Morton, I.D. Reid, L. Teodorescu, S. Zahid

Baylor University, Waco, USA
K. Call, J. Dittmann, K. Hatakeyama, H. Liu, C. Madrid, B. Mcmaster, N. Pastika, C. Smith

Catholic University of America, Washington DC, USA
R. Bartek, A. Dominguez

The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, USA
A. Buccilli, S.I. Cooper, C. Henderson, P. Rumerio, C. West

Boston University, Boston, USA
D. Arcaro, T. Bose, D. Gastler, D. Rankin, C. Richardson, J. Rohlf, L. Sulak, D. Zou

Brown University, Providence, USA
G. Benelli, X. Coubez, D. Cutts, M. Hadley, J. Hakala, U. Heintz, J.M. Hogan[62], K.H.M. Kwok, E. Laird, G. Landsberg, J. Lee, Z. Mao, M. Narain, J. Pazzini, S. Piperov, S. Sagir[63], R. Syarif, E. Usai, D. Yu

University of California, Davis, Davis, USA
R. Band, C. Brainerd, R. Breedon, D. Burns, M. Calderon De La Barca Sanchez, M. Chertok, J. Conway, R. Conway, P.T. Cox, R. Erbacher, C. Flores, G. Funk, W. Ko, O. Kukral, R. Lander, C. Mclean, M. Mulhearn, D. Pellett, J. Pilot, S. Shalhout, M. Shi, D. Stolp, D. Taylor, K. Tos, M. Tripathi, Z. Wang, F. Zhang

University of California, Los Angeles, USA
M. Bachtis, C. Bravo, R. Cousins, A. Dasgupta, A. Florent, J. Hauser, M. Ignatenko, N. Mccoll, S. Regnard, D. Saltzberg, C. Schnaible, V. Valuev

University of California, Riverside, Riverside, USA
E. Bouvier, K. Burt, R. Clare, J.W. Gary, S.M.A. Ghiasi Shirazi, G. Hanson, G. Karapostoli, E. Kennedy, F. Lacroix, O.R. Long, M. Olmedo Negrete, M.I. Paneva, W. Si, L. Wang, H. Wei, S. Wimpenny, B.R. Yates

University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, USA
J.G. Branson, S. Cittolin, M. Derdzinski, R. Gerosa, D. Gilbert, B. Hashemi, A. Holzner, D. Klein, G. Kole, V. Krutelyov, J. Letts, M. Masciovecchio, D. Olivito, S. Padhi, M. Pieri, M. Sani,

V. Sharma, S. Simon, M. Tadel, A. Vartak, S. Wasserbaech[64], J. Wood, F. Würthwein, A. Yagil, G. Zevi Della Porta

University of California, Santa Barbara - Department of Physics, Santa Barbara, USA
N. Amin, R. Bhandari, J. Bradmiller-Feld, C. Campagnari, M. Citron, A. Dishaw, V. Dutta, M. Franco Sevilla, L. Gouskos, R. Heller, J. Incandela, A. Ovcharova, H. Qu, J. Richman, D. Stuart, I. Suarez, S. Wang, J. Yoo

California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA
D. Anderson, A. Bornheim, J.M. Lawhorn, H.B. Newman, T.Q. Nguyen, M. Spiropulu, J.R. Vlimant, R. Wilkinson, S. Xie, Z. Zhang, R.Y. Zhu

Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, USA
M.B. Andrews, T. Ferguson, T. Mudholkar, M. Paulini, M. Sun, I. Vorobiev, M. Weinberg

University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, USA
J.P. Cumalat, W.T. Ford, F. Jensen, A. Johnson, M. Krohn, S. Leontsinis, E. MacDonald, T. Mulholland, K. Stenson, K.A. Ulmer, S.R. Wagner

Cornell University, Ithaca, USA
J. Alexander, J. Chaves, Y. Cheng, J. Chu, A. Datta, K. Mcdermott, N. Mirman, J.R. Patterson, D. Quach, A. Rinkevicius, A. Ryd, L. Skinnari, L. Soffi, S.M. Tan, Z. Tao, J. Thom, J. Tucker, P. Wittich, M. Zientek

Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, USA
S. Abdullin, M. Albrow, M. Alyari, G. Apollinari, A. Apresyan, A. Apyan, S. Banerjee, L.A.T. Bauerdick, A. Beretvas, J. Berryhill, P.C. Bhat, G. Bolla[†], K. Burkett, J.N. Butler, A. Canepa, G.B. Cerati, H.W.K. Cheung, F. Chlebana, M. Cremonesi, J. Duarte, V.D. Elvira, J. Freeman, Z. Gecse, E. Gottschalk, L. Gray, D. Green, S. Grünendahl, O. Gutsche, J. Hanlon, R.M. Harris, S. Hasegawa, J. Hirschauer, Z. Hu, B. Jayatilaka, S. Jindariani, M. Johnson, U. Joshi, B. Klima, M.J. Kortelainen, B. Kreis, S. Lammel, D. Lincoln, R. Lipton, M. Liu, T. Liu, J. Lykken, K. Maeshima, J.M. Marraffino, D. Mason, P. McBride, P. Merkel, S. Mrenna, S. Nahn, V. O'Dell, K. Pedro, C. Pena, O. Prokofyev, G. Rakness, L. Ristori, A. Savoy-Navarro[65], B. Schneider, E. Sexton-Kennedy, A. Soha, W.J. Spalding, L. Spiegel, S. Stoynev, J. Strait, N. Strobbe, L. Taylor, S. Tkaczyk, N.V. Tran, L. Uplegger, E.W. Vaandering, C. Vernieri, M. Verzocchi, R. Vidal, M. Wang, H.A. Weber, A. Whitbeck

University of Florida, Gainesville, USA
D. Acosta, P. Avery, P. Bortignon, D. Bourilkov, A. Brinkerhoff, L. Cadamuro, A. Carnes, M. Carver, D. Curry, R.D. Field, S.V. Gleyzer, B.M. Joshi, J. Konigsberg, A. Korytov, P. Ma, K. Matchev, H. Mei, G. Mitselmakher, K. Shi, D. Sperka, J. Wang, S. Wang

Florida International University, Miami, USA
Y.R. Joshi, S. Linn

Florida State University, Tallahassee, USA
A. Ackert, T. Adams, A. Askew, S. Hagopian, V. Hagopian, K.F. Johnson, T. Kolberg, G. Martinez, T. Perry, H. Prosper, A. Saha, A. Santra, V. Sharma, R. Yohay

Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, USA
M.M. Baarmand, V. Bhopatkar, S. Colafranceschi, M. Hohlmann, D. Noonan, M. Rahmani, T. Roy, F. Yumiceva

University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC), Chicago, USA
M.R. Adams, L. Apanasevich, D. Berry, R.R. Betts, R. Cavanaugh, X. Chen, S. Dittmer,

O. Evdokimov, C.E. Gerber, D.A. Hangal, D.J. Hofman, K. Jung, J. Kamin, C. Mills, I.D. Sandoval Gonzalez, M.B. Tonjes, N. Varelas, H. Wang, X. Wang, Z. Wu, J. Zhang

The University of Iowa, Iowa City, USA
M. Alhusseini, B. Bilki[66], W. Clarida, K. Dilsiz[67], S. Durgut, R.P. Gandrajula, M. Haytmyradov, V. Khristenko, J.-P. Merlo, A. Mestvirishvili, A. Moeller, J. Nachtman, H. Ogul[68], Y. Onel, F. Ozok[69], A. Penzo, C. Snyder, E. Tiras, J. Wetzel

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA
B. Blumenfeld, A. Cocoros, N. Eminizer, D. Fehling, L. Feng, A.V. Gritsan, W.T. Hung, P. Maksimovic, J. Roskes, U. Sarica, M. Swartz, M. Xiao, C. You

The University of Kansas, Lawrence, USA
A. Al-bataineh, A. Anderson, P. Baringer, A. Bean, S. Boren, J. Bowen, C. Bruner, J. Castle, S. Khalil, A. Kropivnitskaya, D. Majumder, W. Mcbrayer, M. Murray, C. Rogan, S. Sanders, E. Schmitz, J.D. Tapia Takaki, Q. Wang

Kansas State University, Manhattan, USA
A. Ivanov, K. Kaadze, D. Kim, Y. Maravin, D.R. Mendis, T. Mitchell, A. Modak, A. Mohammadi, L.K. Saini, N. Skhirtladze

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, USA
F. Rebassoo, D. Wright

University of Maryland, College Park, USA
A. Baden, O. Baron, A. Belloni, S.C. Eno, Y. Feng, C. Ferraioli, N.J. Hadley, S. Jabeen, G.Y. Jeng, R.G. Kellogg, J. Kunkle, A.C. Mignerey, F. Ricci-Tam, Y.H. Shin, A. Skuja, S.C. Tonwar, K. Wong

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, USA
D. Abercrombie, B. Allen, V. Azzolini, A. Baty, G. Bauer, R. Bi, S. Brandt, W. Busza, I.A. Cali, M. D'Alfonso, Z. Demiragli, G. Gomez Ceballos, M. Goncharov, P. Harris, D. Hsu, M. Hu, Y. Iiyama, G.M. Innocenti, M. Klute, D. Kovalskyi, Y.-J. Lee, P.D. Luckey, B. Maier, A.C. Marini, C. Mcginn, C. Mironov, S. Narayanan, X. Niu, C. Paus, C. Roland, G. Roland, G.S.F. Stephans, K. Sumorok, K. Tatar, D. Velicanu, J. Wang, T.W. Wang, B. Wyslouch, S. Zhaozhong

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, USA
A.C. Benvenuti, R.M. Chatterjee, A. Evans, P. Hansen, S. Kalafut, Y. Kubota, Z. Lesko, J. Mans, S. Nourbakhsh, N. Ruckstuhl, R. Rusack, J. Turkewitz, M.A. Wadud

University of Mississippi, Oxford, USA
J.G. Acosta, S. Oliveros

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, USA
E. Avdeeva, K. Bloom, D.R. Claes, C. Fangmeier, F. Golf, R. Gonzalez Suarez, R. Kamalieddin, I. Kravchenko, J. Monroy, J.E. Siado, G.R. Snow, B. Stieger

State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, USA
A. Godshalk, C. Harrington, I. Iashvili, A. Kharchilava, D. Nguyen, A. Parker, S. Rappoccio, B. Roozbahani

Northeastern University, Boston, USA
G. Alverson, E. Barberis, C. Freer, A. Hortiangtham, D.M. Morse, T. Orimoto, R. Teixeira De Lima, T. Wamorkar, B. Wang, A. Wisecarver, D. Wood

Northwestern University, Evanston, USA
S. Bhattacharya, O. Charaf, K.A. Hahn, N. Mucia, N. Odell, M.H. Schmitt, K. Sung, M. Trovato, M. Velasco

University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, USA
R. Bucci, N. Dev, M. Hildreth, K. Hurtado Anampa, C. Jessop, D.J. Karmgard, N. Kellams, K. Lannon, W. Li, N. Loukas, N. Marinelli, F. Meng, C. Mueller, Y. Musienko[33], M. Planer, A. Reinsvold, R. Ruchti, P. Siddireddy, G. Smith, S. Taroni, M. Wayne, A. Wightman, M. Wolf, A. Woodard

The Ohio State University, Columbus, USA
J. Alimena, L. Antonelli, B. Bylsma, L.S. Durkin, S. Flowers, B. Francis, A. Hart, C. Hill, W. Ji, T.Y. Ling, W. Luo, B.L. Winer, H.W. Wulsin

Princeton University, Princeton, USA
S. Cooperstein, P. Elmer, J. Hardenbrook, P. Hebda, S. Higginbotham, A. Kalogeropoulos, D. Lange, M.T. Lucchini, J. Luo, D. Marlow, K. Mei, I. Ojalvo, J. Olsen, C. Palmer, P. Piroué, J. Salfeld-Nebgen, D. Stickland, C. Tully

University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez, USA
S. Malik, S. Norberg

Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA
A. Barker, V.E. Barnes, S. Das, L. Gutay, M. Jones, A.W. Jung, A. Khatiwada, B. Mahakud, D.H. Miller, N. Neumeister, C.C. Peng, H. Qiu, J.F. Schulte, J. Sun, F. Wang, R. Xiao, W. Xie

Purdue University Northwest, Hammond, USA
T. Cheng, J. Dolen, N. Parashar

Rice University, Houston, USA
Z. Chen, K.M. Ecklund, S. Freed, F.J.M. Geurts, M. Guilbaud, M. Kilpatrick, W. Li, B. Michlin, B.P. Padley, J. Roberts, J. Rorie, W. Shi, Z. Tu, J. Zabel, A. Zhang

University of Rochester, Rochester, USA
A. Bodek, P. de Barbaro, R. Demina, Y.t. Duh, J.L. Dulemba, C. Fallon, T. Ferbel, M. Galanti, A. Garcia-Bellido, J. Han, O. Hindrichs, A. Khukhunaishvili, K.H. Lo, P. Tan, R. Taus, M. Verzetti

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, Piscataway, USA
A. Agapitos, J.P. Chou, Y. Gershtein, T.A. Gómez Espinosa, E. Halkiadakis, M. Heindl, E. Hughes, S. Kaplan, R. Kunnawalkam Elayavalli, S. Kyriacou, A. Lath, R. Montalvo, K. Nash, M. Osherson, H. Saka, S. Salur, S. Schnetzer, D. Sheffield, S. Somalwar, R. Stone, S. Thomas, P. Thomassen, M. Walker

University of Tennessee, Knoxville, USA
A.G. Delannoy, J. Heideman, G. Riley, K. Rose, S. Spanier, K. Thapa

Texas A&M University, College Station, USA
O. Bouhali[70], A. Castaneda Hernandez[70], A. Celik, M. Dalchenko, M. De Mattia, A. Delgado, S. Dildick, R. Eusebi, J. Gilmore, T. Huang, T. Kamon[71], S. Luo, R. Mueller, Y. Pakhotin, R. Patel, A. Perloff, L. Perniè, D. Rathjens, A. Safonov, A. Tatarinov

Texas Tech University, Lubbock, USA
N. Akchurin, J. Damgov, F. De Guio, P.R. Dudero, S. Kunori, K. Lamichhane, S.W. Lee, T. Mengke, S. Muthumuni, T. Peltola, S. Undleeb, I. Volobouev, Z. Wang

Vanderbilt University, Nashville, USA
S. Greene, A. Gurrola, R. Janjam, W. Johns, C. Maguire, A. Melo, H. Ni, K. Padeken, J.D. Ruiz Alvarez, P. Sheldon, S. Tuo, J. Velkovska, M. Verweij, Q. Xu

University of Virginia, Charlottesville, USA
M.W. Arenton, P. Barria, B. Cox, R. Hirosky, M. Joyce, A. Ledovskoy, H. Li, C. Neu, T. Sinthuprasith, Y. Wang, E. Wolfe, F. Xia

Wayne State University, Detroit, USA
R. Harr, P.E. Karchin, N. Poudyal, J. Sturdy, P. Thapa, S. Zaleski

University of Wisconsin - Madison, Madison, WI, USA
M. Brodski, J. Buchanan, C. Caillol, D. Carlsmith, S. Dasu, L. Dodd, S. Duric, B. Gomber, M. Grothe, M. Herndon, A. Hervé, U. Hussain, P. Klabbers, A. Lanaro, A. Levine, K. Long, R. Loveless, T. Ruggles, A. Savin, N. Smith, W.H. Smith, N. Woods

†: Deceased
1: Also at Vienna University of Technology, Vienna, Austria
2: Also at IRFU, CEA, Université Paris-Saclay, Gif-sur-Yvette, France
3: Also at Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, Brazil
4: Also at Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, Brazil
5: Also at Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium
6: Also at Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia
7: Also at Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia
8: Also at Fayoum University, El-Fayoum, Egypt
9: Now at British University in Egypt, Cairo, Egypt
10: Now at Helwan University, Cairo, Egypt
11: Also at Department of Physics, King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
12: Also at Université de Haute Alsace, Mulhouse, France
13: Also at Skobeltsyn Institute of Nuclear Physics, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia
14: Also at Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia
15: Also at CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland
16: Also at RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut A, Aachen, Germany
17: Also at University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany
18: Also at Brandenburg University of Technology, Cottbus, Germany
19: Also at MTA-ELTE Lendület CMS Particle and Nuclear Physics Group, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary
20: Also at Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary
21: Also at Institute of Physics, University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary
22: Also at Indian Institute of Technology Bhubaneswar, Bhubaneswar, India
23: Also at Institute of Physics, Bhubaneswar, India
24: Also at Shoolini University, Solan, India
25: Also at University of Visva-Bharati, Santiniketan, India
26: Also at Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, Iran
27: Also at Plasma Physics Research Center, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
28: Also at Università degli Studi di Siena, Siena, Italy
29: Also at International Islamic University of Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
30: Also at Malaysian Nuclear Agency, MOSTI, Kajang, Malaysia
31: Also at Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología, Mexico city, Mexico

32: Also at Warsaw University of Technology, Institute of Electronic Systems, Warsaw, Poland
33: Also at Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia
34: Now at National Research Nuclear University 'Moscow Engineering Physics Institute' (MEPhI), Moscow, Russia
35: Also at Institute of Nuclear Physics of the Uzbekistan Academy of Sciences, Tashkent, Uzbekistan
36: Also at St. Petersburg State Polytechnical University, St. Petersburg, Russia
37: Also at University of Florida, Gainesville, USA
38: Also at Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, Novosibirsk, Russia
39: Also at Faculty of Physics, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia
40: Also at INFN Sezione di Pavia [a], Università di Pavia [b], Pavia, Italy
41: Also at University of Belgrade, Faculty of Physics and Vinca Institute of Nuclear Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia
42: Also at Scuola Normale e Sezione dell'INFN, Pisa, Italy
43: Also at National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece
44: Also at Riga Technical University, Riga, Latvia
45: Also at Universität Zürich, Zurich, Switzerland
46: Also at Stefan Meyer Institute for Subatomic Physics (SMI), Vienna, Austria
47: Also at Gaziosmanpasa University, Tokat, Turkey
48: Also at Adiyaman University, Adiyaman, Turkey
49: Also at Istanbul Aydin University, Istanbul, Turkey
50: Also at Mersin University, Mersin, Turkey
51: Also at Piri Reis University, Istanbul, Turkey
52: Also at Ozyegin University, Istanbul, Turkey
53: Also at Izmir Institute of Technology, Izmir, Turkey
54: Also at Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey
55: Also at Kafkas University, Kars, Turkey
56: Also at Istanbul University, Faculty of Science, Istanbul, Turkey
57: Also at Istanbul Bilgi University, Istanbul, Turkey
58: Also at Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey
59: Also at Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom
60: Also at School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southampton, Southampton, United Kingdom
61: Also at Monash University, Faculty of Science, Clayton, Australia
62: Also at Bethel University, St. Paul, USA
63: Also at Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University, Karaman, Turkey
64: Also at Utah Valley University, Orem, USA
65: Also at Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA
66: Also at Beykent University, Istanbul, Turkey
67: Also at Bingol University, Bingol, Turkey
68: Also at Sinop University, Sinop, Turkey
69: Also at Mimar Sinan University, Istanbul, Istanbul, Turkey
70: Also at Texas A&M University at Qatar, Doha, Qatar
71: Also at Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea