



CERN-EP-2024-240  
17 September 2024

## Investigating charm quark energy loss in medium with the nuclear modification factor of $D^0$ -tagged jets

ALICE Collaboration\*

### Abstract

The nuclear modification factor  $R_{AA}$  of charm jets, identified by the presence of a  $D^0$  meson among the jet constituents, has been measured for the first time in Pb–Pb collisions at a centre-of-mass energy per nucleon pair  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$  TeV with the ALICE detector at the LHC. The  $D^0$  mesons and their charge conjugates are reconstructed from the hadronic decay  $D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$ . Jets are reconstructed from  $D^0$ -meson candidates and charged particles using the anti- $k_T$  algorithm with jet resolution parameter  $R = 0.3$ , in the jet transverse momentum ( $p_T$ ) range  $5 < p_T^{\text{ch jet}} < 50$  GeV/ $c$  and pseudorapidity  $|\eta^{\text{ch jet}}| < 0.6$ . A hint of reduced suppression in the charm-jet  $R_{AA}$  is observed in comparison to inclusive jets in central Pb–Pb collisions with a significance of about  $2\sigma$  in  $20 < p_T^{\text{ch jet}} < 50$  GeV/ $c$ , suggesting the in-medium energy loss to depend on both the difference between quark and gluon coupling strength (Casimir colour-charge effect) and quark mass (dead-cone effect). The data are compared with model calculations that include mass effects in the in-medium energy loss. Among these, LIDO provides the best description of the data, highlighting the role of mass effects in interpreting the results.

arXiv:2409.11939v1 [nucl-ex] 18 Sep 2024

© 2024 CERN for the benefit of the ALICE Collaboration.

Reproduction of this article or parts of it is allowed as specified in the CC-BY-4.0 license.

---

\*See Appendix A for the list of collaboration members

## 1 Introduction

At the high energy density and temperature reached in ultrarelativistic heavy-ion collisions, the formation of a deconfined state of quarks and gluons, known as the quark–gluon plasma (QGP) [1–3], is predicted by quantum chromodynamic (QCD) calculations on the lattice [2, 4–6]. The QGP is created and studied in high-energy heavy-ion collisions at the Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider (RHIC) [7–11] and the CERN Large Hadron Collider (LHC) [3]. Heavy quarks (charm and beauty), due to their large masses, are mainly produced in hard scattering processes that occur in the early stage of the collisions, on a shorter time scale compared to the QGP formation [12, 13]. Therefore, they experience the entire evolution of the system, also considering that their thermal production and annihilation rates in the strongly interacting medium are small, even at the high temperatures and densities achieved in Pb–Pb collisions at the LHC.

Jets, i.e. collimated sprays of hadrons arising from the fragmentation of energetic partons produced in hard scattering processes, serve as effective probes for studying the microscopic interactions of partons with the QGP. Unlike single-hadron measurements, jets provide more direct information on energy and direction of the parton initiating the shower, as well as a smaller bias due to fragmentation [14]. According to QCD predictions [15–17], the parton-shower evolution of the jet in vacuum is expected to depend on the colour charge, characterised by the Casimir factor, as well as the quark mass, through the dead-cone effect, which has recently been directly measured for the first time by ALICE in pp collisions [18].

In heavy-ion collisions, high-energy partons undergo medium-induced gluon radiation and elastic scatterings [19] as a result of their interactions with the constituents of the QGP. Differences in quark mass and colour charge could be contributing factors to the difference in the energy loss between charm jets and inclusive jets, which contain a mixture of quark- and gluon-initiated jets.

Due to their large mass, heavy quarks are expected to lose less energy compared to light quarks through both collisional and radiative processes, as gluon radiation by massive quarks is suppressed (dead-cone effect) [20–22].

Such effects can be investigated, in heavy-ion collisions, with the measurement of the nuclear modification factor ( $R_{AA}$ ) of jets. This factor is defined as the ratio of the  $p_T$ -differential production yield in nucleus–nucleus collisions ( $dN_{AA}/dp_T$ ) and the production cross section in proton–proton collisions ( $d\sigma_{pp}/dp_T$ ) scaled by the average nuclear overlap function,  $\langle T_{AA} \rangle$

$$R_{AA} = \frac{1}{\langle T_{AA} \rangle} \frac{d^2 N_{Pb-Pb} / d\eta^{ch\ jet} dp_T^{ch\ jet}}{d^2 \sigma_{pp} / d\eta^{ch\ jet} dp_T^{ch\ jet}}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\langle T_{AA} \rangle$  is estimated with Glauber model calculations [23, 24] and is related to the number of binary nucleon–nucleon collisions ( $\langle N_{coll} \rangle$ ) and the inelastic nucleon–nucleon cross section ( $\sigma_{pp}^{inel}$ ) according to  $\langle T_{AA} \rangle = \langle N_{coll} \rangle / \sigma_{pp}^{inel}$ .

Several measurements at the LHC have investigated the energy loss of charm, beauty, and light quarks and gluons via the nuclear modification of fully reconstructed D mesons, non-prompt  $J/\psi$ , and charged hadrons in Pb–Pb collisions [25–36]. The comparison with model predictions allowed for constraining the charm spatial diffusion coefficient and provided important insights into the role of radiative and collisional energy loss as well as into the hadronisation mechanism. Furthermore, the quark-mass dependence of parton energy loss was explored by comparing the  $R_{AA}$  of charm and beauty hadrons, which were either reconstructed directly or accessed through their decay products [25, 27, 35, 37, 38]. Models incorporating a quark-mass dependence of energy loss were able to describe the data. On the jet side, the measurement of radial distributions of  $D^0$  mesons with respect to the jet axis, performed with the CMS detector [39], showed a hint of modification in Pb–Pb collisions for low- $p_T$   $D^0$  mesons. This suggests charm-quark diffusion in the medium, implying a potential influence of both mass and colour charge on partonic energy loss in heavy-ion collisions. Recent measurements of the ATLAS Collaboration indicate

a lower suppression of beauty jets [40] and of photon-tagged jets (mainly produced by light quarks) [41] when compared with inclusive jets in central Pb–Pb collisions. This is evidence of a larger jet quenching in gluon jets, which are a dominant part of the inclusive jet sample at the LHC, in comparison to quark jets and it unequivocally highlights the role of the colour-charge effect.

The ALICE detector, with its excellent particle identification (PID) and tracking performance, provides the unique opportunity to tag charged-particle jets with reconstructed heavy-flavour hadrons at low  $p_T$ . Thus, it allows for the investigation of the low-jet-transverse-momentum region, where the mass effects are expected to be most pronounced.

In this paper, the yields of charm jets tagged with  $D^0$  mesons ( $D^0$ -tagged jets) and their nuclear modification factor in the most central (0–10%) Pb–Pb events at centre-of-mass energy  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$  TeV are presented. This paper is organised as follows: Section 2 describes the ALICE detector and the utilised data sample; Sections 3 and 4 present details of the analysis strategy and the systematic uncertainty estimations; Section 5 reports the results compared with inclusive jet measurements and model predictions. A summary is provided in Section 6.

## 2 Detector and data sample

The ALICE experimental apparatus [42] consists of a central barrel (covering the pseudorapidity range  $|\eta| < 0.9$ ) embedded in a large solenoidal magnet that provides a magnetic field of 0.5 T, parallel to the beams axis. It also includes a forward muon spectrometer ( $-4 < \eta < -2.5$ ) and a set of detectors at forward and backward rapidity used for triggering, background rejection, and event characterisation.

The central-barrel detectors employed in this paper for charged-particle reconstruction and identification at midrapidity are the Inner Tracking System (ITS) [43], the Time Projection Chamber (TPC) [44], and the Time-Of-Flight detector (TOF) [45]. The ITS consists of six layers of silicon detectors used for tracking charged particles and reconstructing primary and secondary vertices. The TPC serves as the main tracking detector and provides particle identification through the measurement of the particle specific energy loss ( $dE/dx$ ) in the detector gas. Complementary particle identification information is obtained from the TOF, which measures the flight time of charged particles from the interaction point to the detector.

The results reported in this paper were obtained using the data sample collected during the 2018 LHC Pb–Pb run at centre-of-mass energy  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$  TeV. Events were selected using a minimum bias (MB) trigger provided by the V0 detectors [46], which consist of two arrays of 32 scintillators each, covering the full azimuthal angle in the pseudorapidity ranges of  $-3.7 < \eta < -1.7$  (V0C) and  $2.8 < \eta < 5.1$  (V0A). An additional trigger class, based on the online event selection provided by the V0 signal amplitude, was used during the data taking to enrich the sample of central collisions considered in this analysis. Events arising from the interactions of the beams with residual gas in the vacuum pipe were rejected offline using the timing information from the V0 detector and the Zero Degree Calorimeter (ZDC) [47]. Only the events with a primary vertex reconstructed within  $\pm 10$  cm from the nominal centre of the detector along the beam axis were considered in the analysis. The centrality estimator is defined in terms of percentiles of the hadronic Pb–Pb cross section, using the sum of the V0 signal amplitudes, as described in detail in Ref. [43]. In the present analysis, only the 10% most central collisions are used (0–10% centrality class). The corresponding average nuclear overlap function is  $\langle T_{AA} \rangle = 23.26 \pm 0.17 \text{ mb}^{-1}$  [48, 49] and the total number of analysed events is about  $N_{\text{events}} = 100 \times 10^6$ , corresponding to an integrated luminosity of  $L_{\text{int}} = 130.5 \pm 0.5 \text{ } \mu\text{b}^{-1}$ . The data used for the measurement of the pp reference in the calculation of the  $R_{AA}$  is the same as used in Ref. [50].

The Monte Carlo samples used for the corrections in this analysis were generated by simulating pp collisions containing a  $c\bar{c}$  or a  $b\bar{b}$  pair with PYTHIA 8 [51] (Monash 2013 tune [52]). The charged-

particle multiplicity and detector occupancy observed in data [53] were simulated superimposing an underlying event generated with HIJING 1.36 [54]. The generated-level particles from these simulations were passed through a particle transport and detector-response simulation of the entire ALICE apparatus based on GEANT3 [55].

### 3 Analysis Strategy

The analysis closely follows the procedure described in detail in the ALICE studies of charm jets tagged with  $D^0$  mesons [50]. It consists of three main parts: (i) reconstruction of jets tagged by the presence of a  $D^0$  meson; (ii) extraction of the raw yields of  $D^0$ -tagged jets; (iii) correction for the reconstruction efficiency of the  $D^0$  jets, subtraction of the feed-down contribution from  $D^0$  mesons coming from beauty decays, and correction for the detector-related effects and underlying-event fluctuations.

A major challenge in jet reconstruction in central heavy-ion collisions compared to pp collisions is the fluctuation of the underlying event, which is a background to the reconstructed jet. These fluctuations significantly affect the jet transverse momentum. To account for these background fluctuations and detector effects, the data was corrected using a deconvolution procedure (unfolding). This correction involved constructing a response matrix that maps the  $D^0$ -jet  $p_T$  at the generated level, simulated using PYTHIA 8 for pp collisions, to the detector-level spectrum. The matching between generated and detector-level  $D^0$  jets was achieved by requiring the identification of the same  $D^0$  meson among their constituents. To ensure a realistic representation of the heavy-ion environment, detector-level particles were embedded into real Pb–Pb data to simulate the background accurately.

#### 3.1 $D^0$ -meson selection and jet reconstruction

The  $D^0$  and  $\bar{D}^0$  mesons were reconstructed via the hadronic decay channel  $D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$  (and its charge conjugate) with branching ratio  $BR = 3.950 \pm 0.031\%$  [15].  $D^0$  mesons produced either directly from charm-quark fragmentation or from decays of directly-produced excited charm hadron states are referred to as prompt  $D^0$  mesons, while those originating from decays of beauty hadrons are termed non-prompt  $D^0$  mesons. The selection strategy, described in detail in Refs. [56] and [25], exploited the displaced topology of the decay and made use of the particle identification capabilities of the TPC and TOF to identify the decay particles of the  $D^0$  mesons in the pseudorapidity interval  $|\eta_D| < 0.9$ .

Charm-jet reconstruction was performed using a track-based procedure with the FastJet [57] anti- $k_T$  clustering algorithm [58] with resolution parameter  $R = 0.3$ . This parameter was chosen in order to keep under control the jet background fluctuations, which increase for large  $R$ , while the jet's characteristics are not completely dominated by the jet core, which happens for small  $R$ . The jet reconstruction was carried out using the  $p_T$ -recombination scheme [59], in the kinematic range  $5 < p_T^{\text{ch, jet}} < 50 \text{ GeV}/c$ . Charged particles were required to have  $p_T > 150 \text{ MeV}/c$  and  $|\eta| < 0.9$ . To ensure that the entire jet was contained within the detector acceptance, jets were required to have their axes within the pseudorapidity range of  $|\eta| < 0.9 - R$ .

At low momenta, the  $D^0$  decay products may be emitted at angles larger than the defined jet cone size. To address this issue and ensure that the pion and kaon from the  $D^0$  decay were assigned to the same jet, they were removed from the set of charged-particle tracks before the jet reconstruction and their four-momenta were replaced by that of the  $D^0$  candidate. A charm jet was identified when a  $D^0$ -meson candidate in the transverse momentum range  $3 < p_{T,D} < 36 \text{ GeV}/c$  was found among its constituents. This procedure was repeated for each  $D^0$ -meson candidate in the event, where the decay products of only one candidate were replaced at a time.

Measuring jets in heavy-ion collisions down to low transverse momentum, such as  $5 \text{ GeV}/c$ , is particularly challenging due to the large background from the underlying event and its fluctuations [60]. At low  $p_T$ , a large fraction of the reconstructed jets is not related to a hard scattering process. This background

source dominates the low jet- $p_T$  region (below 20 GeV/c). Moreover, independently of the  $p_T$  interval, all reconstructed jets can include tracks from the underlying event, i.e. particles not originating from the fragmentation of the hard-scattered parton that initiated the jet. To account for the background coming from the underlying event, the area-based method was employed, following the approach described in Refs. [61, 62]. This method estimates the average additive contribution to the jet momentum on a jet-by-jet basis. The underlying background momentum density,  $\rho^{\text{ch}}$ , was estimated event-by-event using the median of  $p_{T, \text{raw}}^{\text{ch jet}}/A_{\text{raw}}^{\text{ch jet}}$ , where  $p_{T, \text{raw}}^{\text{ch jet}}$  is the uncorrected jet transverse momentum and  $A_{\text{raw}}^{\text{ch jet}}$  is the area of jets reconstructed with the  $k_T$  algorithm [63]. The two leading jets were removed from the calculation of  $\rho^{\text{ch}}$ . The signal anti- $k_T$  jets were then corrected by subtracting the median of the jet transverse momentum density multiplied by the jet area:  $p_{T, \text{corr}}^{\text{ch jet}} = p_{T, \text{raw}}^{\text{ch jet}} - \rho^{\text{ch}} A_{\text{raw}}^{\text{ch jet}}$ .

### 3.2 Extraction of $D^0$ -tagged jet raw yields

The raw yield of  $D^0$  jets was determined through an invariant-mass analysis of the  $D^0$ -meson candidates used for tagging the charm-jet candidates. The analysis was performed in different intervals of  $D^0$ -meson transverse momentum ranging from 3 to 36 GeV/c. For each  $p_{T,D}$  interval, the invariant-mass distribution of the  $D^0$ -meson candidates was fitted with a function consisting of a Gaussian function to represent the signal and an exponential function to account for the combinatorial background [56].

When the two tracks forming a  $D^0$  candidate are compatible with both the kaon and pion hypothesis, the candidate can be identified both as a  $D^0$  and as a  $\bar{D}^0$ , leading to an irreducible correlated background, which is referred to as reflections [56, 64]. The contribution of residual  $D^0$ -meson reflections, which were not rejected by particle identification, were considered in the fit by including a template composed of the sum of two Gaussian functions. The centroids and widths of these Gaussian functions were fixed to the values based on a fit to the invariant mass distributions of reflections derived from the simulation. The ratio between the reflected signal and the  $D^0$ -meson yield was also fixed to the value obtained from the simulations.

The yield of  $D^0$ -meson-tagged jet candidates was determined by dividing the corresponding  $D^0$  invariant-mass range in two sub-samples within each  $p_{T,D}$  interval: a *peak region* corresponding to candidates with  $|m_{\text{inv}} - m_{\text{fit}}| < 2\sigma_{\text{fit}}$  (where  $m_{\text{fit}}$  and  $\sigma_{\text{fit}}$  are the mean and width of the Gaussian component of the fit, respectively) and a *sideband region* consisting of candidates with  $4\sigma_{\text{fit}} < |m_{\text{inv}} - m_{\text{fit}}| < 8\sigma_{\text{fit}}$ . The jet  $p_T$  distribution associated with the  $D$ -meson candidates in the sideband region was normalised to the integral of the background in the peak region and then subtracted from the jet  $p_T$  distribution in the peak region to obtain the raw yield of  $D^0$  jets.

### 3.3 Corrections of $D^0$ -tagged-jet raw yields

The raw yields of  $D^0$ -tagged jets extracted using the invariant mass method required corrections to account for the limited detector acceptance and the reconstruction efficiency of  $D^0$  mesons. These corrections are described in detail in Refs. [50, 65]. After the removal of non-prompt  $D^0$  meson contributions, the raw yield is unfolded to correct for the detector finite resolution and jet background fluctuations.

First, the raw yields obtained in different intervals of  $p_{T,D}$  were corrected for the product of the acceptance and the reconstruction efficiency of prompt  $D^0$  mesons associated to jets that pass the acceptance and  $p_T^{\text{ch jet}}$  selection,  $\varepsilon^{c \rightarrow D^0}(p_{T,D})$ . This correction factor took into account the probability of detecting and reconstructing jets containing prompt  $D^0$  mesons within the specified  $p_{T,D}$  intervals and the jet cone radius.

A fraction of the reconstructed  $D^0$ -meson-tagged jets originates from the fragmentation of beauty quarks, where a beauty hadron decays into a  $D^0$  meson. The contribution from beauty jets was estimated using generated templates of non-prompt  $D^0$ -jet  $p_T$  distributions obtained with NLO pQCD calculations of POWHEG [66–69] coupled to the PYTHIA 6 [70] parton shower. The templates were generated with

specific configurations in POWHEG, such as a b-quark mass  $m_b = 4.75 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ , the renormalisation ( $\mu_R$ ) and factorisation ( $\mu_F$ ) scales set to the quark transverse mass  $\mu_R = \mu_F = \sqrt{m_b^2 + p_T^2}$ , and the use of parton distribution functions (PDF) from the CT10NLO [71] set using the LHAPDF6 [72] interpolator.

The non-prompt- $D^0$ -jet yield estimated by the simulation ( $N_{\text{POWHEG}}^{b \rightarrow D^0}$ ) was weighted by the ratio of the efficiencies of non-prompt and prompt  $D^0$ -jets ( $\epsilon^{b \rightarrow D^0}(p_{T,D})/\epsilon^{c \rightarrow D^0}(p_{T,D})$ ) in order to be comparable with  $\epsilon^{c \rightarrow D^0}$ -scaled inclusive  $D^0$ -jet distributions from data. As a next step, the simulated non-prompt  $D^0$ -jet distribution was smeared with the non-prompt response matrix ( $\text{RM}_{b \rightarrow D^0}$ ) in order to take into account the effect of the detector on the jet momentum resolution. The spectrum was also corrected for the kinematic efficiency, which accounts for the limited transverse momentum ranges of the response matrix in the generated ( $\epsilon_{\text{kin}}^{\text{gen}}$ ) and reconstructed ( $\epsilon_{\text{kin}}^{\text{rec}}$ ) axes. Additionally, the measured nuclear modification factor of non-prompt- $D^0$  mesons ( $R_{AA}^{b \rightarrow D^0}$ ) [27] was used to weight the non-prompt  $D^0$ -jet  $p_T$  spectrum. This assumes that the non-prompt  $D^0$ -jet  $R_{AA}$  is dominated by the non-prompt  $D^0$ . This assumption is supported by the expected hard fragmentation of the bottom quark. As a result, the yield of prompt- $D^0$  jets,  $N^c$ , was determined as follows

$$N^c(p_T^{\text{ch jet}}) = N^{c+b}(p_T^{\text{ch jet}}) - N^b(p_T^{\text{ch jet}}), \quad (2)$$

where the contribution of non-prompt  $D^0$ -jet,  $N^b$ , was estimated using the following formula

$$N^b(p_T^{\text{ch jet}}) = \frac{1}{\epsilon_{\text{kin}}^{\text{rec}}} \left[ \sum_{p_{T,D}} \text{RM}_{b \rightarrow D^0}(p_T^{\text{ch jet}}, p_{T,D}) \otimes \sum_{p_{T,D}} \frac{\epsilon^{b \rightarrow D^0}(p_{T,D})}{\epsilon^{c \rightarrow D^0}(p_{T,D})} R_{AA}^{b \rightarrow D^0}(p_{T,D}) \epsilon_{\text{kin}}^{\text{gen}} N_{\text{POWHEG}}^{b \rightarrow D^0}(p_T^{\text{ch jet}}, p_{T,D}) \right]. \quad (3)$$

The contribution of non-prompt  $D^0$  jets varies between 20% and 24% of the inclusive yields depending on the jet  $p_T$ .

Finally, the measured  $D^0$ -jet yield was unfolded with an iterative method based on Bayes' theorem [73] as implemented in the RooUnfold package [74]. The chosen number of iterations was eight, based on optimal convergence. Both the prompt and non-prompt- $D^0$ -jet response matrices were corrected for the kinematic efficiency.

To verify the stability of the unfolding and the choice of the number of iterations, the unfolded spectra were folded back and compared to the original data, showing good agreement in all the cases.

#### 4 Systematic uncertainties

The systematic uncertainty associated to the measurement has several independent sources. These sources were identified as coming from: (i) yield extraction, (ii)  $D^0$ -jet reconstruction efficiency, (iii) feed-down subtraction, (iv) tracking efficiency, (v) unfolding, and (vi) branching ratio.

The uncertainty on the yield extraction procedure, described in Section 3.2, was evaluated by varying the fit approach. In particular, the fit was repeated using different functions to describe the background, varying the fit range, fixing the mean of the Gaussian term describing the signal peak to the nominal value of the  $D^0$ -meson mass or fixing the Gaussian width to the value obtained from Monte Carlo studies. The standard deviation calculated from all variations with respect to the default set of parameters was used as systematic uncertainty. The uncertainties obtained with this procedure increase from 5% at low jet transverse momentum to 6% at higher jet  $p_T$ .

The possible differences in the topological variable distributions between Monte Carlo and data can

affect the  $D^0$ -jet reconstruction efficiency. The related systematic uncertainty was evaluated by extracting the raw-jet  $p_T$  spectrum with tighter and looser topological selections of the  $D^0$ -jet candidates. The corresponding  $p_T$  systematic uncertainty varies from 5% at the low jet transverse momentum up to 14% in the highest  $p_T$  interval (30–50 GeV/ $c$ ).

The uncertainty on the subtraction of the beauty feed-down contribution was quantified by varying the factorisation and renormalisation scales, the beauty-quark mass, and the PDF in the generated POWHEG + PYTHIA 6 templates of non-prompt- $D^0$  jets [75]. The largest deviations among all variations were used as systematic uncertainties, resulting in a value of 7–8% depending on the jet  $p_T$ . An additional contribution to this uncertainty comes from the systematic uncertainty related to the assumption on the nuclear modification factor  $R_{AA}^{b \rightarrow D^0}$ . It was estimated by assuming different values of the non-prompt- $D^0$  nuclear modification factor and recalculating the non-prompt  $D^0$ -jet yield  $N^b$ . The difference between the variations and the default spectrum was used as systematic uncertainty. The uncertainty ranges from 6% to 8% in jet  $p_T$  kinematic interval.

The uncertainties on the track reconstruction efficiency can impact the jet momentum resolution and  $D^0$ -jet reconstruction efficiency. The systematic uncertainty on the reconstruction efficiency of a single track was estimated to be 4% [76]. To evaluate its impact, a response matrix was built by randomly rejecting 4% of the reconstructed tracks (artificially decreasing the tracking efficiency). This response matrix was used to unfold the measurement and the difference with respect to the results obtained with the default response matrix was considered as systematic uncertainty. This uncertainty varies from 0.5% in the 5–6 GeV/ $c$  jet  $p_T$  range up to 10% in the 30–50 GeV/ $c$  jet- $p_T$  interval.

The systematic uncertainties due to the unfolding procedure were evaluated by studying three independent aspects of the Bayesian unfolding method. First, the regularisation parameter was varied by  $\pm 1$  iteration. These two variations were compared to the unfolded distribution obtained using the default parameter and the largest deviations were used as systematic uncertainty. Second, the shape of the prior spectrum of the  $D^0$ -jet transverse-momentum distribution in the response matrix was also varied. The default shape was taken from POWHEG+PYTHIA 6 simulations and the variation used was from PYTHIA 8. The observed difference was adopted as systematic uncertainty. Third, the lower limit of the kinematic range of the measurement was also varied and, after unfolding, the spectrum was compared to the default range and the relative deviation was used as systematic uncertainty. The combined systematic uncertainties from unfolding range from 8% at low jet  $p_T$  to 16% in the 30–50 GeV/ $c$  interval.

The systematic uncertainties arising from the sources that affect the raw jet- $p_T$  spectrum (such as yield extraction, kinematic and topological selections, and feed-down subtraction) were propagated to the final  $D^0$ -jet yield by unfolding the upper and lower bands of the combined systematic uncertainty. These were then combined in quadrature with the systematic uncertainties affecting the correction of the reconstructed jet momentum (including single-particle tracking efficiency and unfolding). This resulted in a combined systematic uncertainties for  $D^0$  jets that varies from 15% in the 5–6 GeV/ $c$  jet  $p_T$  range up to 52% in the 30–50 GeV/ $c$  interval.

In the evaluation of the nuclear modification factor, the systematic uncertainties associated with the  $D^0$ -jet yield in Pb–Pb collisions and the reference cross section in pp collisions were treated as uncorrelated, with the exception of the uncertainty related to the branching ratio (BR), which cancels out in the ratio, and the feed-down that was considered as partially correlated between pp and Pb–Pb collisions. The contributions of the uncertainties on the luminosity determination in pp collisions, and the  $\langle T_{AA} \rangle$  estimated with the Glauber model are common across all the transverse-momentum intervals and therefore contribute to a normalisation uncertainty on the  $R_{AA}$ , which is shown separately from the other sources when displaying the results.


## 5 Results and discussion

The transverse-momentum differential yields of charm jets tagged with prompt  $D^0$  mesons in central Pb–Pb collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{\text{NN}}} = 5.02$  TeV were calculated using the following equation (4), with the measured yields corrected according to the procedure described in Section 3:

$$\frac{d^2N}{d\eta^{\text{ch jet}} d p_T^{\text{ch jet}}} = \frac{1}{N_{\text{events}}} \frac{1}{\text{BR}} \frac{N(p_T^{\text{ch jet}})}{\Delta\eta^{\text{ch jet}} \Delta p_T^{\text{ch jet}}}, \quad (4)$$

where  $N_{\text{events}}$  is the number of events, BR is the branching ratio of the considered  $D^0$  decay channel,  $N(p_T^{\text{ch jet}})$  is the measured yield in each interval of transverse momentum,  $\Delta\eta^{\text{ch jet}}$  is the pseudorapidity interval of  $D^0$  jets and  $\Delta p_T^{\text{ch jet}}$  is the width of the  $p_T$  interval.

Figure 1 displays the measured yields of charm jets tagged with a prompt  $D^0$  meson in the transverse momentum interval  $5 < p_T^{\text{ch jet}} < 50$  GeV/ $c$  for central (0–10%) Pb–Pb collisions at a centre-of-mass energy of  $\sqrt{s_{\text{NN}}} = 5.02$  TeV, along with the reference yields from pp collisions [50]. The reference yields in pp collisions were computed as the product of the average nuclear overlap function  $\langle T_{\text{AA}} \rangle$  and the  $D^0$ -jet  $p_T$ -differential cross section  $d\sigma_{\text{pp}}/dp_T$ . In both collision systems, the charm jets were required to contain a prompt  $D^0$  as one of their constituents, reconstructed in the kinematic interval  $3 < p_{T,D} < 36$  GeV/ $c$ . This requirement allowed for the reconstruction of  $D^0$ -tagged jets with low transverse momentum. The measured yields in Pb–Pb collisions exhibit a clear suppression of the  $D^0$ -jet production yield compared to the reference yields in pp collisions. The nuclear modification factor ( $R_{\text{AA}}$ ) of prompt-




**Figure 1:** Transverse-momentum differential yields of charm jets tagged with prompt  $D^0$  mesons in central (0–10%) Pb–Pb collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{\text{NN}}} = 5.02$  TeV (red markers) and cross section in pp collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 5.02$  TeV (blue markers) scaled by the nuclear overlap function  $\langle T_{\text{AA}} \rangle$  for the considered centrality interval. The vertical lines are the statistical uncertainties and the filled squares are the systematic uncertainties.

$D^0$  jets was computed, based on Eq. (1), using the transverse momentum differential yield measured in Pb–Pb collisions and the pp reference at the same centre-of-mass energy [50].

The resulting  $R_{\text{AA}}$  of charm jets tagged with prompt  $D^0$  mesons is shown in Fig. 2. The value of  $R_{\text{AA}}$






**Figure 2:** Nuclear modification factor of  $D^0$  jets (red markers), inclusive jets with resolution parameter  $R = 0.2$  (light blue) and  $R = 0.4$  (blue markers) [77], and averaged  $D^0$ ,  $D^+$ ,  $D^{*+}$  mesons [56] (green markers). Statistical and systematic uncertainties are shown as vertical error bars and boxes, respectively. The global uncertainty originated from the  $\langle T_{AA} \rangle$  normalisation and the luminosity is displayed as a box around unity.

increases as a function of jet  $p_T$ . It varies from about 0.32 in the lowest jet- $p_T$  interval to 0.5 in the highest jet- $p_T$  interval. This indicates a strong suppression of  $D^0$ -jet production in central (0–10%) Pb–Pb collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$  TeV.

Figure 2 shows the comparison of  $D^0$ -jet  $R_{AA}$  to the  $R_{AA}$  of inclusive charged-particle jets with  $R = 0.2$  and with  $R = 0.4$  [77]. The two inclusive-jet  $R_{AA}$  measurements are compatible between each other within systematic uncertainties, with the  $R_{AA}$  for  $R = 0.4$  being systematically lower. The  $R_{AA}$  measurement for  $R = 0.3$  is not available, but it is reasonable to expect that it should lie between the two measurements. Due to its broader kinematic range, only the measurement with  $R = 0.2$  will be considered from this point onward. In the overlapping jet transverse momentum region ( $20 < p_T^{\text{ch jet}} < 50$  GeV/c), the inclusive jet  $R_{AA}$  is lower than the  $D^0$ -jet  $R_{AA}$ , suggesting a reduced suppression of charm jets tagged with  $D^0$  mesons as compared to inclusive jet. The statistical significance of the difference is about  $2.1\sigma$  in the transverse momentum range  $20 < p_T^{\text{ch jet}} < 30$  GeV/c and  $1.8\sigma$  in the entire transverse momentum region of the overlap between the two measurements. The figure shows also the comparison with the nuclear modification factor (average of  $D^0$ ,  $D^+$ , and  $D^{*+}$ ) taken from Ref. [56]. Despite the difficulty in assessing a momentum scale to properly compare the jet and the single hadron measurements, it is remarkable to observe that  $D^0$  jets and D mesons show similar magnitudes of suppression at similar  $p_T$ . The minimum  $p_{T,D}$  is 3 GeV/c, which is a lower limit for all  $D^0$  jets in this measurement. The upper limit of the first  $D^0$ -jet  $p_T^{\text{ch jet}}$  interval (5–6 GeV/c) also limits its highest  $p_{T,D}$ . The  $R_{AA}$  in this  $D^0$ -jet interval is consistent with the  $D^0$   $R_{AA}$  in the range  $4 < p_{T,D} < 6$  GeV/c.

In evaluating the comparison between inclusive jets and  $D^0$  jets, the steepness of the transverse-momentum differential yields in pp collisions, which were used as the reference for computing the  $R_{AA}$ , should be taken into account. The momentum shift of inclusive and  $D^0$  jets due to the energy loss could differ due to the different steepness of their transverse-momentum spectrum and introduce a bias in the comparison of the two  $R_{AA}$  measurements.




**Figure 3:** Transverse momentum distributions of  $D^0$  mesons (green markers) [64], inclusive jets with jet resolution parameter 0.2 (light blue) and 0.4 (blue markers) [78], and  $D^0$  jets (red markers) in pp collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 5.02$  TeV (see text for details about the normalisation). Statistical and systematic uncertainties are shown as vertical error bars and boxes, respectively. The function  $\alpha/p_T^\beta$  was fitted to each of the distributions (solid lines) to compare their steepness.

Figure 3 presents the  $p_T$ -differential yields of  $D^0$  mesons [64],  $D^0$ -tagged jets [50], and inclusive jets with  $R = 0.2$  and  $R = 0.4$  [78] measured in pp collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 5.02$  TeV and normalised to their integral in given  $p_T$  intervals. The  $D^0$  distribution was normalised in such a way that it has the same integral in the interval 5 to 6 GeV/c as the  $D^0$ -tagged jet distribution. The same was done for the inclusive-jet distributions in the interval 10 to 50 GeV/c. Each transverse momentum distribution was fitted using a function  $\alpha/p_T^\beta$ , where  $\alpha$  is a parameter that accounts for the normalisation of the distributions, and  $\beta$  quantifies the steepness of the function. Both statistical and systematic uncertainties were considered for the fit. For the  $D^0$ -meson and inclusive-jet transverse momentum spectra in pp collisions, it was found that  $\beta_{D^0} = 4.42 \pm 0.06$ ,  $\beta_{\text{inc.jets}}^{R=0.2} = 4.296 \pm 0.004$ , and  $\beta_{\text{inc.jets}}^{R=0.4} = 4.468 \pm 0.004$ , which show that these are steeper transverse momentum distributions in comparison to  $D^0$  jets with  $\beta_{D^0\text{jets}} = 3.96 \pm 0.06$ . However, even assuming an hypothetical scenario where 80% of the jets have a 10 GeV/c shift to lower  $p_T$ , the difference in the steepness between inclusive jets and jets tagged with a  $D^0$  could account for up to a 9% difference between their nuclear modification factors, thus is not sufficiently large to explain the observed differences in their respective  $R_{AA}$ .

In Fig. 4, the nuclear modification factors of both  $D^0$ -tagged jets and inclusive jets are compared to calculations from different theory models, namely Dai et al. [80], JETSCAPE [79] (left panel) and to LIDO [81, 82] model (right panel).

The calculation by Dai et al. [80] is based on a Langevin transport model, which describes the evolution of heavy quarks and their collisional energy loss, as well as a higher-twist description of radiative energy loss for both heavy and light partons. This model also includes the dead-cone effect for heavy quarks and utilises a (2+1)-dimensional viscous hydrodynamic medium with averaged initial conditions. The model uses a fixed jet transport parameter (proportional to the local parton density in the medium)  $\hat{q}_0 = 1.2$  GeV<sup>2</sup>/fm and varies its value ( $1 < \hat{q}_0 < 1.5$  GeV<sup>2</sup>/fm) to estimate the uncertainties of the model



**Figure 4:** Left: comparison of the nuclear modification factor of  $D^0$  jets (and inclusive jets) with predictions from JETSCAPE [79] and Dai et al. [80]. The bands of the theory curves represent the systematic uncertainties on the model predictions. Right: comparison to the LIDO [81, 82] predictions for  $D^0$  jets with and without dead-cone effect and predictions for inclusive jets.

predictions. It reproduces the measured inclusive jet  $R_{AA}$ , consistently lying on the upper edge of the systematic uncertainties of the data points. However, it tends to underestimate the nuclear modification factor of  $D^0$ -tagged jets for  $p_T^{\text{ch jet}} > 12$  GeV/ $c$ .

The JETSCAPE model [79] includes a modification of the parton shower due to the interaction with the medium using MATTER [83] at high parton virtuality, and LBT [84] at low parton virtuality. JETSCAPE severely underestimates the  $R_{AA}$  of  $D^0$  jets, while showing good agreement with the inclusive jet  $R_{AA}$  measurement.

LIDO is a partonic transport model that incorporates heavy-quark scatterings with medium partons using matrix elements calculated in perturbative QCD. It describes the transport of heavy quarks between scatterings through a Boltzmann type equation, including both elastic collisions and medium-induced parton radiation. The transport coefficients in LIDO are calibrated using a Bayesian analysis to match the measured single-inclusive nuclear modification factors of light-flavour hadrons and D mesons at the LHC and RHIC [85]. The model introduces the parameter  $\mu_{\text{min}}$  to control the coupling between the jet and the medium, based on measurements of the  $R_{AA}$  of B and D mesons. The value of this parameter is proportional to the temperature of the QGP,  $T$ . LIDO predictions, shown in the right panel of Fig. 4, were obtained with  $\mu_{\text{min}} = 1.8\pi T$  and demonstrate the best agreement with the data in terms of the shape and trend for both inclusive jets and  $D^0$  jets.

Predictions for inclusive jets down to  $p_T = 5$  GeV/ $c$  (compatible with the minimum  $p_T$  of the  $D^0$ -tagged jet measurement) confirm the larger suppression of inclusive jets also at low  $p_T$ . Moreover, the result obtained without including the dead-cone effect in the calculations are also shown to single out the quark-mass effect in this model.

The absence of dead-cone effect for the charm jets results in a larger suppression of the nuclear modification factor for  $p_T^{\text{ch jet}} < 50$  GeV/ $c$ , pointing towards a significant role of the mass effect in this kinematic region. The dead-cone effect becomes less relevant for  $p_T^{\text{ch jet}} > 50$  GeV/ $c$ , where the model predictions for charm jets and inclusive jets are extended up to  $p_T = 200$  GeV/ $c$  and result to be compatible. This observation corroborates the mass-hierarchy in energy loss, as evidenced also by the comparison of the nuclear modification factors of beauty-originated hadrons and charm-originated hadrons [27, 37]. The residual difference between the model curves of  $D^0$ -tagged jets without dead-cone effect and inclusive

jets can likely be attributed to the different Casimir factors of quarks and gluons, as the inclusive jet sample is a mixture of gluon- and light-quark-initiated jets.

## 6 Summary

In this paper, the measurement of the production yield and nuclear modification factor of charm jets tagged with fully reconstructed  $D^0$  mesons in central (0–10%) Pb–Pb collisions at a centre-of-mass energy per nucleon pair  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$  TeV has been reported. The use of  $D^0$  mesons for charm-jet tagging extends the measurement of the charm-jet production to transverse momentum values down to  $p_T^{\text{ch jet}} = 5$  GeV/c.

The nuclear modification factor of charm jets tagged with  $D^0$  mesons, which quantifies the suppression of the jet yield due to interactions with the medium, was measured for the first time. It was computed by comparing the  $D^0$ -jet yield in Pb–Pb collisions with the production cross section of  $D^0$ -tagged jets in pp collisions at the same collision energy as a reference and it was found to be suppressed in the full measured  $p_T$  range. The comparison with the nuclear modification factor of inclusive jets at the same centre-of-mass energy and centrality class indicates a lower suppression of charm jets compared to light-quark and gluon jets when traversing the medium, with a significance of about  $2\sigma$  in the transverse momentum range  $20 < p_T^{\text{ch jet}} < 50$  GeV/c. This difference can be attributed to the interplay of effects arising from the mass of the initial quark and the colour charge. The heavier quark mass suppresses the energy loss of charm quarks compared to light quarks, while the larger colour charge enhances the energy loss for gluon-initiated jets, which are more abundant at lower  $p_T$ , compared to quark-initiated jets.

The results are compared with JETSCAPE, Dai et al., and LIDO theoretical calculations of in-medium energy loss including quark-mass and colour-charge effects. Among the models considered, LIDO qualitatively describes the ordering between charm jets and inclusive jets and it also shows the best quantitative agreement with the data. Specific modifications of the LIDO predictions indicate that dead-cone effect is an important factor in the suppression of radiative processes and it is a fundamental factor differentiating the nuclear modification factor of inclusive jets from that of  $D^0$ -tagged jets in the kinematic region of the measurement.

A difference is found in the LIDO model also between the  $R_{AA}$  of inclusive jets and that of charm jets without dead-cone effect and it can be attributed to the influence of colour charge effects. The other theoretical predictions tend to underestimate the nuclear modification factor of charm jets.

Overall, this measurement provides important insights into the modification of charm jets in the QGP created in heavy-ion collisions and sheds light on the quark-mass and colour-charge dependence of the in-medium energy loss mechanisms.

## Acknowledgements

The ALICE Collaboration would like to thank all its engineers and technicians for their invaluable contributions to the construction of the experiment and the CERN accelerator teams for the outstanding performance of the LHC complex. The ALICE Collaboration gratefully acknowledges the resources and support provided by all Grid centres and the Worldwide LHC Computing Grid (WLCG) collaboration. The ALICE Collaboration acknowledges the following funding agencies for their support in building and running the ALICE detector: A. I. Alikhanyan National Science Laboratory (Yerevan Physics Institute) Foundation (ANSL), State Committee of Science and World Federation of Scientists (WFS), Armenia; Austrian Academy of Sciences, Austrian Science Fund (FWF): [M 2467-N36] and Nationalstiftung für Forschung, Technologie und Entwicklung, Austria; Ministry of Communications and High Technologies, National Nuclear Research Center, Azerbaijan; Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento

Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq), Financiadora de Estudos e Projetos (Finep), Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo (FAPESP) and Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS), Brazil; Bulgarian Ministry of Education and Science, within the National Roadmap for Research Infrastructures 2020-2027 (object CERN), Bulgaria; Ministry of Education of China (MOEC), Ministry of Science & Technology of China (MSTC) and National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC), China; Ministry of Science and Education and Croatian Science Foundation, Croatia; Centro de Aplicaciones Tecnológicas y Desarrollo Nuclear (CEADEN), Cubaenergía, Cuba; Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports of the Czech Republic, Czech Republic; The Danish Council for Independent Research | Natural Sciences, the VILLUM FONDEN and Danish National Research Foundation (DNRF), Denmark; Helsinki Institute of Physics (HIP), Finland; Commissariat à l’Energie Atomique (CEA) and Institut National de Physique Nucléaire et de Physique des Particules (IN2P3) and Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS), France; Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung (BMBF) and GSI Helmholtzzentrum für Schwerionenforschung GmbH, Germany; General Secretariat for Research and Technology, Ministry of Education, Research and Religions, Greece; National Research, Development and Innovation Office, Hungary; Department of Atomic Energy Government of India (DAE), Department of Science and Technology, Government of India (DST), University Grants Commission, Government of India (UGC) and Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR), India; National Research and Innovation Agency - BRIN, Indonesia; Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare (INFN), Italy; Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) and Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) KAKENHI, Japan; Consejo Nacional de Ciencia (CONACYT) y Tecnología, through Fondo de Cooperación Internacional en Ciencia y Tecnología (FONCICYT) and Dirección General de Asuntos del Personal Académico (DGAPA), Mexico; Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek (NWO), Netherlands; The Research Council of Norway, Norway; Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, Peru; Ministry of Science and Higher Education, National Science Centre and WUT ID-UB, Poland; Korea Institute of Science and Technology Information and National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF), Republic of Korea; Ministry of Education and Scientific Research, Institute of Atomic Physics, Ministry of Research and Innovation and Institute of Atomic Physics and Universitatea Nationala de Stiinta si Tehnologie Politehnica Bucuresti, Romania; Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport of the Slovak Republic, Slovakia; National Research Foundation of South Africa, South Africa; Swedish Research Council (VR) and Knut & Alice Wallenberg Foundation (KAW), Sweden; European Organization for Nuclear Research, Switzerland; Suranaree University of Technology (SUT), National Science and Technology Development Agency (NSTDA) and National Science, Research and Innovation Fund (NSRF via PMU-B B05F650021), Thailand; Turkish Energy, Nuclear and Mineral Research Agency (TENMAK), Turkey; National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Ukraine; Science and Technology Facilities Council (STFC), United Kingdom; National Science Foundation of the United States of America (NSF) and United States Department of Energy, Office of Nuclear Physics (DOE NP), United States of America. In addition, individual groups or members have received support from: Czech Science Foundation (grant no. 23-07499S), Czech Republic; FORTE project, reg. no. CZ.02.01.01/00/22\_008/0004632, Czech Republic, co-funded by the European Union, Czech Republic; European Research Council (grant no. 950692), European Union; ICSC - Centro Nazionale di Ricerca in High Performance Computing, Big Data and Quantum Computing, European Union - NextGenerationEU; Academy of Finland (Center of Excellence in Quark Matter) (grant nos. 346327, 346328), Finland.

## References

- [1] U. W. Heinz and M. Jacob, “Evidence for a new state of matter: An Assessment of the results from the CERN lead beam program”, arXiv:nucl-th/0002042.
- [2] 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) 339–376, arXiv:1802.04801 [hep-ph].

- [3] **ALICE** Collaboration, S. Acharya *et al.*, “The ALICE experiment: a journey through QCD”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **84** (2024) 813, arXiv:2211.04384 [nucl-ex].
- [4] **HotQCD** Collaboration, A. Bazavov *et al.*, “Chiral crossover in QCD at zero and non-zero chemical potentials”, *Phys. Lett. B* **795** (2019) 15–21, arXiv:1812.08235 [hep-lat].
- [5] S. Borsanyi *et al.*, “QCD Crossover at Finite Chemical Potential from Lattice Simulations”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125** (2020) 052001, arXiv:2002.02821 [hep-lat].
- [6] H. Satz, “Colour deconfinement and quarkonium binding”, *J. Phys. G* **32** (2006) R25, arXiv:hep-ph/0512217.
- [7] **STAR** Collaboration, J. Adams *et al.*, “Experimental and theoretical challenges in the search for the quark gluon plasma: The STAR Collaboration’s critical assessment of the evidence from RHIC collisions”, *Nucl. Phys. A* **757** (2005) 102–183, arXiv:nucl-ex/0501009.
- [8] **STAR** Collaboration, J. Adams *et al.*, “Direct observation of dijets in central Au+Au collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$  GeV”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97** (2006) 162301, arXiv:nucl-ex/0604018.
- [9] **PHENIX** Collaboration, S. S. Adler *et al.*, “Dense-Medium Modifications to Jet-Induced Hadron Pair Distributions in Au+Au Collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$  GeV”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97** (2006) 052301, arXiv:nucl-ex/0507004.
- [10] **STAR** Collaboration, C. Adler *et al.*, “Centrality dependence of high  $p_T$  hadron suppression in Au+Au collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 130$  GeV”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89** (2002) 202301, arXiv:nucl-ex/0206011.
- [11] **PHENIX** Collaboration, K. Adcox *et al.*, “Formation of dense partonic matter in relativistic nucleus-nucleus collisions at RHIC: Experimental evaluation by the PHENIX collaboration”, *Nucl. Phys. A* **757** (2005) 184–283, arXiv:nucl-ex/0410003.
- [12] F.-M. Liu and S.-X. Liu, “QGP formation time and direct photons from heavy ion collisions”, *Phys. Rev. C* **89** (2014) 034906, arXiv:1212.6587 [nucl-th].
- [13] A. Andronic *et al.*, “Heavy-flavour and quarkonium production in the LHC era: from proton–proton to heavy-ion collisions”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76** (2016) 107, arXiv:1506.03981 [nucl-ex].
- [14] M. Djordjevic, “Heavy flavor puzzle at LHC: a serendipitous interplay of jet suppression and fragmentation”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112** (2014) 042302, arXiv:1307.4702 [nucl-th].
- [15] **Particle Data Group** Collaboration, M. Tanabashi *et al.*, “Review of Particle Physics”, *Phys. Rev. D* **98** (2018) 030001.
- [16] A. Buckley *et al.*, “General-purpose event generators for LHC physics”, *Phys. Rept.* **504** (2011) 145–233, arXiv:1101.2599 [hep-ph].
- [17] I. M. Dremin and J. W. Gary, “Hadron multiplicities”, *Phys. Rept.* **349** (2001) 301–393, arXiv:hep-ph/0004215.
- [18] **ALICE** Collaboration, S. Acharya *et al.*, “Direct observation of the dead-cone effect in quantum chromodynamics”, *Nature* **605** (2022) 440–446, arXiv:2106.05713 [nucl-ex]. [Erratum: *Nature* 607, E22 (2022)].
- [19] J. Aichelin, P. B. Gossiaux, and T. Gousset, “Radiative and Collisional Energy Loss of Heavy Quarks in Deconfined Matter”, *Acta Phys. Polon. B* **43** (2012) 655–662, arXiv:1201.4192 [nucl-th].

- [20] N. Armesto, C. A. Salgado, and U. A. Wiedemann, “Medium induced gluon radiation off massive quarks fills the dead cone”, *Phys. Rev. D* **69** (2004) 114003, arXiv:hep-ph/0312106.
- [21] B.-W. Zhang, E. Wang, and X.-N. Wang, “Heavy quark energy loss in nuclear medium”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93** (2004) 072301, arXiv:nuc1-th/0309040.
- [22] M. Djordjevic and M. Gyulassy, “Heavy quark radiative energy loss in QCD matter”, *Nucl. Phys. A* **733** (2004) 265–298, arXiv:nuc1-th/0310076.
- [23] 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) 205–243, arXiv:nuc1-ex/0701025.
- [24] D. d’Enterria and C. Loizides, “Progress in the Glauber Model at Collider Energies”, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **71** (2021) 315–344, arXiv:2011.14909 [hep-ph].
- [25] ALICE Collaboration, S. Acharya *et al.*, “Measurement of  $D^0$ ,  $D^+$ ,  $D^{*+}$  and  $D_s^+$  production in Pb–Pb collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$  TeV”, *JHEP* **10** (2018) 174, arXiv:1804.09083 [nuc1-ex].
- [26] ALICE Collaboration, J. Adam *et al.*, “Centrality dependence of high- $p_T$  D meson suppression in Pb–Pb collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$  TeV”, *JHEP* **11** (2015) 205, arXiv:1506.06604 [nuc1-ex]. [Addendum: *JHEP* 06, 32 (2017)].
- [27] ALICE Collaboration, S. Acharya *et al.*, “Measurement of beauty production via non-prompt  $D^0$  mesons in Pb–Pb collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$  TeV”, *JHEP* **12** (2022) 126, arXiv:2202.00815 [nuc1-ex].
- [28] ALICE Collaboration, S. Acharya *et al.*, “Centrality and transverse momentum dependence of inclusive  $J/\psi$  production at midrapidity in Pb–Pb collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 5.02$  TeV”, *Phys. Lett. B* **805** (2020) 135434, arXiv:1910.14404 [nuc1-ex].
- [29] CMS Collaboration, A. M. Sirunyan *et al.*, “Nuclear modification factor of  $D^0$  mesons in PbPb collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$  TeV”, *Phys. Lett. B* **782** (2018) 474–496, arXiv:1708.04962.
- [30] CMS Collaboration, S. Chatrchyan *et al.*, “Observation of sequential  $\Upsilon$  suppression in PbPb collisions”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109** (2012) 222301, arXiv:1208.2826. [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.Lett.* 120, 199903 (2018)].
- [31] CMS Collaboration, S. Chatrchyan *et al.*, “Suppression of non-prompt  $J/\psi$ , prompt  $J/\psi$ , and  $\Upsilon(1S)$  in PbPb collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$  TeV”, *JHEP* **2012** (2012) 063, arXiv:1201.5069.
- [32] ATLAS Collaboration, M. Aaboud *et al.*, “Measurement of the suppression and azimuthal anisotropy of muons from heavy-flavor decays in Pb+Pb collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$  TeV with the ATLAS detector”, *Phys. Rev. C* **98** (2018) 044905, arXiv:1805.05220 [nuc1-ex].
- [33] ATLAS Collaboration, G. Aad *et al.*, “Measurement of the nuclear modification factor for muons from charm and bottom hadrons in Pb+Pb collisions at 5.02 TeV with the ATLAS detector”, *Phys. Lett. B* **829** (2022) 137077, arXiv:2109.00411.
- [34] ATLAS Collaboration, M. Aaboud *et al.*, “Prompt and non-prompt  $J/\psi$  and  $\psi(2S)$  suppression at high transverse momentum in  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$  TeV Pb+Pb collisions with the ATLAS experiment”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **78** 762, arXiv:1805.04077 [nuc1-ex].
- [35] ALICE Collaboration, S. Acharya *et al.*, “Measurement of electrons from beauty-hadron decays in pp and Pb–Pb collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$  TeV”, *Phys. Rev. C* **108** (2023) 034906, arXiv:2211.13985 [nuc1-ex].

- [36] **CMS** Collaboration, A. M. Sirunyan *et al.*, “Measurement of the  $B^\pm$  Meson Nuclear Modification Factor in Pb–Pb Collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$  TeV”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119** (2017) 152301, arXiv:1705.04727 [hep-ex].
- [37] **ALICE** Collaboration, S. Acharya *et al.*, “Measurement of beauty-strange meson production in Pb–Pb collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$  TeV via non-prompt  $D_s^+$  mesons”, *Phys. Lett. B* **846** (2023) 137561, arXiv:2204.10386 [nucl-ex].
- [38] **CMS** Collaboration, A. M. Sirunyan *et al.*, “Measurement of prompt and nonprompt charmonium suppression in PbPb collisions at 5.02 TeV”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **78** (2018) 509, arXiv:1712.08959 [nucl-ex]. [Erratum: *Eur.Phys.J.C* 83, 145 (2023)].
- [39] **CMS** Collaboration, A. M. Sirunyan *et al.*, “Studies of charm quark diffusion inside jets using PbPb and pp collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$  TeV”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125** (2020) 102001, arXiv:1911.01461 [hep-ex].
- [40] **ATLAS** Collaboration, G. Aad *et al.*, “Measurement of the nuclear modification factor of  $b$ -jets in 5.02 TeV Pb+Pb collisions with the ATLAS detector”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83** (2023) 438, arXiv:2204.13530 [nucl-ex].
- [41] **ATLAS** Collaboration, G. Aad *et al.*, “Comparison of inclusive and photon-tagged jet suppression in 5.02 TeV Pb+Pb collisions with ATLAS”, *Phys. Lett. B* **846** (2023) 138154, arXiv:2303.10090 [nucl-ex].
- [42] **ALICE** Collaboration, K. Aamodt *et al.*, “The ALICE experiment at the CERN LHC”, *JINST* **3** (2008) S08002.
- [43] **ALICE** Collaboration, K. Aamodt *et al.*, “Alignment of the ALICE Inner Tracking System with cosmic-ray tracks”, *JINST* **5** (2010) P03003, arXiv:1001.0502 [physics.ins-det].
- [44] J. Alme *et al.*, “The ALICE TPC, a large 3-dimensional tracking device with fast readout for ultra-high multiplicity events”, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **622** (2010) 316–367, arXiv:1001.1950 [physics.ins-det].
- [45] A. Akindinov *et al.*, “Performance of the ALICE Time-Of-Flight detector at the LHC”, *Eur. Phys. J. Plus* **128** (2013) 44.
- [46] **ALICE** Collaboration, E. Abbas *et al.*, “Performance of the ALICE VZERO system”, *JINST* **8** (2013) P10016, arXiv:1306.3130 [nucl-ex].
- [47] G. Puddu *et al.*, “The zero degree calorimeters for the ALICE experiment”, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **581** (2007) 397–401. [Erratum: *Nucl.Instrum.Meth.A* 604, 765 (2009)].
- [48] **ALICE** Collaboration, J. Adam *et al.*, “Centrality dependence of the charged-particle multiplicity density at midrapidity in Pb–Pb collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$  TeV”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116** (2016) 222302, arXiv:1512.06104 [nucl-ex].
- [49] **ALICE** Collaboration, “Centrality determination in heavy ion collisions”, ALICE–PUBLIC–2018–011 (2018). <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2636623>.
- [50] **ALICE** Collaboration, S. Acharya *et al.*, “Measurement of the production of charm jets tagged with  $D^0$  mesons in pp collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 5.02$  and 13 TeV”, *JHEP* **06** (2023) 133, arXiv:2204.10167 [nucl-ex].
- [51] T. Sjostrand, S. Mrenna, and P. Z. Skands, “A Brief Introduction to PYTHIA 8.1”, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **178** (2008) 852–867, arXiv:0710.3820 [hep-ph].



- [52] P. Skands, S. Carrazza, and J. Rojo, “Tuning PYTHIA 8.1: the Monash 2013 Tune”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74** (2014) 3024, arXiv:1404.5630 [hep-ph].
- [53] ALICE Collaboration, B. Abelev *et al.*, “Pseudorapidity density of charged particles in p–Pb collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$  TeV”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110** (2013) 032301, arXiv:1210.3615 [nucl-ex].
- [54] 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) 3501–3516.
- [55] R. Brun *et al.*, *GEANT: Detector Description and Simulation Tool; Oct 1994*. CERN Program Library. CERN, Geneva, 1993. <https://cds.cern.ch/record/1082634>. Long Writeup W5013.
- [56] ALICE Collaboration, S. Acharya *et al.*, “Prompt  $D^0$ ,  $D^+$ , and  $D^{*+}$  production in Pb–Pb collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$  TeV”, *JHEP* **01** (2022) 174, arXiv:2110.09420 [nucl-ex].
- [57] M. Cacciari, G. P. Salam, and G. Soyez, “FastJet user manual”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **72** (2012) 1896, arXiv:1111.6097 [hep-ph].
- [58] M. Cacciari, G. P. Salam, and G. Soyez, “The anti- $k_t$  jet clustering algorithm”, *JHEP* **04** (2008) 063, arXiv:0802.1189 [hep-ph].
- [59] G. P. Salam, “Towards Jetography”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **67** (2010) 637–686, arXiv:0906.1833 [hep-ph].
- [60] ALICE Collaboration, B. Abelev *et al.*, “Measurement of event background fluctuations for charged particle jet reconstruction in Pb–Pb collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$  TeV”, *JHEP* **03** (2012) 053, arXiv:1201.2423 [hep-ex].
- [61] ALICE Collaboration, B. Abelev *et al.*, “Measurement of charged jet suppression in Pb–Pb collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$  TeV”, *JHEP* **03** (2014) 013, arXiv:1311.0633 [nucl-ex].
- [62] ALICE Collaboration, J. Adam *et al.*, “Measurement of jet suppression in central Pb–Pb collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$  TeV”, *Phys. Lett. B* **746** (2015) 1–14, arXiv:1502.01689 [nucl-ex].
- [63] S. D. Ellis and D. E. Soper, “Successive combination jet algorithm for hadron collisions”, *Phys. Rev. D* **48** (1993) 3160–3166, arXiv:hep-ph/9305266.
- [64] ALICE Collaboration, S. Acharya *et al.*, “Measurement of  $D^0$ ,  $D^+$ ,  $D^{*+}$ , and  $D_s^+$  production in pp collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 5.02$  TeV with ALICE”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79** (2019) 388, arXiv:1901.07979 [nucl-ex].
- [65] ALICE Collaboration, S. Acharya *et al.*, “Measurement of the production of charm jets tagged with  $D^0$  mesons in pp collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 7$  TeV”, *JHEP* **08** (2019) 133, arXiv:1905.02510 [nucl-ex].
- [66] P. Nason, “A New method for combining NLO QCD with shower Monte Carlo algorithms”, *JHEP* **11** (2004) 040, arXiv:hep-ph/0409146.
- [67] S. Frixione, P. Nason, and C. Oleari, “Matching NLO QCD computations with Parton Shower simulations: the POWHEG method”, *JHEP* **11** (2007) 070, arXiv:0709.2092 [hep-ph].
- [68] S. Alioli, P. Nason, C. Oleari, and E. Re, “A general framework for implementing NLO calculations in shower Monte Carlo programs: the POWHEG BOX”, *JHEP* **06** (2010) 043, arXiv:1002.2581 [hep-ph].

- [69] S. Alioli, K. Hamilton, P. Nason, C. Oleari, and E. Re, “Jet pair production in POWHEG”, *JHEP* **04** (2011) 081, arXiv:1012.3380 [hep-ph].
- [70] T. Sjostrand, S. Mrenna, and P. Z. Skands, “PYTHIA 6.4 Physics and Manual”, *JHEP* **05** (2006) 026, arXiv:hep-ph/0603175.
- [71] H.-L. Lai, M. Guzzi, J. Huston, Z. Li, P. M. Nadolsky, J. Pumplin, and C. P. Yuan, “New parton distributions for collider physics”, *Phys. Rev. D* **82** (2010) 074024, arXiv:1007.2241 [hep-ph].
- [72] A. Buckley *et al.*, “LHAPDF6: parton density access in the LHC precision era”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **75** (2015) 132, arXiv:1412.7420 [hep-ph].
- [73] G. D’Agostini, “Improved iterative Bayesian unfolding”, in *Alliance Workshop on Unfolding and Data Correction*. 10, 2010. arXiv:1010.0632 [physics.data-an].
- [74] L. Brenner *et al.*, “Comparison of unfolding methods using roofitunfold”, *International Journal of Modern Physics A* **35** (2020) 2050145, arXiv:1910.14654.
- [75] M. Cacciari, S. Frixione, N. Houdeau, M. L. Mangano, P. Nason, and G. Ridolfi, “Theoretical predictions for charm and bottom production at the LHC”, *JHEP* **10** (2012) 137, arXiv:1205.6344 [hep-ph].
- [76] ALICE Collaboration, S. Acharya *et al.*, “Measurements of inclusive jet spectra in pp and central Pb–Pb collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$  TeV”, *Phys. Rev. C* **101** (2020) 034911, arXiv:1909.09718 [nucl-ex].
- [77] ALICE Collaboration, S. Acharya *et al.*, “Measurement of the radius dependence of charged-particle jet suppression in Pb–Pb collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$  TeV”, *Phys. Lett. B* **849** (2024) 138412, arXiv:2303.00592 [nucl-ex].
- [78] ALICE Collaboration, S. Acharya *et al.*, “Measurement of charged jet cross section in pp collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 5.02$  TeV”, *Phys. Rev. D* **100** (2019) 092004, arXiv:1905.02536 [nucl-ex].
- [79] J. H. Putschke *et al.*, “The JETSCAPE framework”, arXiv:1903.07706 [nucl-th].
- [80] W. Dai, S. Wang, S.-L. Zhang, B.-W. Zhang, and E. Wang, “Transverse Momentum Balance and Angular Distribution of  $b\bar{b}$  Dijets in Pb+Pb collisions”, *Chin. Phys. C* **44** (2020) 104105, arXiv:1806.06332 [nucl-th].
- [81] W. Ke, Y. Xu, and S. A. Bass, “Modified Boltzmann approach for modeling the splitting vertices induced by the hot QCD medium in the deep Landau–Pomeranchuk–Migdal region”, *Phys. Rev. C* **100** (2019) 064911, arXiv:1810.08177 [nucl-th].
- [82] W. Ke, Y. Xu, and S. A. Bass, “Linearized Boltzmann–Langevin model for heavy quark transport in hot and dense QCD matter”, *Phys. Rev. C* **98** (2018) 064901, arXiv:1806.08848 [nucl-th].
- [83] S. Cao and A. Majumder, “Nuclear modification of leading hadrons and jets within a virtuality ordered parton shower”, *Phys. Rev. C* **101** (2020) 024903, arXiv:1712.10055 [nucl-th].
- [84] Y. He, T. Luo, X.-N. Wang, and Y. Zhu, “Linear Boltzmann Transport for Jet Propagation in the Quark-Gluon Plasma: Elastic Processes and Medium Recoil”, *Phys. Rev. C* **91** (2015) 054908, arXiv:1503.03313 [nucl-th]. [Erratum: *Phys. Rev. C* **97**, 019902 (2018)].
- [85] W. Ke and X.-N. Wang, “QGP modification to single inclusive jets in a calibrated transport model”, *JHEP* **05** (2021) 041, arXiv:2010.13680 [hep-ph].

## A The ALICE Collaboration

S. Acharya <sup>127</sup>, A. Agarwal <sup>135</sup>, G. Aglieri Rinella <sup>32</sup>, L. Aglietta <sup>24</sup>, M. Agnello <sup>29</sup>, N. Agrawal <sup>25</sup>, Z. Ahammed <sup>135</sup>, S. Ahmad <sup>15</sup>, S.U. Ahn <sup>71</sup>, I. Ahuja <sup>37</sup>, A. Akindinov <sup>140</sup>, V. Akishina <sup>38</sup>, M. Al-Turany <sup>97</sup>, D. Aleksandrov <sup>140</sup>, B. Alessandro <sup>56</sup>, H.M. Alfanda <sup>6</sup>, R. Alfaro Molina <sup>67</sup>, B. Ali <sup>15</sup>, A. Alici <sup>25</sup>, N. Alizadehvandchali <sup>116</sup>, A. Alkin <sup>104</sup>, J. Alme <sup>20</sup>, G. Alocco <sup>24,52</sup>, T. Alt <sup>64</sup>, A.R. Altamura <sup>50</sup>, I. Altsybeev <sup>95</sup>, J.R. Alvarado <sup>44</sup>, C.O.R. Alvarez <sup>44</sup>, M.N. Anaam <sup>6</sup>, C. Andrei <sup>45</sup>, N. Andreou <sup>115</sup>, A. Andronic <sup>126</sup>, E. Andronov <sup>140</sup>, V. Anguelov <sup>94</sup>, F. Antinori <sup>54</sup>, P. Antonioli <sup>51</sup>, N. Apadula <sup>74</sup>, L. Aphecetche <sup>103</sup>, H. Appelshäuser <sup>64</sup>, C. Arata <sup>73</sup>, S. Arcelli <sup>25</sup>, R. Arnaldi <sup>56</sup>, J.G.M.C.A. Arneiro <sup>110</sup>, I.C. Arsene <sup>19</sup>, M. Arslanodk <sup>138</sup>, A. Augustinus <sup>32</sup>, R. Averbeck <sup>97</sup>, D. Averyanov <sup>140</sup>, M.D. Azmi <sup>15</sup>, H. Baba <sup>124</sup>, A. Badalà <sup>53</sup>, J. Bae <sup>104</sup>, Y.W. Baek <sup>40</sup>, X. Bai <sup>120</sup>, R. Bailhache <sup>64</sup>, Y. Bailung <sup>48</sup>, R. Bala <sup>91</sup>, A. Balbino <sup>29</sup>, A. Baldisseri <sup>130</sup>, B. Balis <sup>2</sup>, Z. Banoo <sup>91</sup>, V. Barbasova <sup>37</sup>, F. Barile <sup>31</sup>, L. Barioglio <sup>56</sup>, M. Barlou <sup>78</sup>, B. Barman <sup>41</sup>, G.G. Barnaföldi <sup>46</sup>, L.S. Barnby <sup>115</sup>, E. Barreau <sup>103</sup>, V. Barret <sup>127</sup>, L. Barreto <sup>110</sup>, C. Bartels <sup>119</sup>, K. Barth <sup>32</sup>, E. Bartsch <sup>64</sup>, N. Bastid <sup>127</sup>, S. Basu <sup>75</sup>, G. Batigne <sup>103</sup>, D. Battistini <sup>95</sup>, B. Batyunya <sup>141</sup>, D. Bauri <sup>47</sup>, J.L. Bazo Alba <sup>101</sup>, I.G. Bearden <sup>83</sup>, C. Beattie <sup>138</sup>, P. Becht <sup>97</sup>, D. Behera <sup>48</sup>, I. Belikov <sup>129</sup>, A.D.C. Bell Hechavarria <sup>126</sup>, F. Bellini <sup>25</sup>, R. Bellwied <sup>116</sup>, S. Belokurova <sup>140</sup>, L.G.E. Beltran <sup>109</sup>, Y.A.V. Beltran <sup>44</sup>, G. Bencedi <sup>46</sup>, A. Bensaoula <sup>116</sup>, S. Beole <sup>24</sup>, Y. Berdnikov <sup>140</sup>, A. Berdnikova <sup>94</sup>, L. Bergmann <sup>94</sup>, M.G. Besoiu <sup>63</sup>, L. Betev <sup>32</sup>, P.P. Bhaduri <sup>135</sup>, A. Bhasin <sup>91</sup>, B. Bhattacharjee <sup>41</sup>, L. Bianchi <sup>24</sup>, J. Bielčik <sup>35</sup>, J. Bielčíková <sup>86</sup>, A.P. Bigot <sup>129</sup>, A. Bilandzic <sup>95</sup>, G. Biro <sup>46</sup>, S. Biswas <sup>4</sup>, N. Bize <sup>103</sup>, J.T. Blair <sup>108</sup>, D. Blau <sup>140</sup>, M.B. Blidaru <sup>97</sup>, N. Bluhme <sup>38</sup>, C. Blume <sup>64</sup>, G. Boca <sup>21,55</sup>, F. Bock <sup>87</sup>, T. Bodova <sup>20</sup>, J. Bok <sup>16</sup>, L. Boldizsár <sup>46</sup>, M. Bombara <sup>37</sup>, P.M. Bond <sup>32</sup>, G. Bonomi <sup>134,55</sup>, H. Borel <sup>130</sup>, A. Borissov <sup>140</sup>, A.G. Borquez Carcamo <sup>94</sup>, E. Botta <sup>24</sup>, Y.E.M. Bouziani <sup>64</sup>, L. Bratrud <sup>64</sup>, P. Braun-Munzinger <sup>97</sup>, M. Bregant <sup>110</sup>, M. Broz <sup>35</sup>, G.E. Bruno <sup>96,31</sup>, V.D. Buchakchiev <sup>36</sup>, M.D. Buckland <sup>85</sup>, D. Budnikov <sup>140</sup>, H. Buesching <sup>64</sup>, S. Bufalino <sup>29</sup>, P. Buhler <sup>102</sup>, N. Burmasov <sup>140</sup>, Z. Buthelezi <sup>68,123</sup>, A. Bylinkin <sup>20</sup>, S.A. Bysiak <sup>107</sup>, J.C. Cabanillas Noris <sup>109</sup>, M.F.T. Cabrera <sup>116</sup>, M. Cai <sup>6</sup>, H. Caines <sup>138</sup>, A. Caliva <sup>28</sup>, E. Calvo Villar <sup>101</sup>, J.M.M. Camacho <sup>109</sup>, P. Camerini <sup>23</sup>, F.D.M. Canedo <sup>110</sup>, S.L. Cantway <sup>138</sup>, M. Carabas <sup>113</sup>, A.A. Carballo <sup>32</sup>, F. Carnesecchi <sup>32</sup>, R. Caron <sup>128</sup>, L.A.D. Carvalho <sup>110</sup>, J. Castillo Castellanos <sup>130</sup>, M. Castoldi <sup>32</sup>, F. Catalano <sup>32</sup>, S. Cattaruzzi <sup>23</sup>, C. Ceballos Sanchez <sup>7</sup>, R. Cerri <sup>24</sup>, I. Chakaberia <sup>74</sup>, P. Chakraborty <sup>136</sup>, S. Chandra <sup>135</sup>, S. Chapeland <sup>32</sup>, M. Chartier <sup>119</sup>, S. Chattopadhyay <sup>135</sup>, S. Chattopadhyay <sup>135</sup>, S. Chattopadhyay <sup>99</sup>, M. Chen <sup>39</sup>, T. Cheng <sup>6</sup>, C. Cheshkov <sup>128</sup>, V. Chibante Barroso <sup>32</sup>, D.D. Chinellato <sup>102</sup>, E.S. Chizzali <sup>11,95</sup>, J. Cho <sup>58</sup>, S. Cho <sup>58</sup>, P. Chochula <sup>32</sup>, Z.A. Chochulska <sup>136</sup>, D. Choudhury <sup>41</sup>, P. Christakoglou <sup>84</sup>, C.H. Christensen <sup>83</sup>, P. Christiansen <sup>75</sup>, T. Chujo <sup>125</sup>, M. Ciaccio <sup>29</sup>, C. Cicalo <sup>52</sup>, M.R. Ciupek <sup>97</sup>, G. Clai <sup>III,51</sup>, F. Colamaria <sup>50</sup>, J.S. Colburn <sup>100</sup>, D. Colella <sup>31</sup>, A. Colelli <sup>31</sup>, M. Colocci <sup>25</sup>, M. Concas <sup>32</sup>, G. Conesa Balbastre <sup>73</sup>, Z. Conesa del Valle <sup>131</sup>, G. Contin <sup>23</sup>, J.G. Contreras <sup>35</sup>, M.L. Coquet <sup>103</sup>, P. Cortese <sup>133,56</sup>, M.R. Cosentino <sup>112</sup>, F. Costa <sup>32</sup>, S. Costanza <sup>21,55</sup>, C. Cot <sup>131</sup>, P. Crochet <sup>127</sup>, R. Cruz-Torres <sup>74</sup>, M.M. Czarnynoga <sup>136</sup>, A. Dainese <sup>54</sup>, G. Dange <sup>38</sup>, M.C. Danisch <sup>94</sup>, A. Danu <sup>63</sup>, P. Das <sup>80</sup>, S. Das <sup>4</sup>, A.R. Dash <sup>126</sup>, S. Dash <sup>47</sup>, A. De Caro <sup>28</sup>, G. de Cataldo <sup>50</sup>, J. de Cuveland <sup>38</sup>, A. De Falco <sup>22</sup>, D. De Gruttola <sup>28</sup>, N. De Marco <sup>56</sup>, C. De Martin <sup>23</sup>, S. De Pasquale <sup>28</sup>, R. Deb <sup>134</sup>, R. Del Grande <sup>95</sup>, L. Dello Stritto <sup>32</sup>, W. Deng <sup>6</sup>, K.C. Devereaux <sup>18</sup>, P. Dhankher <sup>18</sup>, D. Di Bari <sup>31</sup>, A. Di Mauro <sup>32</sup>, B. Di Ruzza <sup>132</sup>, B. Diab <sup>130</sup>, R.A. Diaz <sup>141,7</sup>, T. Dietel <sup>114</sup>, Y. Ding <sup>6</sup>, J. Ditzel <sup>64</sup>, R. Divià <sup>32</sup>, Ø. Djuvsland <sup>20</sup>, U. Dmitrieva <sup>140</sup>, A. Dobrin <sup>63</sup>, B. Dönigus <sup>64</sup>, J.M. Dubinski <sup>136</sup>, A. Dubla <sup>97</sup>, P. Dupieux <sup>127</sup>, N. Dzalaiova <sup>13</sup>, T.M. Eder <sup>126</sup>, R.J. Ehlers <sup>74</sup>, F. Eisenhut <sup>64</sup>, R. Ejima <sup>92</sup>, D. Elia <sup>50</sup>, B. Erazmus <sup>103</sup>, F. Ercolessi <sup>25</sup>, B. Espagnon <sup>131</sup>, G. Eulisse <sup>32</sup>, D. Evans <sup>100</sup>, S. Evdokimov <sup>140</sup>, L. Fabbietti <sup>95</sup>, M. Faggin <sup>23</sup>, J. Faivre <sup>73</sup>, F. Fan <sup>6</sup>, W. Fan <sup>74</sup>, A. Fantoni <sup>49</sup>, M. Fasel <sup>87</sup>, A. Feliciello <sup>56</sup>, G. Feofilov <sup>140</sup>, A. Fernández Téllez <sup>44</sup>, L. Ferrandi <sup>110</sup>, M.B. Ferrer <sup>32</sup>, A. Ferrero <sup>130</sup>, C. Ferrero <sup>IV,56</sup>, A. Ferretti <sup>24</sup>, V.J.G. Feuillard <sup>94</sup>, V. Filova <sup>35</sup>, D. Finogeev <sup>140</sup>, F.M. Fionda <sup>52</sup>, E. Flatland <sup>32</sup>, F. Flor <sup>138,116</sup>, A.N. Flores <sup>108</sup>, S. Foertsch <sup>68</sup>, I. Fokin <sup>94</sup>, S. Fokin <sup>140</sup>, U. Follo <sup>IV,56</sup>, E. Fragiaco <sup>57</sup>, E. Frajna <sup>46</sup>, U. Fuchs <sup>32</sup>, N. Funicello <sup>28</sup>, C. Furget <sup>73</sup>, A. Furs <sup>140</sup>, T. Fusayasu <sup>98</sup>, J.J. Gaardhøje <sup>83</sup>, M. Gagliardi <sup>24</sup>, A.M. Gago <sup>101</sup>, T. Gahlaut <sup>47</sup>, C.D. Galvan <sup>109</sup>, S. Gami <sup>80</sup>, D.R. Gangadharan <sup>116</sup>, P. Ganoti <sup>78</sup>, C. Garabatos <sup>97</sup>, J.M. García <sup>44</sup>, T. García Chávez <sup>44</sup>, E. García-Solis <sup>9</sup>, C. Gargiulo <sup>32</sup>, P. Gasik <sup>97</sup>, H.M. Gaur <sup>38</sup>, A. Gautam <sup>118</sup>, M.B. Gay Ducati <sup>66</sup>, M. Germain <sup>103</sup>, R.A. Gernhaeuser <sup>95</sup>, C. Ghosh <sup>135</sup>, M. Giacalone <sup>51</sup>, G. Gioachin <sup>29</sup>, S.K. Giri <sup>135</sup>, P. Giubellino <sup>97,56</sup>, P. Giubilato <sup>27</sup>, A.M.C. Glaenger <sup>130</sup>, P. Glässel <sup>94</sup>, E. Glimos <sup>122</sup>, D.J.Q. Goh <sup>76</sup>, V. Gonzalez <sup>137</sup>, P. Gordeev <sup>140</sup>, M. Gorgon <sup>2</sup>, K. Goswami <sup>48</sup>, S. Gotovac <sup>33</sup>, V. Grabski <sup>67</sup>,

L.K. Graczykowski<sup>136</sup>, E. Grecka<sup>86</sup>, A. Grelli<sup>59</sup>, C. Grigoras<sup>32</sup>, V. Grigoriev<sup>140</sup>, S. Grigoryan<sup>141,1</sup>, F. Groso<sup>32</sup>, J.F. Grosse-Oetringhaus<sup>32</sup>, R. Grosso<sup>97</sup>, D. Grund<sup>35</sup>, N.A. Grunwald<sup>94</sup>, G.G. Guardiano<sup>111</sup>, R. Guernane<sup>73</sup>, M. Guilbaud<sup>103</sup>, K. Gulbrandsen<sup>83</sup>, J.J.W.K. Gumprecht<sup>102</sup>, T. Gündem<sup>64</sup>, T. Gunji<sup>124</sup>, W. Guo<sup>6</sup>, A. Gupta<sup>91</sup>, R. Gupta<sup>91</sup>, R. Gupta<sup>48</sup>, K. Gwizdzziel<sup>136</sup>, L. Gyulai<sup>46</sup>, C. Hadjidakis<sup>131</sup>, F.U. Haider<sup>91</sup>, S. Haidlova<sup>35</sup>, M. Haldar<sup>4</sup>, H. Hamagaki<sup>76</sup>, Y. Han<sup>139</sup>, B.G. Hanley<sup>137</sup>, R. Hannigan<sup>108</sup>, J. Hansen<sup>75</sup>, M.R. Haque<sup>97</sup>, J.W. Harris<sup>138</sup>, A. Harton<sup>9</sup>, M.V. Hartung<sup>64</sup>, H. Hassan<sup>117</sup>, D. Hatzifotiadou<sup>51</sup>, P. Hauer<sup>42</sup>, L.B. Havener<sup>138</sup>, E. Hellbär<sup>32</sup>, H. Helstrup<sup>34</sup>, M. Hemmer<sup>64</sup>, T. Herman<sup>35</sup>, S.G. Hernandez<sup>116</sup>, G. Herrera Corral<sup>8</sup>, S. Herrmann<sup>128</sup>, K.F. Hetland<sup>34</sup>, B. Heybeck<sup>64</sup>, H. Hillemanns<sup>32</sup>, B. Hippolyte<sup>129</sup>, I.P.M. Hobus<sup>84</sup>, F.W. Hoffmann<sup>70</sup>, B. Hofman<sup>59</sup>, G.H. Hong<sup>139</sup>, M. Horst<sup>95</sup>, A. Horzyk<sup>2</sup>, Y. Hou<sup>6</sup>, P. Hristov<sup>32</sup>, P. Huhn<sup>64</sup>, L.M. Huhta<sup>117</sup>, T.J. Humanic<sup>88</sup>, A. Hutson<sup>116</sup>, D. Hutter<sup>38</sup>, M.C. Hwang<sup>18</sup>, R. Ilkaev<sup>140</sup>, M. Inaba<sup>125</sup>, G.M. Innocenti<sup>32</sup>, M. Ippolitov<sup>140</sup>, A. Isakov<sup>84</sup>, T. Isidori<sup>118</sup>, M.S. Islam<sup>99</sup>, S. Iurchenko<sup>140</sup>, M. Ivanov<sup>97</sup>, M. Ivanov<sup>13</sup>, V. Ivanov<sup>140</sup>, K.E. Iversen<sup>75</sup>, M. Jablonski<sup>2</sup>, B. Jacak<sup>18,74</sup>, N. Jacazio<sup>25</sup>, P.M. Jacobs<sup>74</sup>, S. Jadlovská<sup>106</sup>, J. Jadlovsky<sup>106</sup>, S. Jaelani<sup>82</sup>, C. Jahnke<sup>110</sup>, M.J. Jakubowska<sup>136</sup>, M.A. Janik<sup>136</sup>, T. Janson<sup>70</sup>, S. Ji<sup>16</sup>, S. Jia<sup>10</sup>, T. Jiang<sup>10</sup>, A.A.P. Jimenez<sup>65</sup>, F. Jonas<sup>74</sup>, D.M. Jones<sup>119</sup>, J.M. Jowett<sup>32,97</sup>, J. Jung<sup>64</sup>, M. Jung<sup>64</sup>, A. Junique<sup>32</sup>, A. Jusko<sup>100</sup>, J. Kaewjai<sup>105</sup>, P. Kalinak<sup>60</sup>, A. Kalweit<sup>32</sup>, A. Karasu Uysal<sup>V,72</sup>, D. Karatovic<sup>89</sup>, N. Karatzenis<sup>100</sup>, O. Karavichev<sup>140</sup>, T. Karavicheva<sup>140</sup>, E. Karpechev<sup>140</sup>, M.J. Karwowska<sup>32,136</sup>, U. Kebschull<sup>70</sup>, M. Keil<sup>32</sup>, B. Ketzer<sup>42</sup>, J. Keul<sup>64</sup>, S.S. Khade<sup>48</sup>, A.M. Khan<sup>120</sup>, S. Khan<sup>15</sup>, A. Khanzadeev<sup>140</sup>, Y. Kharlov<sup>140</sup>, A. Khatun<sup>118</sup>, A. Khuntia<sup>35</sup>, Z. Khuranova<sup>64</sup>, B. Kileng<sup>34</sup>, B. Kim<sup>104</sup>, C. Kim<sup>16</sup>, D.J. Kim<sup>117</sup>, E.J. Kim<sup>69</sup>, J. Kim<sup>139</sup>, J. Kim<sup>58</sup>, J. Kim<sup>32,69</sup>, M. Kim<sup>18</sup>, S. Kim<sup>17</sup>, T. Kim<sup>139</sup>, K. Kimura<sup>92</sup>, A. Kirkova<sup>36</sup>, S. Kirsch<sup>64</sup>, I. Kisel<sup>38</sup>, S. Kiselev<sup>140</sup>, A. Kisiel<sup>136</sup>, J.P. Kitowski<sup>2</sup>, J.L. Klay<sup>5</sup>, J. Klein<sup>32</sup>, S. Klein<sup>74</sup>, C. Klein-Bösing<sup>126</sup>, M. Kleiner<sup>64</sup>, T. Klemenz<sup>95</sup>, A. Kluge<sup>32</sup>, C. Kobdaj<sup>105</sup>, R. Kohara<sup>124</sup>, T. Kollegger<sup>97</sup>, A. Kondratyev<sup>141</sup>, N. Kondratyeva<sup>140</sup>, J. König<sup>64</sup>, S.A. Königstorfer<sup>95</sup>, P.J. Konopka<sup>32</sup>, G. Kornakov<sup>136</sup>, M. Korwieser<sup>95</sup>, S.D. Koryciak<sup>2</sup>, C. Koster<sup>84</sup>, A. Kotliarov<sup>86</sup>, N. Kovacic<sup>89</sup>, V. Kovalenko<sup>140</sup>, M. Kowalski<sup>107</sup>, V. Kozuharov<sup>36</sup>, G. Kozlov<sup>38</sup>, I. Králik<sup>60</sup>, A. Kravčáková<sup>37</sup>, L. Krcal<sup>32,38</sup>, M. Krivda<sup>100,60</sup>, F. Krizek<sup>86</sup>, K. Krizkova Gajdosova<sup>32</sup>, C. Krug<sup>66</sup>, M. Krüger<sup>64</sup>, D.M. Krupova<sup>35</sup>, E. Kryshen<sup>140</sup>, V. Kučera<sup>58</sup>, C. Kuhn<sup>129</sup>, P.G. Kuijer<sup>84</sup>, T. Kumaoka<sup>125</sup>, D. Kumar<sup>135</sup>, L. Kumar<sup>90</sup>, N. Kumar<sup>90</sup>, S. Kumar<sup>50</sup>, S. Kundu<sup>32</sup>, P. Kurashvili<sup>79</sup>, A. Kurepin<sup>140</sup>, A.B. Kurepin<sup>140</sup>, A. Kuryakin<sup>140</sup>, S. Kushpil<sup>86</sup>, V. Kuskov<sup>140</sup>, M. Kutyla<sup>136</sup>, A. Kuznetsov<sup>141</sup>, M.J. Kweon<sup>58</sup>, Y. Kwon<sup>139</sup>, S.L. La Pointe<sup>38</sup>, P. La Rocca<sup>26</sup>, A. Lakrathok<sup>105</sup>, M. Lamanna<sup>32</sup>, A.R. Landou<sup>73</sup>, R. Langoy<sup>121</sup>, P. Larionov<sup>32</sup>, E. Laudi<sup>32</sup>, L. Lautner<sup>32,95</sup>, R.A.N. Laveaga<sup>109</sup>, R. Lavicka<sup>102</sup>, R. Lea<sup>134,55</sup>, H. Lee<sup>104</sup>, I. Legrand<sup>45</sup>, G. Legras<sup>126</sup>, J. Lehrbach<sup>38</sup>, A.M. Lejeune<sup>35</sup>, T.M. Lelek<sup>2</sup>, R.C. Lemmon<sup>I,85</sup>, I. León Monzón<sup>109</sup>, M.M. Lesch<sup>95</sup>, E.D. Lesser<sup>18</sup>, P. Lévai<sup>46</sup>, M. Li<sup>6</sup>, P. Li<sup>10</sup>, X. Li<sup>10</sup>, B.E. Liang-gilman<sup>18</sup>, J. Lien<sup>121</sup>, R. Lietava<sup>100</sup>, I. Likmeta<sup>116</sup>, B. Lim<sup>24</sup>, S.H. Lim<sup>16</sup>, V. Lindenstruth<sup>38</sup>, C. Lippmann<sup>97</sup>, D.H. Liu<sup>6</sup>, J. Liu<sup>119</sup>, G.S.S. Liveraro<sup>111</sup>, I.M. Lofnes<sup>20</sup>, C. Loizides<sup>87</sup>, S. Lokos<sup>107</sup>, J. Lömker<sup>59</sup>, X. Lopez<sup>127</sup>, E. López Torres<sup>7</sup>, C. Lotteau<sup>128</sup>, P. Lu<sup>97,120</sup>, Z. Lu<sup>10</sup>, F.V. Lugo<sup>67</sup>, J.R. Luhder<sup>126</sup>, M. Lunardon<sup>27</sup>, G. Luparello<sup>57</sup>, Y.G. Ma<sup>39</sup>, M. Mager<sup>32</sup>, A. Maire<sup>129</sup>, E.M. Majerz<sup>2</sup>, M.V. Makariev<sup>36</sup>, M. Malaev<sup>140</sup>, G. Malfattore<sup>25</sup>, N.M. Malik<sup>91</sup>, S.K. Malik<sup>91</sup>, L. Malinina<sup>I,VIII,141</sup>, D. Mallick<sup>131</sup>, N. Mallick<sup>48</sup>, G. Mandaglio<sup>30,53</sup>, S.K. Mandal<sup>79</sup>, A. Manea<sup>63</sup>, V. Manko<sup>140</sup>, F. Manso<sup>127</sup>, V. Manzari<sup>50</sup>, Y. Mao<sup>6</sup>, R.W. Marcjan<sup>2</sup>, G.V. Margagliotti<sup>23</sup>, A. Margotti<sup>51</sup>, A. Marín<sup>97</sup>, C. Markert<sup>108</sup>, C.F.B. Marquez<sup>31</sup>, P. Martinengo<sup>32</sup>, M.I. Martínez<sup>44</sup>, G. Martínez García<sup>103</sup>, M.P.P. Martins<sup>110</sup>, S. Masciocchi<sup>97</sup>, M. Masera<sup>24</sup>, A. Masoni<sup>52</sup>, L. Massacrier<sup>131</sup>, O. Massen<sup>59</sup>, A. Mastroserio<sup>132,50</sup>, O. Matonoha<sup>75</sup>, S. Mattiazzo<sup>27</sup>, A. Matyja<sup>107</sup>, F. Mazzaschi<sup>32,24</sup>, M. Mazzilli<sup>116</sup>, Y. Melikyan<sup>43</sup>, M. Melo<sup>110</sup>, A. Menchaca-Rocha<sup>67</sup>, J.E.M. Mendez<sup>65</sup>, E. Meninno<sup>102</sup>, A.S. Menon<sup>116</sup>, M.W. Menzel<sup>32,94</sup>, M. Meres<sup>13</sup>, Y. Miake<sup>125</sup>, L. Micheletti<sup>32</sup>, D.L. Mihaylov<sup>95</sup>, K. Mikhaylov<sup>141,140</sup>, N. Minafra<sup>118</sup>, D. Miśkowiec<sup>97</sup>, A. Modak<sup>134</sup>, B. Mohanty<sup>80</sup>, M. Mohisin Khan<sup>VI,15</sup>, M.A. Molander<sup>43</sup>, S. Monira<sup>136</sup>, C. Mordasini<sup>117</sup>, D.A. Moreira De Godoy<sup>126</sup>, I. Morozov<sup>140</sup>, A. Morsch<sup>32</sup>, T. Mrnjavac<sup>32</sup>, V. Muccifora<sup>49</sup>, S. Muhuri<sup>135</sup>, J.D. Mulligan<sup>74</sup>, A. Mulliri<sup>22</sup>, M.G. Munhoz<sup>110</sup>, R.H. Munzer<sup>64</sup>, H. Murakami<sup>124</sup>, S. Murray<sup>114</sup>, L. Musa<sup>32</sup>, J. Musinsky<sup>60</sup>, J.W. Myrcha<sup>136</sup>, B. Naik<sup>123</sup>, A.I. Nambrath<sup>18</sup>, B.K. Nandi<sup>47</sup>, R. Nania<sup>51</sup>, E. Nappi<sup>50</sup>, A.F. Nassirpour<sup>17</sup>, A. Nath<sup>94</sup>, S. Nath<sup>135</sup>, C. Nattrass<sup>122</sup>, M.N. Naydenov<sup>36</sup>, A. Neagu<sup>19</sup>, A. Negru<sup>113</sup>, E. Nekrasova<sup>140</sup>, L. Nellen<sup>65</sup>, R. Nepeivoda<sup>75</sup>, S. Nese<sup>19</sup>, N. Nicassio<sup>50</sup>, B.S. Nielsen<sup>83</sup>, E.G. Nielsen<sup>83</sup>, S. Nikolae<sup>140</sup>, S. Nikulin<sup>140</sup>, V. Nikulin<sup>140</sup>, F. Noferini<sup>51</sup>, S. Noh<sup>12</sup>, P. Nomokonov<sup>141</sup>, J. Norman<sup>119</sup>,



J. Vrláková<sup>37</sup>, J. Wan<sup>39</sup>, C. Wang<sup>39</sup>, D. Wang<sup>39</sup>, Y. Wang<sup>39</sup>, Y. Wang<sup>6</sup>, Z. Wang<sup>39</sup>,  
 A. Wegrzynek<sup>32</sup>, F.T. Weiglhofer<sup>38</sup>, S.C. Wenzel<sup>32</sup>, J.P. Wessels<sup>126</sup>, J. Wiechula<sup>64</sup>, J. Wikne<sup>19</sup>,  
 G. Wilk<sup>79</sup>, J. Wilkinson<sup>97</sup>, G.A. Willems<sup>126</sup>, B. Windelband<sup>94</sup>, M. Winn<sup>130</sup>, J.R. Wright<sup>108</sup>,  
 W. Wu<sup>39</sup>, Y. Wu<sup>120</sup>, Z. Xiong<sup>120</sup>, R. Xu<sup>6</sup>, A. Yadav<sup>42</sup>, A.K. Yadav<sup>135</sup>, Y. Yamaguchi<sup>92</sup>, S. Yang<sup>20</sup>,  
 S. Yano<sup>92</sup>, E.R. Yeats<sup>18</sup>, Z. Yin<sup>6</sup>, I.-K. Yoo<sup>16</sup>, J.H. Yoon<sup>58</sup>, H. Yu<sup>12</sup>, S. Yuan<sup>20</sup>, A. Yuncu<sup>94</sup>,  
 V. Zaccolo<sup>23</sup>, C. Zampolli<sup>32</sup>, F. Zanone<sup>94</sup>, N. Zardoshti<sup>32</sup>, A. Zarochentsev<sup>140</sup>, P. Závada<sup>62</sup>,  
 N. Zaviyalov<sup>140</sup>, M. Zhalov<sup>140</sup>, B. Zhang<sup>94,6</sup>, C. Zhang<sup>130</sup>, L. Zhang<sup>39</sup>, M. Zhang<sup>127,6</sup>, M. Zhang<sup>6</sup>,  
 S. Zhang<sup>39</sup>, X. Zhang<sup>6</sup>, Y. Zhang<sup>120</sup>, Z. Zhang<sup>6</sup>, M. Zhao<sup>10</sup>, V. Zhrebchevskii<sup>140</sup>, Y. Zhi<sup>10</sup>,  
 D. Zhou<sup>6</sup>, Y. Zhou<sup>83</sup>, J. Zhu<sup>54,6</sup>, S. Zhu<sup>120</sup>, Y. Zhu<sup>6</sup>, S.C. Zugravel<sup>56</sup>, N. Zurlo<sup>134,55</sup>

## Affiliation Notes

<sup>I</sup> Deceased

<sup>II</sup> Also at: Max-Planck-Institut für Physik, Munich, Germany

<sup>III</sup> Also at: Italian National Agency for New Technologies, Energy and Sustainable Economic Development (ENEA), Bologna, Italy

<sup>IV</sup> Also at: Dipartimento DET del Politecnico di Torino, Turin, Italy

<sup>V</sup> Also at: Yildiz Technical University, Istanbul, Türkiye

<sup>VI</sup> Also at: Department of Applied Physics, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, India

<sup>VII</sup> Also at: Institute of Theoretical Physics, University of Wrocław, Poland

<sup>VIII</sup> Also at: An institution covered by a cooperation agreement with CERN

## Collaboration Institutes

<sup>1</sup> A.I. Alikhanyan National Science Laboratory (Yerevan Physics Institute) Foundation, Yerevan, Armenia

<sup>2</sup> AGH University of Krakow, Cracow, Poland

<sup>3</sup> Bogolyubov Institute for Theoretical Physics, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Kiev, Ukraine

<sup>4</sup> Bose Institute, Department of Physics and Centre for Astroparticle Physics and Space Science (CAPSS), Kolkata, India

<sup>5</sup> California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, California, United States

<sup>6</sup> Central China Normal University, Wuhan, China

<sup>7</sup> Centro de Aplicaciones Tecnológicas y Desarrollo Nuclear (CEADEN), Havana, Cuba

<sup>8</sup> Centro de Investigación y de Estudios Avanzados (CINVESTAV), Mexico City and Mérida, Mexico

<sup>9</sup> Chicago State University, Chicago, Illinois, United States

<sup>10</sup> China Institute of Atomic Energy, Beijing, China

<sup>11</sup> China University of Geosciences, Wuhan, China

<sup>12</sup> Chungbuk National University, Cheongju, Republic of Korea

<sup>13</sup> Comenius University Bratislava, Faculty of Mathematics, Physics and Informatics, Bratislava, Slovak Republic

<sup>14</sup> Creighton University, Omaha, Nebraska, United States

<sup>15</sup> Department of Physics, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, India

<sup>16</sup> Department of Physics, Pusan National University, Pusan, Republic of Korea

<sup>17</sup> Department of Physics, Sejong University, Seoul, Republic of Korea

<sup>18</sup> Department of Physics, University of California, Berkeley, California, United States

<sup>19</sup> Department of Physics, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway

<sup>20</sup> Department of Physics and Technology, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway

<sup>21</sup> Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Pavia, Pavia, Italy

<sup>22</sup> Dipartimento di Fisica dell'Università and Sezione INFN, Cagliari, Italy

<sup>23</sup> Dipartimento di Fisica dell'Università and Sezione INFN, Trieste, Italy

<sup>24</sup> Dipartimento di Fisica dell'Università and Sezione INFN, Turin, Italy

<sup>25</sup> Dipartimento di Fisica e Astronomia dell'Università and Sezione INFN, Bologna, Italy

<sup>26</sup> Dipartimento di Fisica e Astronomia dell'Università and Sezione INFN, Catania, Italy

<sup>27</sup> Dipartimento di Fisica e Astronomia dell'Università and Sezione INFN, Padova, Italy

<sup>28</sup> Dipartimento di Fisica 'E.R. Caianiello' dell'Università and Gruppo Collegato INFN, Salerno, Italy

<sup>29</sup> Dipartimento DISAT del Politecnico and Sezione INFN, Turin, Italy

<sup>30</sup> Dipartimento di Scienze MIFT, Università di Messina, Messina, Italy

<sup>31</sup> Dipartimento Interateneo di Fisica 'M. Merlin' and Sezione INFN, Bari, Italy

- <sup>32</sup> European Organization for Nuclear Research (CERN), Geneva, Switzerland
- <sup>33</sup> Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering and Naval Architecture, University of Split, Split, Croatia
- <sup>34</sup> Faculty of Engineering and Science, Western Norway University of Applied Sciences, Bergen, Norway
- <sup>35</sup> Faculty of Nuclear Sciences and Physical Engineering, Czech Technical University in Prague, Prague, Czech Republic
- <sup>36</sup> Faculty of Physics, Sofia University, Sofia, Bulgaria
- <sup>37</sup> Faculty of Science, P.J. Šafárik University, Košice, Slovak Republic
- <sup>38</sup> Frankfurt Institute for Advanced Studies, Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt, Frankfurt, Germany
- <sup>39</sup> Fudan University, Shanghai, China
- <sup>40</sup> Gangneung-Wonju National University, Gangneung, Republic of Korea
- <sup>41</sup> Gauhati University, Department of Physics, Guwahati, India
- <sup>42</sup> Helmholtz-Institut für Strahlen- und Kernphysik, Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn, Bonn, Germany
- <sup>43</sup> Helsinki Institute of Physics (HIP), Helsinki, Finland
- <sup>44</sup> High Energy Physics Group, Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, Puebla, Mexico
- <sup>45</sup> Horia Hulubei National Institute of Physics and Nuclear Engineering, Bucharest, Romania
- <sup>46</sup> HUN-REN Wigner Research Centre for Physics, Budapest, Hungary
- <sup>47</sup> Indian Institute of Technology Bombay (IIT), Mumbai, India
- <sup>48</sup> Indian Institute of Technology Indore, Indore, India
- <sup>49</sup> INFN, Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, Frascati, Italy
- <sup>50</sup> INFN, Sezione di Bari, Bari, Italy
- <sup>51</sup> INFN, Sezione di Bologna, Bologna, Italy
- <sup>52</sup> INFN, Sezione di Cagliari, Cagliari, Italy
- <sup>53</sup> INFN, Sezione di Catania, Catania, Italy
- <sup>54</sup> INFN, Sezione di Padova, Padova, Italy
- <sup>55</sup> INFN, Sezione di Pavia, Pavia, Italy
- <sup>56</sup> INFN, Sezione di Torino, Turin, Italy
- <sup>57</sup> INFN, Sezione di Trieste, Trieste, Italy
- <sup>58</sup> Inha University, Incheon, Republic of Korea
- <sup>59</sup> Institute for Gravitational and Subatomic Physics (GRASP), Utrecht University/Nikhef, Utrecht, Netherlands
- <sup>60</sup> Institute of Experimental Physics, Slovak Academy of Sciences, Košice, Slovak Republic
- <sup>61</sup> Institute of Physics, Homi Bhabha National Institute, Bhubaneswar, India
- <sup>62</sup> Institute of Physics of the Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague, Czech Republic
- <sup>63</sup> Institute of Space Science (ISS), Bucharest, Romania
- <sup>64</sup> Institut für Kernphysik, Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt, Frankfurt, Germany
- <sup>65</sup> Instituto de Ciencias Nucleares, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico City, Mexico
- <sup>66</sup> Instituto de Física, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS), Porto Alegre, Brazil
- <sup>67</sup> Instituto de Física, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico City, Mexico
- <sup>68</sup> iThemba LABS, National Research Foundation, Somerset West, South Africa
- <sup>69</sup> Jeonbuk National University, Jeonju, Republic of Korea
- <sup>70</sup> Johann-Wolfgang-Goethe Universität Frankfurt Institut für Informatik, Fachbereich Informatik und Mathematik, Frankfurt, Germany
- <sup>71</sup> Korea Institute of Science and Technology Information, Daejeon, Republic of Korea
- <sup>72</sup> KTO Karatay University, Konya, Turkey
- <sup>73</sup> Laboratoire de Physique Subatomique et de Cosmologie, Université Grenoble-Alpes, CNRS-IN2P3, Grenoble, France
- <sup>74</sup> Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, California, United States
- <sup>75</sup> Lund University Department of Physics, Division of Particle Physics, Lund, Sweden
- <sup>76</sup> Nagasaki Institute of Applied Science, Nagasaki, Japan
- <sup>77</sup> Nara Women's University (NWU), Nara, Japan
- <sup>78</sup> National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, School of Science, Department of Physics, Athens, Greece
- <sup>79</sup> National Centre for Nuclear Research, Warsaw, Poland
- <sup>80</sup> National Institute of Science Education and Research, Homi Bhabha National Institute, Jatni, India
- <sup>81</sup> National Nuclear Research Center, Baku, Azerbaijan
- <sup>82</sup> National Research and Innovation Agency - BRIN, Jakarta, Indonesia

- <sup>83</sup> Niels Bohr Institute, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark  
<sup>84</sup> Nikhef, National institute for subatomic physics, Amsterdam, Netherlands  
<sup>85</sup> Nuclear Physics Group, STFC Daresbury Laboratory, Daresbury, United Kingdom  
<sup>86</sup> Nuclear Physics Institute of the Czech Academy of Sciences, Husinec-Řež, Czech Republic  
<sup>87</sup> Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, United States  
<sup>88</sup> Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, United States  
<sup>89</sup> Physics department, Faculty of science, University of Zagreb, Zagreb, Croatia  
<sup>90</sup> Physics Department, Panjab University, Chandigarh, India  
<sup>91</sup> Physics Department, University of Jammu, Jammu, India  
<sup>92</sup> Physics Program and International Institute for Sustainability with Knotted Chiral Meta Matter (SKCM2), Hiroshima University, Hiroshima, Japan  
<sup>93</sup> Physikalisches Institut, Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany  
<sup>94</sup> Physikalisches Institut, Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg, Heidelberg, Germany  
<sup>95</sup> Physik Department, Technische Universität München, Munich, Germany  
<sup>96</sup> Politecnico di Bari and Sezione INFN, Bari, Italy  
<sup>97</sup> Research Division and ExtreMe Matter Institute EMMI, GSI Helmholtzzentrum für Schwerionenforschung GmbH, Darmstadt, Germany  
<sup>98</sup> Saga University, Saga, Japan  
<sup>99</sup> Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, Homi Bhabha National Institute, Kolkata, India  
<sup>100</sup> School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, United Kingdom  
<sup>101</sup> Sección Física, Departamento de Ciencias, Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, Lima, Peru  
<sup>102</sup> Stefan Meyer Institut für Subatomare Physik (SMI), Vienna, Austria  
<sup>103</sup> SUBATECH, IMT Atlantique, Nantes Université, CNRS-IN2P3, Nantes, France  
<sup>104</sup> Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon City, Republic of Korea  
<sup>105</sup> Suranaree University of Technology, Nakhon Ratchasima, Thailand  
<sup>106</sup> Technical University of Košice, Košice, Slovak Republic  
<sup>107</sup> The Henryk Niewodniczanski Institute of Nuclear Physics, Polish Academy of Sciences, Cracow, Poland  
<sup>108</sup> The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas, United States  
<sup>109</sup> Universidad Autónoma de Sinaloa, Culiacán, Mexico  
<sup>110</sup> Universidade de São Paulo (USP), São Paulo, Brazil  
<sup>111</sup> Universidade Estadual de Campinas (UNICAMP), Campinas, Brazil  
<sup>112</sup> Universidade Federal do ABC, Santo Andre, Brazil  
<sup>113</sup> Universitatea Nationala de Stiinta si Tehnologie Politehnica Bucuresti, Bucharest, Romania  
<sup>114</sup> University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa  
<sup>115</sup> University of Derby, Derby, United Kingdom  
<sup>116</sup> University of Houston, Houston, Texas, United States  
<sup>117</sup> University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä, Finland  
<sup>118</sup> University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, United States  
<sup>119</sup> University of Liverpool, Liverpool, United Kingdom  
<sup>120</sup> University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, China  
<sup>121</sup> University of South-Eastern Norway, Kongsberg, Norway  
<sup>122</sup> University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee, United States  
<sup>123</sup> University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa  
<sup>124</sup> University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan  
<sup>125</sup> University of Tsukuba, Tsukuba, Japan  
<sup>126</sup> Universität Münster, Institut für Kernphysik, Münster, Germany  
<sup>127</sup> Université Clermont Auvergne, CNRS/IN2P3, LPC, Clermont-Ferrand, France  
<sup>128</sup> Université de Lyon, CNRS/IN2P3, Institut de Physique des 2 Infinis de Lyon, Lyon, France  
<sup>129</sup> Université de Strasbourg, CNRS, IPHC UMR 7178, F-67000 Strasbourg, France, Strasbourg, France  
<sup>130</sup> Université Paris-Saclay, Centre d'Etudes de Saclay (CEA), IRFU, Département de Physique Nucléaire (DPhN), Saclay, France  
<sup>131</sup> Université Paris-Saclay, CNRS/IN2P3, IJCLab, Orsay, France  
<sup>132</sup> Università degli Studi di Foggia, Foggia, Italy  
<sup>133</sup> Università del Piemonte Orientale, Vercelli, Italy  
<sup>134</sup> Università di Brescia, Brescia, Italy  
<sup>135</sup> Variable Energy Cyclotron Centre, Homi Bhabha National Institute, Kolkata, India



<sup>136</sup> Warsaw University of Technology, Warsaw, Poland

<sup>137</sup> Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan, United States

<sup>138</sup> Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut, United States

<sup>139</sup> Yonsei University, Seoul, Republic of Korea

<sup>140</sup> Affiliated with an institute covered by a cooperation agreement with CERN

<sup>141</sup> Affiliated with an international laboratory covered by a cooperation agreement with CERN.