



MIT Open Access Articles

Studies of dijet transverse momentum balance and pseudorapidity distributions in pPb collisions at $s_{NN} = 5.02$ TeV

The MIT Faculty has made this article openly available. ***Please share*** how this access benefits you. Your story matters.

Citation	Chatrchyan, S., V. Khachatryan, A. M. Sirunyan, A. Tumasyan, W. Adam, T. Bergauer, M. Dragicevic, et al. "Studies of Dijet Transverse Momentum Balance and Pseudorapidity Distributions in pPb Collisions at $s_{NN} = 5.02$ TeV." Eur. Phys. J. C 74, no. 7 (July 2014). © CERN for the benefit of the CMS collaboration
As Published	http://dx.doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-014-2951-y
Publisher	Springer-Verlag
Version	Final published version
Accessed	Fri Sep 21 19:41:36 EDT 2018
Citable Link	http://hdl.handle.net/1721.1/91199
Terms of Use	Creative Commons Attribution
Detailed Terms	http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Studies of dijet transverse momentum balance and pseudorapidity distributions in pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV

The CMS Collaboration*

CERN, Geneva, Switzerland

Received: 18 January 2014 / Accepted: 23 June 2014 / Published online: 23 July 2014

© CERN for the benefit of the CMS collaboration 2014. This article is published with open access at Springerlink.com

Abstract Dijet production has been measured in pPb collisions at a nucleon–nucleon centre-of-mass energy of 5.02 TeV. A data sample corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 35 nb^{-1} was collected using the Compact Muon Solenoid detector at the Large Hadron Collider. The dijet transverse momentum balance, azimuthal angle correlations, and pseudorapidity distributions are studied as a function of the transverse energy in the forward calorimeters ($E_T^{4 < |\eta| < 5.2}$). For pPb collisions, the dijet transverse momentum ratio and the width of the distribution of dijet azimuthal angle difference are comparable to the same quantities obtained from a simulated pp reference and insensitive to $E_T^{4 < |\eta| < 5.2}$. In contrast, the mean value of the dijet pseudorapidity is found to change monotonically with increasing $E_T^{4 < |\eta| < 5.2}$, indicating a correlation between the energy emitted at large pseudorapidity and the longitudinal motion of the dijet frame. The pseudorapidity distribution of the dijet system in minimum bias pPb collisions is compared with next-to-leading-order perturbative QCD predictions obtained from both nucleon and nuclear parton distribution functions, and the data more closely match the latter.

1 Introduction

Relativistic heavy ion collisions allow to study the fundamental theory of strong interactions—quantum chromodynamics (QCD)—under extreme conditions of temperature and energy density. Lattice QCD calculations [1] predict a new chirally-symmetric form of matter that consists of an extended volume of deconfined quarks and gluons above the critical energy density of the phase transition, about $1 \text{ GeV}/\text{fm}^3$ [2–5]. One of the most interesting experimental signatures of the formation of this novel matter, the quark-gluon plasma (QGP), is “jet-quenching” resulting from the energy loss of hard-scattered partons passing

through the medium. Back-to-back dijets have long been proposed as a particularly useful tool for studying the QGP properties [6, 7]. In PbPb collisions at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC), the effects of this medium were observed in the first jet measurements as a dijet transverse momentum imbalance [8, 9].

Recent data at the LHC for jets [8–12], correlations between jets and single particles [13–15], and charged-particle measurements [16, 17], provide unprecedented information about the jet-quenching phenomenon. For head-on collisions, a large broadening of the dijet transverse momentum ratio ($p_{T,2}/p_{T,1}$) and a decrease in its mean is observed where, as is the case for all the dijet observables in the following discussion, the subscripts 1 and 2 in the kinematical quantities refer to the leading and subleading jets (the two highest- p_T jets), respectively. This observation is consistent with theoretical calculations that involve differential energy loss of back-to-back hard-scattered partons as they traverse the medium [18–20]. At leading order (LO) and in the absence of parton energy loss in the QGP, the two jets have equal transverse momenta (p_T) with respect to the beam axis and are back-to-back in azimuth (e.g. with the relative azimuthal angle $\Delta\phi_{1,2} = |\varphi_1 - \varphi_2| \approx \pi$). However, medium-induced gluon emission in the final state can significantly unbalance the energy of leading and subleading jets and decorrelate the jets in azimuth.

Studies of dijet properties in pPb collisions are of great importance to establish a QCD baseline for hadronic interactions with cold nuclear matter [21, 22]. This is crucial for the interpretation of the PbPb results, which could include the effects of both cold nuclear matter and a hot partonic medium. The dijet production rates as a function of jet pseudorapidity (η) have also been proposed as a tool to probe the nuclear modifications of the parton distribution functions (PDFs) [23–28]. Pseudorapidity η is defined as $-\ln[\tan(\theta/2)]$, where θ is the polar angle with respect to the proton beam direction.

In this paper, the first dijet transverse momentum balance and pseudorapidity distribution measurements in pPb collisions

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

sions are presented as a function of the transverse energy in the forward calorimeters ($E_T^{4<|\eta|<5.2}$). This analysis uses pPb data recorded with the Compact Muon Solenoid (CMS) detector in 2013, corresponding to an integrated luminosity of $35 \pm 1 \text{ nb}^{-1}$. The lead nuclei and protons had beam energies of 1.58 TeV per nucleon and 4 TeV, respectively, corresponding to a nucleon–nucleon centre-of-mass energy of $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02 \text{ TeV}$. Jets are reconstructed within $|\eta| < 3$ using the anti- k_T sequential recombination algorithm [29,30] with a distance parameter of 0.3. This analysis is performed using events required to have a dijet with a leading jet $p_{T,1} > 120 \text{ GeV}/c$, a subleading jet $p_{T,2} > 30 \text{ GeV}/c$, and $\Delta\phi_{1,2} > 2\pi/3$.

2 The CMS detector

A detailed description of the CMS experiment can be found in Ref. [31]. The silicon tracker, located in the 3.8 T magnetic field of the superconducting solenoid is used to measure charged particles within the pseudorapidity range $|\eta| < 2.5$. It provides an impact parameter resolution of $\approx 15 \mu\text{m}$ and a p_T resolution of about 1.5 % for particles with $p_T = 100 \text{ GeV}/c$. Also located inside the solenoid are an electromagnetic calorimeter (ECAL) and a hadron calorimeter (HCAL). The ECAL consists of more than 75 000 lead tungstate crystals, arranged in a quasi-projective geometry, and distributed in a barrel region ($|\eta| < 1.48$) and in two endcaps that extend up to $|\eta| = 3.0$. The HCAL barrel and endcaps are sampling calorimeters composed of brass and scintillator plates, covering $|\eta| < 3.0$. Iron hadron-forward (HF) calorimeters, with quartz fibers read out by photomultipliers, extend the calorimeter coverage up to $|\eta| = 5.2$ and are used to differentiate between central and peripheral pPb collisions. Calorimeter cells are grouped in projective towers of granularity in pseudorapidity and azimuthal angle given by $\Delta\eta \times \Delta\phi = 0.087 \times 0.087$ close to midrapidity, having a coarser segmentation at large rapidities. An efficient muon system is deployed for the reconstruction and identification of muons up to $|\eta| = 2.4$. The detailed Monte Carlo (MC) simulation of the CMS detector response is based on GEANT4 [32].

Because of the different energies of the two beams, the nucleon–nucleon centre-of-mass frame in pPb collisions is not at rest in the detector frame. Results are presented in the laboratory frame, where the higher energy proton beam is defined to travel in the positive η direction ($\theta = 0$). Therefore, a massless particle emitted at $\eta_{\text{cm}} = 0$ in the nucleon–nucleon centre-of-mass frame will be detected at $\eta_{\text{lab}} = +0.465$ in the laboratory frame. During part of the data taking period, the directions of the proton and lead beams were reversed. For the dataset taken with the opposite direc-

tion proton beam, the standard CMS definition of η was flipped so that the proton always moves towards positive η .

3 Jet reconstruction

Offline jet reconstruction is performed using the CMS “particle-flow” algorithm [33,34]. By combining information from all sub-detector systems, the particle-flow algorithm attempts to identify all stable particles in an event, classifying them as electrons, muons, photons, charged and neutral hadrons. These particle-flow objects are first grouped into “pseudo-towers” according to the CMS HCAL granularity. The transverse-energy of the pseudo-towers is calculated from the scalar sum of the transverse-energy of the particle-flow objects, assuming zero mass. Then, jets are reconstructed based on the pseudo-towers, using the anti- k_T sequential recombination algorithm provided in the FASTJET framework [29,30] with a distance parameter of 0.3.

To subtract the underlying event (UE) background in pPb collisions, an iterative algorithm described in Ref. [35] is employed, using the same implementation as in the PbPb analysis [8]. The energies of the particle-flow candidates are mapped onto projective towers with the same segmentation as the HCAL, and the mean and the dispersion of the energies detected in rings of constant η are subtracted from the jet energy. Jets reconstructed without UE subtraction are used to estimate the systematic uncertainty associated with the subtraction algorithm.

The measured jet energies are then corrected to the energies of the corresponding true particle jets using a factorized multi-step approach [36]. The MC jet energy corrections which remove the non-linearity of the detector response are derived using simulated PYTHIA events [37] (tune D6T with PDFs CTEQ6L1 used for 2.76 TeV, tune Z2 for pp 7 TeV). The residual corrections, accounting for the small differences between data and simulation, are obtained from dijet and photon+jet data and simulated events.

4 The Monte Carlo simulation

In order to study the jet reconstruction performance in pPb collisions, dijet events in pp collisions are first simulated with the PYTHIA MC generator (version 6.423, tune Z2) [38] and later embedded in the simulated pPb underlying events. A minimum hard-interaction scale (\hat{p}_T) selection of $30 \text{ GeV}/c$ is used to increase the number of dijet events produced in the momentum range studied. To model the pPb underlying event, minimum bias pPb events are simulated with the HIJING event generator [39], version 1.383 [40]. The HIJING simulation with an effective total nucleon–nucleon cross-section of 84 mb is tuned to reproduce the total particle mul-

tiplicities and charged-hadron spectra, and to approximate the underlying event fluctuations seen in data.

The complete detector simulation and analysis chain is used to process PYTHIA dijet events and these events are then embedded into HIJING events (denoted as PYTHIA + HIJING). The effects of the pPb underlying event on the jet position resolution, jet energy scale, and jet finding efficiency are studied as a function of the total transverse energy detected by the HF calorimeter, jet pseudorapidity and transverse momentum. These effects are small and do not require specific corrections to the measurements, but they are considered as systematic uncertainties.

5 Event selection

The CMS online event selection employs a hardware-based Level-1 trigger and a software-based high-level trigger (HLT). Events are selected using an inclusive single-jet trigger in the HLT, requiring a calorimeter-based jet with transverse momentum $p_T > 100$ GeV/c. The trigger becomes fully efficient for events with a leading jet with $p_T > 120$ GeV/c. In addition to the jet data sample, a minimum bias event sample is selected by requiring at least one track with $p_T > 0.4$ GeV/c to be found in the pixel tracker coincident with the pPb bunch crossing.

In the offline analysis, an additional selection of hadronic collisions is applied by requiring a coincidence of at least one of the HF calorimeter towers, with more than 3 GeV of total energy, from the HF detectors on both sides of the interaction point. Events are required to have at least one reconstructed primary vertex. The primary vertex is formed by two or more associated tracks and is required to have a distance from the nominal interaction region of less than 15 cm along the beam

axis and less than 0.15 cm in the transverse plane. If there are more than 10 tracks in the event, the fraction of good-quality tracks originating from the primary vertex is required to be larger than 20 % in order to suppress beam backgrounds [41].

In addition to the selection of inelastic hadronic collisions, the analysis has extra requirements on the leading and sub-leading jet, which are the jets with the largest and the second largest p_T in the $|\eta| < 3$ interval, respectively. These requirements are $p_{T,1} > 120$ GeV/c, $p_{T,2} > 30$ GeV/c, and $\Delta\phi_{1,2} > 2\pi/3$. Only offline reconstructed jets within $|\eta| < 3$ in the lab frame are considered in this analysis. In order to remove events with residual HCAL noise that are missed by the calorimeter noise rejection algorithms [42,43], either the leading or subleading jet is required to have at least one track with $p_T > 4$ GeV/c. This selection does not introduce a bias of the dijet kinematic distributions based on studies using PYTHIA+HIJING MC simulation.

The selected minimum bias and dijet events are divided into HF activity classes according to the raw transverse energy measured in the HF detectors within the pseudorapidity interval $4.0 < |\eta| < 5.2$, denoted as $E_T^{4 < |\eta| < 5.2}$. This pseudorapidity interval is chosen in order to separate the transverse energy and dijet measurements by a pseudorapidity gap of at least one unit ($3.0 < |\eta| < 4.0$). The HF transverse energy distribution for the selected dijet events in comparison to that for minimum bias events is shown in Fig. 1a. It can be seen that the selection of a high- p_T dijet leads to a bias in the $E_T^{4 < |\eta| < 5.2}$ distributions toward higher values. The correlation between $E_T^{4 < |\eta| < 5.2}$ and the raw number of tracks originating from the primary vertex ($N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{offline}}$) with $|\eta| < 2.4$ and $p_T > 0.4$ GeV/c (before the tracking efficiency correction) is shown in Fig. 1b. A broad correlation between the two quantities is observed in the inclusive




Fig. 1 **a** Raw transverse energy measured by the HF detector in the pseudorapidity interval $4.0 < |\eta| < 5.2$ for minimum bias collisions (black open histogram) and dijet events passing the dijet selection defined in this analysis (red hatched histogram). **b** Correlation between the raw number of reconstructed tracks from the primary vertex ($N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{offline}}$) with $|\eta| < 2.4$ and $p_T > 0.4$ GeV/c and raw transverse energy mea-

sured by the HF detector in the pseudorapidity interval $4.0 < |\eta| < 5.2$ ($E_T^{4 < |\eta| < 5.2}$). **c** Correlation between the raw transverse energy measured by the HF in proton (E_T^p , measured in the pseudorapidity interval $4.0 < \eta < 5.2$) and lead (E_T^{Pb} , measured in the pseudorapidity interval $-5.2 < \eta < -4.0$) directions

Table 1 Fractions of the data sample for each HF activity class calculated for the minimum bias data passing DS selection and for the jet-triggered data passing dijet selection. The fourth column shows the

$E_T^{4< \eta <5.2}$ range (GeV)	Fraction of DS data (%)	Fraction of dijet data (%)	$\langle N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{corrected}} \rangle$ in DS data	$\langle E_T^{4< \eta <5.2} \rangle$ (GeV) in DS data
<20	73.1	52.6	33 ± 2	9.4
20–25	10.5	16.8	75 ± 3	22.4
25–30	7.1	12.7	89 ± 4	27.3
30–40	6.8	13.0	108 ± 5	34.1
>40	2.5	4.9	140 ± 6	46.3

pPb collisions. The correlation between the raw transverse energy measured by the HF detector in the pseudorapidity interval $4.0 < \eta < 5.2$ (in the proton direction, E_T^{P}) and in the pseudorapidity interval $-5.2 < \eta < -4.0$ (in the lead direction, E_T^{Pb}) is also shown in Fig. 1(c). It can be seen that E_T^{P} and E_T^{Pb} are only loosely correlated. In the sample of selected dijet events, 2 % contain at least one additional jet with $p_T > 20 \text{ GeV}/c$ and $4.0 < |\eta| < 5.2$. The potential bias due to the presence of forward jets is found to be negligible and is included in the systematic uncertainty estimation.

The analysis is performed in five $E_T^{4<|\eta|<5.2}$ bins, separated by the boundaries 20, 25, 30 and 40 GeV. The same analysis is also performed with inclusive data without $E_T^{4<|\eta|<5.2}$ selection, where the mean value of $E_T^{4<|\eta|<5.2}$ is 14.7 GeV. The total number of selected events in data is corrected for the difference between the double-sided (DS) selections using particle- and detector-level information in inelastic hadronic HIJING MC simulation [44]. The DS correction in HIJING is found to be 0.98 ± 0.01 . The particle-level selection is very similar to the actual selection described above: at least one particle (proper life time $\tau > 10^{-18} \text{ s}$) with $E > 3 \text{ GeV}$ in the pseudorapidity range $-5 < \eta < -3$ and one in the range $3 < \eta < 5$ [44]. The efficiency-corrected fractions of minimum bias events with DS selection [44], as well as the selected dijet events from the jet-triggered sample falling into each HF activity class are provided in Table 1. The average multiplicity of reconstructed charged particles per bin with $|\eta| < 2.4$ and $p_T > 0.4 \text{ GeV}/c$ ($N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{corrected}}$) after efficiency, acceptance, and misreconstruction corrections as described in Ref. [44] is also included in this table. In order to study the correlation between the collision geometry and forward calorimeter energy, the distributions of number of participating nucleons (N_{part}) in the HIJING Monte Carlo simulation in the five $E_T^{4<|\eta|<5.2}$ bins are shown in Fig. 2. While the mean of the N_{part} distribution is found to be increasing monotonically as a function of $E_T^{4<|\eta|<5.2}$, the fluctuation of N_{part} is found to be large in each HF activity class.

The instantaneous luminosity of the pPb run in 2013 resulted in a $\sim 3 \%$ probability of at least one additional interaction occurring in the same bunch crossing. Events with more than one interaction are referred to as “pileup events”.

average multiplicity of reconstructed charged particles per bin with $|\eta| < 2.4$ and $p_T > 0.4 \text{ GeV}/c$ ($N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{corrected}}$). The fifth column gives the mean HF activity in each class calculated from DS events




Fig. 2 Number of participating nucleons (N_{part}) in the HIJING MC simulations for five different $E_T^{4<|\eta|<5.2}$ bins and the cumulative distribution without any requirement on $E_T^{4<|\eta|<5.2}$

Since the event classes are typically determined from the forward calorimeter information, the energy deposits from each collision in a given pileup event cannot be separated. Therefore, a pileup rejection algorithm developed in Ref. [45] is employed to select a clean single-collision sample. The pileup rejection efficiency of this filter is greater than 90 % in minimum bias events and it removes a very small fraction (0.01 %) of the events without pileup. The fraction of pileup events after pileup rejection is increasing as a function of $E_T^{4<|\eta|<5.2}$. This fraction is found to be smaller than 2 % in the highest $E_T^{4<|\eta|<5.2}$ bins.

6 Results and discussion

This analysis, motivated by the observation of transverse momentum imbalance in PbPb collisions [8], aims at measuring the dijet transverse momentum ratio and the azimuthal angle correlation in pPb collisions. The dijet pseudorapidity distributions in pPb collisions, which are sensitive to a possible modification of the parton distribution function of the




Fig. 3 Dijet transverse momentum ratio ($p_{T,2}/p_{T,1}$) distributions for leading jets with $p_{T,1} > 120$ GeV/c, subleading jets with $p_{T,2} > 30$ GeV/c, and $\Delta\phi_{1,2} > 2\pi/3$ are shown (a) without any selection on the HF transverse energy $E_T^{4<|\eta|<5.2}$, and b–f for different $E_T^{4<|\eta|<5.2}$ classes. Results for pPb events are shown as the red solid circles, while

the crosses show the results for PYTHIA + HIJING simulated events. Results for the simulated PYTHIA events are shown as the grey histogram which is replicated in all the panels. The error bars for the statistical uncertainties are smaller than the marker size and the total systematic uncertainties are shown as yellow boxes

nuclei (nPDF) with respect to that of the nucleons, are also studied.

6.1 Dijet transverse momentum balance

As a function of collision centrality (i.e. the degree of overlap of the two colliding nuclei), dijet events in PbPb collisions were found to have an increasing transverse momentum imbalance for more central events compared to a pp reference [8–10]. The same analysis is performed in pPb collisions. To characterize the dijet transverse momentum balance (or imbalance) quantitatively, the dijet transverse momentum ratio $p_{T,2}/p_{T,1}$ is used. As shown in Fig. 3, $p_{T,2}/p_{T,1}$ distributions measured in pPb data, PYTHIA and PYTHIA + HIJING agree within the systematic uncertainty in different $E_T^{4<|\eta|<5.2}$ intervals, including the event class with the largest forward calorimeter activity. The residual difference in the dijet transverse momentum ratio between data and MC simulation can be attributed to a difference in the jet energy resolution, which is better in the MC simulation by about ~1–2 % compared to the data [36].

In order to compare results from pPb and PbPb data, PbPb events which pass the same dijet criteria are selected for fur-

ther analysis with an additional requirement on the forward activity $E_T^{4<|\eta|<5.2} < 60$ GeV, since the bulk of the pPb events satisfy this condition, as can be seen in Fig. 1b. The measured mean value of $p_{T,2}/p_{T,1}$ from these PbPb data is 0.711 ± 0.007 (stat.) ± 0.014 (syst.), which is slightly higher than that in inclusive pPb collisions (0.689 ± 0.014 (syst.), with a negligible statistical uncertainty). The difference between the $E_T^{4<|\eta|<5.2}$ distributions for pPb and PbPb data, which results in a higher mean $E_T^{4<|\eta|<5.2}$ value for PbPb events (35 GeV), as well as the difference in centre-of-mass energy, should be taken into account in this comparison. The predicted $\langle p_{T,2}/p_{T,1} \rangle$ is 6 % higher at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ than that at 5.02 TeV in PYTHIA MC simulations.

The main contributions to the systematic uncertainties of $\langle p_{T,2}/p_{T,1} \rangle$ include the uncertainties in the jet energy scale, the jet reconstruction efficiency and the effects of the UE subtraction. The uncertainty in the subtraction procedure is estimated by considering the difference between the p_T ratio results from reconstructed jets with and without UE subtraction, which is close to 1 %. The residual jet energy scale uncertainty is estimated by varying the transverse momentum of the leading and subleading jets independently and is found to be at the 1–2 % level. Uncertainties associated with




Fig. 4 Distributions of the azimuthal angle difference $\Delta\phi_{1,2}$ between the leading and subleading jets for leading jets with $p_{T,1} > 120$ GeV/c and subleading jets with $p_{T,2} > 30$ GeV/c are shown (a) without any selection on the HF transverse energy $E_T^{4<|\eta|<5.2}$, and b–f for different $E_T^{4<|\eta|<5.2}$ classes. The range for $\Delta\phi$ in this figure extends below the lower bound of $2\pi/3$, which is used in the selection of the dijets for the

other observables. Results for pPb events are shown as the *red solid circles*, while the *crosses* show the results for PYTHIA + HIJING simulated events. Results for the simulated PYTHIA events are shown as the *grey histogram* which is replicated in all the *panels*. The *error bars* for the statistical uncertainties are smaller than the marker size and the total systematic uncertainties are shown as *yellow boxes*

jet reconstruction efficiency are found to be at the 0.1 % level based on Monte Carlo simulation.

6.2 Dijet azimuthal correlations

Earlier studies of the dijet and photon-jet events in heavy-ion collisions [8–11] have shown very small modifications of dijet azimuthal correlations despite the large changes seen in the dijet transverse momentum balance. This is an important aspect of the interpretation of energy loss observations [46].

The distributions of the relative azimuthal angle $\Delta\phi_{1,2}$ between the leading and subleading jets that pass the respective p_T selections in six HF activity classes, compared to PYTHIA and PYTHIA + HIJING simulations, are shown in Figure 4. The distributions from pPb data are in good agreement with the PYTHIA reference. To study the evolution of the shape, the distributions are fitted to a normalized exponential function:


$$\frac{1}{N_{\text{dijet}}} \frac{dN_{\text{dijet}}}{d\Delta\phi_{1,2}} = \frac{e^{(\Delta\phi - \pi)/\sigma}}{(1 - e^{-\pi/\sigma}) \sigma} \quad (1)$$

The fit is restricted to the region $\Delta\phi_{1,2} > 2\pi/3$. In the data, the width of the azimuthal angle difference (σ in Eq. (1)) is 0.217 ± 0.0004 , and its variation as a function of $E_T^{4<|\eta|<5.2}$ is smaller than the systematic uncertainty, which is 3–4 %. The width in the data is also found to be 4–7 % narrower than that in the PYTHIA simulation.

6.3 Dijet pseudorapidity

The normalized distributions of dijet pseudorapidity η_{dijet} , defined as $(\eta_1 + \eta_2)/2$, are studied in bins of $E_T^{4<|\eta|<5.2}$. Since η_{dijet} and the longitudinal-momentum fraction x of the hard-scattered parton from the Pb ion are highly correlated, these distributions are sensitive to possible modifications of the PDF for nucleons in the lead nucleus when comparing η_{dijet} distributions in pp and pPb collisions. As discussed previously, the asymmetry in energy of the pPb collisions at the LHC causes the mean of the *unmodified* dijet pseudorapidity distribution to be centred around a positive value. However, due to the limited jet acceptance (jet $|\eta| < 3$) it is not centred around $\eta = 0.465$, but at $\eta \sim 0.4$. The major systematic uncertainty for the $\langle \eta_{\text{dijet}} \rangle$ measurement comes

Fig. 5 **a** Distribution of dijet pseudorapidity ($\eta_{\text{dijet}} = [\eta_1 + \eta_2]/2$) is shown for pPb dijet events with $p_{T,1} > 120$ GeV/c, $p_{T,2} > 30$ GeV/c, and $\Delta\phi_{1,2} > 2\pi/3$ as the *red solid circles*. The results are compared to NLO calculations using CT10 (*black dashed curve*) and CT10 + EPS09 (*blue solid curve*) PDFs. **b** The difference between η_{dijet} in data and the one calculated with CT10 proton PDF. The *black squares* represent the data points, and the theoretical uncertainty is shown with the *black dashed line*. **c** The difference between η_{dijet} in data and the one calculated with CT10+EPS09 nPDF. The *blue solid circles* show the data points and *blue solid curve* the theoretical uncertainty. The *yellow bands* in **b** and **c** represent experimental uncertainties. The experimental and theoretical uncertainties at different η_{dijet} values are correlated due to normalization to unit area



from the uncertainty in the jet energy correction. Varying the transverse momentum of the jets by $<2\%$ up (down) for the jet at positive (negative) η results in a shift of the $\langle\eta_{\text{dijet}}\rangle$ value by ± 0.03 . The uncertainty associated with the HF activity selection bias is estimated from the difference between PYTHIA without HF activity selection and PYTHIA + HIJING with HF activity selection. The uncertainty is found to be in the range 0.002–0.020. The uncertainty associated with the UE subtraction is studied by comparing the results with and without subtraction, which causes a shift of 0.01 in the two highest HF activity classes. Due to the normalisation to unity, a change in one data point moves the other points in the opposite direction on average, which results in a correlation of the systematic uncertainties at different η_{dijet} values.

The normalized η_{dijet} distribution measured in inclusive pPb collisions, which is compared to next-to-leading-order (NLO) perturbative QCD predictions [47] using the CT10 [48] and EPS09 [24] PDFs, is shown in Fig. 5. The measurement and the NLO calculation based on CT10 + EPS09 PDFs are consistent within the quoted experimental and theoretical uncertainties in the whole η_{dijet} range. On the other hand, the calculation using CT10 alone, which does not account for possible nuclear modifications of the PDFs,

gives a poorer description of the observed distribution. This also shows that η_{dijet} in pPb collisions could be used to better constrain the nPDFs by including the measurement in standard global fits of parton densities.

The η_{dijet} distributions are also studied in different HF activity classes, as shown in Fig. 6. The pPb data are compared to PYTHIA and PYTHIA + HIJING simulations. Deviations of the η_{dijet} distributions in each class are observed with respect to the PYTHIA reference without HF activity selection. The analysis was also performed using the PYTHIA + HIJING simulation in the same HF activity classes and no sizable deviation was observed with respect to the PYTHIA reference. This shows that the PYTHIA+HIJING embedded sample, which assumes that hard and soft scatterings are independent, does not describe the correlation between the dijet pseudorapidity distribution and forward calorimeter energy. To illustrate the observed deviation in each HF activity class with respect to that in the inclusive pPb collisions, the ratio of the dijet pseudorapidity distribution from each $E_T^{4<|\eta|<5.2}$ class to the distribution without HF requirements is presented in Fig. 7. A reduction of the fraction of dijets in the $\eta_{\text{dijet}} > 1$ region is observed in events with large activity measured by the forward calorimeter. The magnitude of the observed modifi-




Fig. 6 Distributions of the dijet pseudorapidity (η_{dijet}) for leading jets with $p_{T,1} > 120$ GeV/c and subleading jets with $p_{T,2} > 30$ GeV/c are shown (a) without any selection on the HF transverse energy $E_T^{4<|\eta|<5.2}$, and b–f for different $E_T^{4<|\eta|<5.2}$ classes. Results for pPb events are shown as the red solid circles, while the crosses show the results for

PYTHIA + HIJING simulated events. Results for the simulated PYTHIA events are shown as the grey histogram which is replicated in all the panels. The error bars for the statistical uncertainties are smaller than the marker size and the total systematic uncertainties are shown as yellow boxes




Fig. 7 Ratio of the dijet pseudorapidity distribution from each $E_T^{4<|\eta|<5.2}$ class shown in b–f of Fig. 6 to the spectrum from the inclusive $E_T^{4<|\eta|<5.2}$ bin shown in a. The error bars represent the statistical uncertainties and the total systematic uncertainties are shown as yellow boxes




Fig. 8 Dijet pseudorapidity distributions in the five HF activity classes. **a** The distributions are normalized by the number of selected dijet events. **b** The distributions are normalized by the number of dijet events

cation is much larger than the predictions from the NLO calculations based on impact-parameter dependent nPDFs [49] in the region $x < 0.1$ for partons in lead nuclei. Note that theory calculations are based on impact parameter, which can take a large range of values in each HF activity class.

The pPb distributions for different HF activity classes, from panels (b)–(f) of Fig. 6, are overlaid in Fig. 8. As shown in Fig. 8a, a systematic monotonic decrease of the average η_{dijet} as a function of the HF transverse energy $E_T^{4<|\eta|<5.2}$ is observed. A decrease in the longitudinal momentum carried by partons that participate in hard scattering coming from the proton, or an increase in the longitudinal momentum of partons from the lead nucleus, with increasing HF transverse energy $E_T^{4<|\eta|<5.2}$ would result in a shift in this direction. In order to compare the shape of the η_{dijet} distributions in the interval $\eta_{dijet} < 0$ the spectra from pPb data are normalized by the number of dijet events with $\eta_{dijet} < 0$ in the corresponding HF activity class. In inclusive pPb collisions, this interval roughly corresponds to $x > 0.1$ for partons in lead, a region where the measurement is sensitive to the nuclear EMC effect [50]. Using this normalization, the shapes of the η_{dijet} distributions in the region $\eta_{dijet} < 0$ are found to be similar, as is shown in Fig. 8b.

Figure 9 summarizes all of the $E_T^{4<|\eta|<5.2}$ dependent dijet results obtained with pPb collisions. A nearly constant width in the dijet azimuthal angle distributions and transverse momentum ratio of the dijets as a function of $E_T^{4<|\eta|<5.2}$ is observed. The lower panels show the mean and standard deviation of the dijet pseudorapidity distribution, measured using jets in the pseudorapidity interval $|\eta| < 3$ in the laboratory frame, as a function of the HF transverse energy. Those quantities change significantly with increasing for-

ward calorimeter transverse energy, while the simulated pp dijets embedded in HIJING MC, representing pPb collisions, show no noticeable changes.

One possible mechanism which could lead to the observed modification of the η_{dijet} distribution in events with large forward activity is the kinematical constraint imposed by the selection. Jets with a given transverse momentum at larger pseudorapidity will have a larger energy ($E = \cosh(\eta)p_T$).

If a large part of the available energy in the collision is observed in the forward calorimeter region, jets above a certain transverse momentum threshold are restricted to be in mid-rapidity, which leads to a narrower dijet pseudorapidity distribution. Moreover, the modification of the PDFs due to the fluctuating size of the proton, as well as the impact parameter dependence of the nuclear PDFs, may further contribute to the observed phenomenon. Therefore, the $\langle \eta_{dijet} \rangle$ is also studied as a function of the forward calorimeter activity in the lead direction (E_T^{Pb}) at fixed values of forward activity in the proton direction (E_T^P).

The correlation between $\langle \eta_{dijet} \rangle$ and E_T^{Pb} in different E_T^P intervals is shown in Fig. 10. With low forward activity in the proton direction ($E_T^P < 5$ GeV, blue circles and solid lines near the top of the figure), the $\langle \eta_{dijet} \rangle$ is around 0.6 and only weakly dependent on the forward activity in the lead direction. The observed high $\langle \eta_{dijet} \rangle$ indicates that the mean x of the parton from the proton in the low E_T^P events is larger than that in inclusive pPb collisions. With high forward activity in the proton direction ($E_T^P > 11$ GeV, red stars and solid lines near the bottom of the figure), the $\langle \eta_{dijet} \rangle$ is found to be decreasing as a function of E_T^{Pb} , from 0.37 to 0.17. These results indicate that the degree of modification of the η_{dijet} distribution is highly dependent on the amount of forward activity in the proton direction.

Fig. 9 Summary of the dijet measurements as a function of $E_T^{4<|\eta|<5.2}$. **a** Fitted $\Delta\phi_{1,2}$ width (σ in Eq. (1)). **b** Average ratio of dijet transverse momentum. **c** Mean of the η_{dijet} distribution. **d** Standard deviation of the η_{dijet} distribution. All panels show pPb data (red solid circles) compared to the PYTHIA + HIJING (black open circles) and PYTHIA (light grey band, where the band width indicates statistical uncertainty) simulations. The inclusive HF activity results for pPb and PYTHIA + HIJING are shown as blue solid and black empty squares, respectively. The yellow, grey and blue boxes indicate the systematic uncertainties and the error bars denote the statistical uncertainties. Note that the legend is spread over the four subfigures





Fig. 10 Mean of η_{dijet} distribution as a function of the raw transverse energy measured in the HF calorimeter in the lead direction (E_T^{Pb}) in bins of forward transverse energy in the proton direction (E_T^{P}). The lines indicate the systematic uncertainty on the points with matching color, and the error bars denote the statistical uncertainties. The results without selection on (E_T^{P}) are also shown as a solid black line with statistical uncertainties represented by the line width. The dashed black lines indicate the systematic uncertainty on the solid black line

7 Summary

The CMS detector has been used to study dijet production in pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{\text{NN}}} = 5.02$ TeV. The anti- k_T algorithm with a distance parameter of 0.3 was used to reconstruct jets based on the combined tracker and calorimeter information. Events containing a leading jet with $p_{T,1} > 120$ GeV/c and a subleading jet with $p_{T,2} > 30$ GeV/c in the pseudorapidity range $|\eta| < 3$ were analyzed. Data were compared to PYTHIA as well as PYTHIA + HIJING dijet simulations. In contrast to what is seen in head-on PbPb collisions, no significant dijet transverse momentum imbalance is observed in pPb data with respect to the simulated distributions. These pPb dijet transverse momentum ratios confirm that the observed dijet transverse momentum imbalance in PbPb collisions is not originating from initial-state effects.

The dijet pseudorapidity distributions in inclusive pPb collisions are compared to NLO calculations using CT10 and CT10 + EPS09 PDFs, and the data more closely match the latter. A strong modification of the dijet pseudorapidity distribution is observed as a function of forward activity. The

mean of the distribution shifts monotonically as a function of $E_T^{4<|\eta|<5.2}$. This indicates a strong correlation between the energy emitted at large pseudorapidity and the longitudinal motion of the dijet frame.

Acknowledgments We would like to thank Jose Guilherme Milhano and Nestor Armesto for their suggestion to study the dijet pseudorapidity shift as a function of HF transverse energy in the proton and lead directions, which extended the scope of this analysis. We congratulate our colleagues in the CERN accelerator departments for the excellent performance of the LHC and thank the technical and administrative staffs at CERN and at other CMS institutes for their contributions to the success of the CMS effort. In addition, we gratefully acknowledge the computing centres and personnel of the Worldwide LHC Computing Grid for delivering so effectively the computing infrastructure essential to our analyses. Finally, we acknowledge the enduring support for the construction and operation of the LHC and the CMS detector provided by the following funding agencies: the Austrian Federal Ministry of Science and Research and the Austrian Science Fund; the Belgian Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique, and Fonds voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek; the Brazilian Funding Agencies (CNPq, CAPES, FAPERJ, and FAPESP); the Bulgarian Ministry of Education and Science; CERN; the Chinese Academy of Sciences, Ministry of Science and Technology, and National Natural Science Foundation of China; the Colombian Funding Agency (COLCIENCIAS); the Croatian Ministry of Science, Education and Sport, and the Croatian Science Foundation; the Research Promotion Foundation, Cyprus; the Ministry of Education and Research, Recurrent financing contract SF0690030s09 and European Regional Development Fund, Estonia; the Academy of Finland, Finnish Ministry of Education and Culture, and Helsinki Institute of Physics; the Institut National de Physique Nucléaire et de Physique des Particules / CNRS, and Commissariat à l'Énergie Atomique et aux Énergies Alternatives / CEA, France; the Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, and Helmholtz-Gemeinschaft Deutscher Forschungszentren, Germany; the General Secretariat for Research and Technology, Greece; the National Scientific Research Foundation, and National Innovation Office, Hungary; the Department of Atomic Energy and the Department of Science and Technology, India; the Institute for Studies in Theoretical Physics and Mathematics, Iran; the Science Foundation, Ireland; the Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Italy; the Korean Ministry of Education, Science and Technology and the World Class University program of NRF, Republic of Korea; the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences; the Ministry of Education, and University of Malaya (Malaysia); the Mexican Funding Agencies (CINVESTAV, CONACYT, SEP, and UASLP-FAI); the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment, New Zealand; the Pakistan Atomic Energy Commission; the Ministry of Science and Higher Education and the National Science Centre, Poland; the Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, Portugal; JINR, Dubna; the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation, the Federal Agency of Atomic Energy of the Russian Federation, Russian Academy of Sciences, and the Russian Foundation for Basic Research; the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of Serbia; the Secretaría de Estado de Investigación, Desarrollo e Innovación and Programa Consolider-Ingenio 2010, Spain; the Swiss Funding Agencies (ETH Board, ETH Zurich, PSI, SNF, UniZH, Canton Zurich, and SER); the National Science Council, Taipei; the Thailand Center of Excellence in Physics, the Institute for the Promotion of Teaching Science and Technology of Thailand, Special Task Force for Activating Research and the National Science and Technology Development Agency of Thailand; the Scientific and Technical Research Council of Turkey, and Turkish Atomic Energy Authority; the Science and Technology Facilities Council, UK; the US Department of Energy, and the US National Science Foundation. Individuals have received support from the Marie-Curie

programme and the European Research Council and EPLANET (European Union); the Leventis Foundation; the A. P. Sloan Foundation; the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation; the Belgian Federal Science Policy Office; the Fonds pour la Formation à la Recherche dans l'Industrie et dans l'Agriculture (FRIA-Belgium); the Agentschap voor Innovatie door Wetenschap en Technologie (IWT-Belgium); the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (MEYS) of Czech Republic; the Council of Science and Industrial Research, India; the Compagnia di San Paolo (Torino); the HOMING PLUS programme of Foundation for Polish Science, cofinanced by EU, Regional Development Fund; and the Thalys and Aristeia programmes cofinanced by EU-ESF and the Greek NSRF.

Open Access This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License which permits any use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and the source are credited.

Funded by SCOAP³ / License Version CC BY 4.0.

References

1. F. Karsch, E. Laermann, Thermodynamics and in-medium hadron properties from lattice QCD, in *Quark–Gluon Plasma III*, ed by R. Hwa, p. 1. (Hackensack, USA, 2003). [arXiv:hep-lat/0305025](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-lat/0305025)
2. J.C. Collins, M.J. Perry, Superdense matter: neutrons or asymptotically free quarks? *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **34**, 1353 (1975). doi:[10.1103/PhysRevLett.34.1353](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.34.1353)
3. N. Cabibbo, G. Parisi, Exponential hadronic spectrum and quark liberation. *Phys. Lett. B* **59**, 67 (1975). doi:[10.1016/0370-2693\(75\)90158-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693(75)90158-6)
4. B.A. Freedman, L.D. McLerran, Fermions and gauge vector mesons at finite temperature and density. III. The ground-state energy of a relativistic quark gas. *Phys. Rev. D* **16**, 1169 (1977). doi:[10.1103/PhysRevD.16.1169](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.16.1169)
5. E.V. Shuryak, Theory of hadronic plasma. *Sov. Phys. JETP* **47**, 212 (1978)
6. D.A. Appel, Jets as a probe of quark–gluon plasmas. *Phys. Rev. D* **33**, 717 (1986). doi:[10.1103/PhysRevD.33.717](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.33.717)
7. J.P. Blaizot, L.D. McLerran, Jets in expanding quark–gluon plasmas. *Phys. Rev. D* **34**, 2739 (1986). doi:[10.1103/PhysRevD.34.2739](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.34.2739)
8. C.M.S. Collaboration, Observation and studies of jet quenching in PbPb collisions at nucleon–nucleon center-of-mass energy = 2.76 TeV. *Phys. Rev. C* **84**, 024906 (2011). doi:[10.1103/PhysRevC.84.024906](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.84.024906), [arXiv:1102.1957](https://arxiv.org/abs/1102.1957)
9. ATLAS Collaboration, Observation of a centrality-dependent Dijet asymmetry in lead–lead collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV with the ATLAS detector at the LHC, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 252303 (2010). doi:[10.1103/PhysRevLett.105.252303](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.105.252303), [arXiv:1011.6182](https://arxiv.org/abs/1011.6182)
10. C.M.S. Collaboration, Jet momentum dependence of jet quenching in PbPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV. *Phys. Lett. B* **712**, 176 (2012). doi:[10.1016/j.physletb.2012.04.058](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2012.04.058), [arXiv:1202.5022](https://arxiv.org/abs/1202.5022)
11. C.M.S. Collaboration, Studies of jet quenching using isolated-photon+jet correlations in PbPb and pp collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV. *Phys. Lett. B* **718**, 773 (2013). doi:[10.1016/j.physletb.2012.11.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2012.11.003), [arXiv:1205.0206](https://arxiv.org/abs/1205.0206)
12. ATLAS Collaboration, Measurement of the jet radius and transverse momentum dependence of inclusive jet suppression in lead–lead collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV with the ATLAS detector, *Phys. Lett. B* **719**, 220 (2013). doi:[10.1016/j.physletb.2013.01.024](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2013.01.024), [arXiv:1208.1967](https://arxiv.org/abs/1208.1967)
13. CMS Collaboration, Measurement of jet fragmentation into charged particles in pp and PbPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV, *JHEP* **1210**, 087 (2012). doi:[10.1007/JHEP10.087](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP10.087), [arXiv:1205.5872](https://arxiv.org/abs/1205.5872)

14. ALICE Collaboration, Particle-yield modification in jet-like azimuthal di-hadron correlations in Pb–Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 092301 (2012). doi:[10.1103/PhysRevLett.108.092301](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.108.092301), arXiv:[1110.0121](https://arxiv.org/abs/1110.0121)
15. C.M.S. Collaboration, Modification of jet shapes in PbPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV. Phys. Lett. B **730**, 243–263 (2014) doi:[10.1016/j.physletb.2014.01.042](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2014.01.042), arXiv:[1310.0878](https://arxiv.org/abs/1310.0878)
16. C.M.S. Collaboration, Study of high- p_T charged particle suppression in PbPb compared to pp collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV. Eur. Phys. J. C **72**, 1945 (2012). doi:[10.1140/epjc/s10052-012-1945-x](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-012-1945-x). arXiv:[1202.2554](https://arxiv.org/abs/1202.2554)
17. ALICE Collaboration, Suppression of charged particle production at large transverse momentum in central Pb–Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV, Phys. Lett. B **696**, 30 (2011). doi:[10.1016/j.physletb.2010.12.020](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2010.12.020), arXiv:[1012.1004](https://arxiv.org/abs/1012.1004)
18. Y. He, I. Vitev, B.-W. Zhang, $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^3)$ Analysis of inclusive jet and dijet production in heavy ion reactions at the Large Hadron Collider. Phys. Lett. B **713**, 224 (2012). doi:[10.1016/j.physletb.2012.05.054](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2012.05.054). arXiv:[1105.2566](https://arxiv.org/abs/1105.2566)
19. C. Young, B. Schenke, S. Jeon, C. Gale, Dijet asymmetry at the energies available at the CERN Large Hadron Collider. Phys. Rev. C **84**, 024907 (2011). doi:[10.1103/PhysRevC.84.024907](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.84.024907). arXiv:[1103.5769](https://arxiv.org/abs/1103.5769)
20. G.-Y. Qin, B. Muller, Explanation of Dijet asymmetry in Pb–Pb collisions at the Large Hadron Collider. Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 162302 (2011). doi:[10.1103/PhysRevLett.106.162302](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.106.162302). arXiv:[1012.5280](https://arxiv.org/abs/1012.5280). Erratum at doi:[10.1103/PhysRevLett.108.189904](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.108.189904)
21. C.A. Salgado et al., Proton–nucleus collisions at the LHC: scientific opportunities and requirements. J. Phys. G **39**, 015010 (2012). doi:[10.1088/0954-3899/39/1/015010](https://doi.org/10.1088/0954-3899/39/1/015010). arXiv:[1105.3919](https://arxiv.org/abs/1105.3919)
22. J.L. Albacete et al., Predictions for p+Pb Collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5$ TeV. Int. J. Mod. Phys. E **22**, 1330007 (2013). doi:[10.1142/S0218301313300075](https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218301313300075). arXiv:[1301.3395](https://arxiv.org/abs/1301.3395)
23. K.J. Eskola, V.J. Kolhinen, P.V. Ruuskanen, Scale evolution of nuclear parton distributions. Nucl. Phys. B **535**, 351 (1998). doi:[10.1016/S0550-3213\(98\)00589-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0550-3213(98)00589-6). arXiv:[hep-ph/9802350](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/9802350)
24. K.J. Eskola, H. Paukkunen, C.A. Salgado, EPS09—a new generation of NLO and LO nuclear parton distribution functions. JHEP **04**, 065 (2009). doi:[10.1088/1126-6708/2009/04/065](https://doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2009/04/065), arXiv:[0902.4154](https://arxiv.org/abs/0902.4154)
25. M. Hirai, S. Kumano, T.-H. Nagai, Nuclear parton distribution functions and their uncertainties. Phys. Rev. C **70**, 044905 (2004). doi:[10.1103/PhysRevC.70.044905](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.70.044905). arXiv:[hep-ph/0404093](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0404093)
26. I. Schienbein et al., Parton distribution function nuclear corrections for charged lepton and neutrino deep inelastic scattering processes. Phys. Rev. D **80**, 094004 (2009). doi:[10.1103/PhysRevD.80.094004](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.80.094004). arXiv:[0907.2357](https://arxiv.org/abs/0907.2357)
27. D. de Florian, R. Sassot, Nuclear parton distributions at next-to-leading order. Phys. Rev. D **69**, 074028 (2004). doi:[10.1103/PhysRevD.69.074028](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.69.074028). arXiv:[hep-ph/0311227](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0311227)
28. L. Frankfurt, V. Guzey, M. Strikman, Leading twist nuclear shadowing phenomena in hard processes with nuclei. Phys. Rept. **512**, 255 (2012). doi:[10.1016/j.physrep.2011.12.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physrep.2011.12.002). arXiv:[1106.2091](https://arxiv.org/abs/1106.2091)
29. M. Cacciari, G.P. Salam, G. Soyez, The anti- k_r jet clustering algorithm. JHEP **04**, 063 (2008). doi:[10.1088/1126-6708/2008/04/063](https://doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2008/04/063), arXiv:[0802.1189](https://arxiv.org/abs/0802.1189)
30. M. Cacciari, G.P. Salam, G. Soyez, FastJet user manual. Eur. Phys. J. C **72**, 1896 (2012). doi:[10.1140/epjc/s10052-012-1896-2](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-012-1896-2). arXiv:[1111.6097](https://arxiv.org/abs/1111.6097)
31. CMS Collaboration, The CMS experiment at the CERN LHC. JINST **3**, S08004 (2008). doi:[10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08004](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08004)
32. Nucl. Instrum. Meth. GEANT4—a simulation toolkit. **506**, 250 (2003). doi:[10.1016/S0168-9002\(03\)01368-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9002(03)01368-8)
33. CMS Collaboration, Particle–flow event reconstruction in CMS and performance for jets, Taos, and E_T^{miss} , CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-PFT-09-001 (2009)
34. CMS Collaboration, Commissioning of the particle-flow event reconstruction with the first LHC collisions recorded in the CMS detector, CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-PFT-10-001 (2010)
35. O. Kodolova, I. Vardanian, A. Nikitenko, A. Oulianov, The performance of the jet identification and reconstruction in heavy ions collisions with CMS detector. Eur. Phys. J. C **50**, 117 (2007). doi:[10.1140/epjc/s10052-007-0223-9](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-007-0223-9)
36. CMS Collaboration, Determination of jet energy calibration and transverse momentum resolution in CMS. JINST **6**, P11002 (2011). doi:[10.1088/1748-0221/6/11/P11002](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/6/11/P11002), arXiv:[1107.4277](https://arxiv.org/abs/1107.4277)
37. T. Sjöstrand, S. Mrenna, P. Skands, PYTHIA 6.4 physics and manual, JHEP **05**, 026 (2006). doi:[10.1088/1126-6708/2006/05/026](https://doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2006/05/026), arXiv:[hep-ph/0603175](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0603175)
38. R. Field, Early LHC, (Underlying Event Data—Findings and Surprises) (2010). arXiv:[1010.3558](https://arxiv.org/abs/1010.3558)
39. X.-N. Wang, M. Gyulassy, HIJING: A Monte Carlo model for multiple jet production in pp, pA, and AA collisions. Phys. Rev. D **44**, 3501 (1991). doi:[10.1103/PhysRevD.44.3501](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.44.3501)
40. M. Gyulassy, X.-N. Wang, HIJING 1.0: A Monte Carlo program for parton and particle production in high-energy hadronic and nuclear collisions. Comput. Phys. Commun. **83**, 307 (1994). doi:[10.1016/0010-4655\(94\)90057-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-4655(94)90057-4). arXiv:[nucl-th/9502021](https://arxiv.org/abs/nucl-th/9502021)
41. C.M.S. Collaboration, CMS tracking performance results from early LHC operation. Eur. Phys. J. C **70**, 1165 (2010). doi:[10.1140/epjc/s10052-010-1491-3](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-010-1491-3). arXiv:[1007.1988](https://arxiv.org/abs/1007.1988)
42. CMS Collaboration, Electromagnetic calorimeter commissioning and first results with 7TeV data, CMS Note CMS-NOTE-2010-012 (2010)
43. CMS Collaboration, Identification and filtering of uncharacteristic noise in the CMS hadron calorimeter, JINST **5**, T03014 (2010). doi:[10.1088/1748-0221/5/03/T03014](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/5/03/T03014), arXiv:[0911.4881](https://arxiv.org/abs/0911.4881)
44. CMS Collaboration, Study of the production of charged pions, kaons, and protons in pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV (2013). arXiv:[1307.3442](https://arxiv.org/abs/1307.3442) (Submitted to EPJC)
45. C.M.S. Collaboration, Multiplicity and transverse momentum dependence of two- and four-particle correlations in pPb and PbPb collisions. Phys. Lett. B **724**, 213 (2013). doi:[10.1016/j.physletb.2013.06.028](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2013.06.028). arXiv:[1305.0609](https://arxiv.org/abs/1305.0609)
46. J. Casalderey-Solana, J.G. Milhano, U.A. Wiedemann, Jet quenching via jet collimation. J. Phys. G **38**, 035006 (2011). doi:[10.1088/0954-3899/38/3/035006](https://doi.org/10.1088/0954-3899/38/3/035006). arXiv:[1012.0745](https://arxiv.org/abs/1012.0745)
47. K. Eskola, H. Paukkunen, C. Salgado, A perturbative QCD study of dijets in p+Pb collisions at the LHC, JHEP **10**, 213 (2013). doi:[10.1007/JHEP10\(2013\)213](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP10(2013)213)
48. H.-L. Lai et al., New parton distributions for collider physics. Phys. Rev. D **82**, 074024 (2010). doi:[10.1103/PhysRevD.82.074024](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.82.074024). arXiv:[1007.2241](https://arxiv.org/abs/1007.2241)
49. I. Helenius, K. J. Eskola, H. Honkanen, C.A. Salgado, Impact-parameter dependent nuclear parton distribution functions: EPS09s and EKS98s and their applications in nuclear hard processes. JHEP **1207**, 073 (2012). doi:[10.1007/JHEP07\(2012\)073](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07(2012)073), arXiv:[1205.5359](https://arxiv.org/abs/1205.5359)
50. P.R. Norton, The EMC effect. Rept. Prog. Phys. **66**, 1253 (2003). doi:[10.1088/0034-4885/66/8/201](https://doi.org/10.1088/0034-4885/66/8/201)

The CMS Collaboration**Yerevan Physics Institute, Yerevan, Armenia**

S. Chatrchyan, V. Khachatryan, A. M. Sirunyan, A. Tumasyan

Institut für Hochenergiephysik der OeAW, Wien, Austria

W. Adam, T. Bergauer, M. Dragicevic, J. Erö, C. Fabjan¹, M. Friedl, R. Frühwirth¹, V. M. Ghete, C. Hartl, N. Hörmann, J. Hrubec, M. Jeitler¹, W. Kiesenhofer, V. Knünz, M. Krammer¹, I. Krätschmer, D. Liko, I. Mikulec, D. Rabady², B. Rahbaran, H. Rohringer, R. Schöfbeck, J. Strauss, A. Taurok, W. Treberer-Treberspurg, W. Waltenberger, C.-E. Wulz¹

National Centre for Particle and High Energy Physics, Minsk, Belarus

V. Mossolov, N. Shumeiko, J. Suarez Gonzalez

Universiteit Antwerpen, Antwerpen, Belgium

S. Alderweireldt, M. Bansal, S. Bansal, T. Cornelis, E. A. De Wolf, X. Janssen, A. Knutsson, S. Luyckx, L. Mucibello, S. Ochesanu, B. Roland, R. Rougny, H. Van Haevermaet, P. Van Mechelen, N. Van Remortel, A. Van Spilbeeck

Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussel, Belgium

F. Blekman, S. Blyweert, J. D'Hondt, N. Heracleous, A. Kalogeropoulos, J. Keaveney, T. J. Kim, S. Lowette, M. Maes, A. Olbrechts, D. Strom, S. Tavernier, W. Van Doninck, P. Van Mulders, G. P. Van Onsem, I. Villella

Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium

C. Caillol, B. Clerbaux, G. De Lentdecker, L. Favart, A. P. R. Gay, A. Léonard, P. E. Marage, A. Mohammadi, L. Perniè, T. Reis, T. Seva, L. Thomas, C. Vander Velde, P. Vanlaer, J. Wang

Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

V. Adler, K. Beernaert, L. Benucci, A. Cimmino, S. Costantini, S. Dildick, G. Garcia, B. Klein, J. Lellouch, J. McCartin, A. A. Ocampo Rios, D. Ryckbosch, S. Salva Diblen, M. Sigamani, N. Strobbe, F. Thyssen, M. Tytgat, S. Walsh, E. Yazgan, N. Zaganidis

Université Catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium

S. Basegmez, C. Beluffi³, G. Bruno, R. Castello, A. Caudron, L. Ceard, G. G. Da Silveira, C. Delaere, T. du Pree, D. Favart, L. Forthomme, A. Giammanco⁴, J. Hollar, P. Jez, M. Komm, V. Lemaitre, J. Liao, O. Militaru, C. Nuttens, D. Pagano, A. Pin, K. Piotrkowski, A. Popov⁵, L. Quertenmont, M. Selvaggi, M. Vidal Marono, J. M. Vizan Garcia

Université de Mons, Mons, Belgium

N. Belyi, T. Caebegs, E. Daubie, G. H. Hammad

Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Fisicas, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

G. A. Alves, M. Correa Martins Junior, T. Martins, M. E. Pol, M. H. G. Souza

Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

W. L. Aldá Júnior, W. Carvalho, J. Chinellato⁶, A. Custódio, E. M. Da Costa, D. De Jesus Damiao, C. De Oliveira Martins, S. Fonseca De Souza, H. Malbouisson, M. Malek, D. Matos Figueiredo, L. Mundim, H. Nogima, W. L. Prado Da Silva, J. Santaolalla, A. Santoro, A. Sznajder, E. J. Tonelli Manganote⁶, A. Vilela Pereira

Universidade Estadual Paulista, São Paulo, Brazil

F. A. Dias⁷, T. R. Fernandez Perez Tomei, C. Lagana, S. F. Novaes, Sandra S. Padula

Universidade Federal do ABC, São Paulo, Brazil

C. A. Bernardes, E. M. Gregores, P. G. Mercadante

Institute for Nuclear Research and Nuclear Energy, Sofia, Bulgaria

V. Genchev², P. Iaydjiev², A. Marinov, S. Piperov, M. Rodozov, G. Sultanov, M. Vutova

University of Sofia, Sofia, Bulgaria

A. Dimitrov, I. Glushkov, R. Hadjiiska, V. Kozuharov, L. Litov, B. Pavlov, P. Petkov

Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing, China

J. G. Bian, G. M. Chen, H. S. Chen, M. Chen, R. Du, C. H. Jiang, D. Liang, S. Liang, X. Meng, R. Plestina⁸, J. Tao, X. Wang, Z. Wang

State Key Laboratory of Nuclear Physics and Technology, Peking University, Beijing, China

C. Asawatangtrakuldee, Y. Ban, Y. Guo, Q. Li, W. Li, S. Liu, Y. Mao, S. J. Qian, D. Wang, L. Zhang, W. Zou

Universidad de Los Andes, Bogota, Colombia

C. Avila, C. A. Carrillo Montoya, L. F. Chaparro Sierra, C. Florez, J. P. Gomez, B. Gomez Moreno, J. C. Sanabria

Technical University of Split, Split, Croatia

N. Godinovic, D. Lelas, D. Polic, I. Puljak

University of Split, Split, Croatia

Z. Antunovic, M. Kovac

Institute Rudjer Boskovic, Zagreb, Croatia

V. Brigljevic, K. Kadija, J. Luetic, D. Mekterovic, S. Morovic, L. Tikvica

University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus

A. Attikis, G. Mavromanolakis, J. Mousa, C. Nicolaou, F. Ptochos, P. A. Razis

Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

M. Finger, M. Finger Jr.

Academy of Scientific Research and Technology of the Arab Republic of Egypt, Egyptian Network of High Energy Physics, Cairo, Egypt

A. A. Abdelalim⁹, Y. Assran¹⁰, S. Elgammal⁹, A. Ellithi Kamel¹¹, M. A. Mahmoud¹², A. Radi^{13,14}

National Institute of Chemical Physics and Biophysics, Tallinn, Estonia

M. Kadastik, M. Müntel, M. Murumaa, M. Raidal, L. Rebane, A. Tiko

Department of Physics, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

P. Eerola, G. Fedi, M. Voutilainen

Helsinki Institute of Physics, Helsinki, Finland

J. Härkönen, V. Karimäki, R. Kinnunen, M. J. Kortelainen, T. Lampén, K. Lassila-Perini, S. Lehti, T. Lindén, P. Luukka, T. Mäenpää, T. Peltola, E. Tuominen, J. Tuominiemi, E. Tuovinen, L. Wendland

Lappeenranta University of Technology, Lappeenranta, Finland

T. Tuuva

DSM/IRFU, CEA/Saclay, Gif-sur-Yvette, France

M. Besancon, F. Couderc, M. Dejardin, D. Denegri, B. Fabbro, J. L. Faure, F. Ferri, S. Ganjour, A. Givernaud, P. Gras, G. Hamel de Monchenault, P. Jarry, E. Locci, J. Malcles, A. Nayak, J. Rander, A. Rosowsky, M. Titov

Laboratoire Leprince-Ringuet, Ecole Polytechnique, IN2P3-CNRS, Palaiseau, France

S. Baffioni, F. Beaudette, P. Busson, C. Charlot, N. Daci, T. Dahms, M. Dalchenko, L. Dobrzynski, A. Florent, R. Granier de Cassagnac, P. Miné, C. Mironov, I. N. Naranjo, M. Nguyen, C. Ochando, P. Paganini, D. Sabes, R. Salerno, Y. Sirois, C. Veelken, Y. Yilmaz, A. Zabi

Institut Pluridisciplinaire Hubert Curien, Université de Strasbourg, Université de Haute Alsace Mulhouse, CNRS/IN2P3, Strasbourg, France

J.-L. Agram¹⁵, J. Andrea, D. Bloch, J.-M. Brom, E. C. Chabert, C. Collard, E. Conte¹⁵, F. Drouhin¹⁵, J.-C. Fontaine¹⁵, D. Gelé, U. Goerlach, C. Goetzmann, P. Juillot, A.-C. Le Bihan, P. Van Hove

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

S. Gadrat

Institut de Physique Nucléaire de Lyon, Université de Lyon, Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, CNRS-IN2P3, Villeurbanne, France

S. Beauceron, N. Beaupere, G. Boudoul, S. Brochet, J. Chasserat, R. Chierici, D. Contardo, P. Depasse, H. El Mamouni, J. Fan, J. Fay, S. Gascon, M. Gouzevitch, B. Ille, T. Kurca, M. Lethuillier, L. Mirabito, S. Perries, J. D. Ruiz Alvarez, L. Sgandurra, V. Sordini, M. Vander Donckt, P. Verdier, S. Viret, H. Xiao

Institute of High Energy Physics and Informatization, Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia

Z. Tsamalaidze¹⁶

RWTH Aachen University, I. Physikalisches Institut, Aachen, Germany

C. Autermann, S. Beranek, M. Bontenackels, B. Calpas, M. Edelhoff, L. Feld, O. Hindrichs, K. Klein, A. Ostapchuk, A. Perieanu, F. Raupach, J. Sammet, S. Schael, D. Sprenger, H. Weber, B. Wittmer, V. Zhukov⁵

RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut A, Aachen, Germany

M. Ata, J. Caudron, E. Dietz-Laursonn, D. Duchardt, M. Erdmann, R. Fischer, A. Güth, T. Hebbeker, C. Heidemann, K. Hoepfner, D. Klingebiel, S. Knutzen, P. Kreuzer, M. Merschmeyer, A. Meyer, M. Olschewski, K. Padeken, P. Papacz, H. Reithler, S. A. Schmitz, L. Sonnenschein, D. Teysier, S. Thüer, M. Weber

RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut B, Aachen, Germany

V. Cherepanov, Y. Erdogan, G. Flügge, H. Geenen, M. Geisler, W. Haj Ahmad, F. Hoehle, B. Kargoll, T. Kress, Y. Kuessel, J. Lingemann², A. Nowack, I. M. Nugent, L. Perchalla, O. Pooth, A. Stahl

Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Hamburg, Germany

I. Asin, N. Bartosik, J. Behr, W. Behrenhoff, U. Behrens, A. J. Bell, M. Bergholz¹⁷, A. Bethani, K. Borras, A. Burgmeier, A. Cakir, L. Calligaris, A. Campbell, S. Choudhury, F. Costanza, C. Diez Pardos, S. Dooling, T. Dorland, G. Eckerlin, D. Eckstein, T. Eichhorn, G. Flucke, A. Geiser, A. Grebenyuk, P. Gunnellini, S. Habib, J. Hauk, G. Hellwig, M. Hempel, D. Horton, H. Jung, M. Kasemann, P. Katsas, J. Kieseler, C. Kleinwort, M. Krämer, D. Krücker, W. Lange, J. Leonard, K. Lipka, W. Lohmann¹⁷, B. Lutz, R. Mankel, I. Marfin, I.-A. Melzer-Pellmann, A. B. Meyer, J. Mnich, A. Mussgiller, S. Naumann-Emme, O. Novgorodova, F. Nowak, H. Perrey, A. Petrukhin, D. Pitzl, R. Placakyte, A. Raspereza, P. M. Ribeiro Cipriano, C. Riedl, E. Ron, M. Ö. Sahin, J. Salfeld-Nebgen, P. Saxena, R. Schmidt¹⁷, T. Schoerner-Sadenius, M. Schröder, M. Stein, A. D. R. Vargas Trevino, R. Walsh, C. Wissing

University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany

M. Aldaya Martin, V. Blobel, H. Enderle, J. Erfle, E. Garutti, K. Goebel, M. Görner, M. Gosselink, J. Haller, R. S. Höing, H. Kirschenmann, R. Klanner, R. Kogler, J. Lange, I. Marchesini, J. Ott, T. Peiffer, N. Pietsch, D. Rathjens, C. Sander, H. Schettler, P. Schleper, E. Schlieckau, A. Schmidt, M. Seidel, J. Sibille¹⁸, V. Sola, H. Stadie, G. Steinbrück, D. Troendle, E. Usai, L. Vanelderen

Institut für Experimentelle Kernphysik, Karlsruhe, Germany

C. Barth, C. Baus, J. Berger, C. Böser, E. Butz, T. Chwalek, W. De Boer, A. Descroix, A. Dierlamm, M. Feindt, M. Guthoff², F. Hartmann², T. Hauth², H. Held, K. H. Hoffmann, U. Husemann, I. Katkov⁵, A. Kornmayer², E. Kuznetsova, P. Lobelle Pardo, D. Martschei, M. U. Mozer, Th. Müller, M. Niegel, A. Nürnberg, O. Oberst, G. Quast, K. Rabbertz, F. Ratnikov, S. Röcker, F.-P. Schilling, G. Schott, H. J. Simonis, F. M. Stober, R. Ulrich, J. Wagner-Kuhr, S. Wayand, T. Weiler, R. Wolf, M. Zeise

Institute of Nuclear and Particle Physics (INPP), NCSR Demokritos, Aghia Paraskevi, Greece

G. Anagnostou, G. Daskalakis, T. Gerasis, S. Kesisoglou, A. Kyriakis, D. Loukas, A. Markou, C. Markou, E. Ntomari, A. Psallidas, I. Topsis-geiotis

University of Athens, Athens, Greece

L. Gouskos, A. Panagiotou, N. Saoulidou, E. Stiliaris

University of Ioánnina, Ioánnina, Greece

X. Aslanoglou, I. Evangelou, G. Flouris, C. Foudas, P. Kokkas, N. Manthos, I. Papadopoulos, E. Paradas

Wigner Research Centre for Physics, Budapest, Hungary

G. Bencze, C. Hajdu, P. Hidas, D. Horvath¹⁹, F. Sikler, V. Veszpremi, G. Vesztergombi²⁰, A. J. Zsigmond

Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary

N. Beni, S. Czellar, J. Molnar, J. Palinkas, Z. Szillasi

University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary

J. Karancsi, P. Raics, Z. L. Trocsanyi, B. Ujvari

National Institute of Science Education and Research, Bhubaneswar, India

S. K. Swain

Panjab University, Chandigarh, India

S. B. Beri, V. Bhatnagar, N. Dhingra, R. Gupta, M. Kaur, M. Z. Mehta, M. Mittal, N. Nishu, A. Sharma, J. B. Singh

University of Delhi, Delhi, India

Ashok Kumar, Arun Kumar, S. Ahuja, A. Bhardwaj, B. C. Choudhary, A. Kumar, S. Malhotra, M. Naimuddin, K. Ranjan, V. Sharma, R. K. Shivpuri

Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, Kolkata, India

S. Banerjee, S. Bhattacharya, K. Chatterjee, S. Dutta, B. Gomber, Sa. Jain, Sh. Jain, R. Khurana, A. Modak, S. Mukherjee, D. Roy, S. Sarkar, M. Sharan, A. P. Singh

Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, Mumbai, India

A. Abdulsalam, D. Dutta, S. Kailas, V. Kumar, A. K. Mohanty², L. M. Pant, P. Shukla, A. Topkar

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-EHEP, Mumbai, India

T. Aziz, R. M. Chatterjee, S. Ganguly, S. Ghosh, M. Guchait²¹, A. Gurtu²², G. Kole, S. Kumar, M. Maity²³, G. Majumder, K. Mazumdar, G. B. Mohanty, B. Parida, K. Sudhakar, N. Wickramage²⁴

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-HECR, Mumbai, India

S. Banerjee, S. Dugad

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

H. Arfaei, H. Bakhshiansohi, H. Behnamian, S. M. Etesami²⁵, A. Fahim²⁶, A. Jafari, M. Khakzad, M. Mohammadi Najafabadi, M. Naseri, S. Paktinat Mehdiabadi, B. Safarzadeh²⁷, M. Zeinali

University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland

M. Grunewald

INFN Sezione di Bari, Bari, Italy

M. Abbrescia, L. Barbone, C. Calabria, S. S. Chhibra, A. Colaleo, D. Creanza, N. De Filippis, M. De Palma, L. Fiore, G. Iaselli, G. Maggi, M. Maggi, B. Marangelli, S. My, S. Nuzzo, N. Pacifico, A. Pompili, G. Pugliese, R. Radogna, G. Selvaggi, L. Silvestris, G. Singh, R. Venditti, P. Verwilligen, G. Zito

Università di Bari, Bari, Italy

M. Abbrescia, L. Barbone, C. Calabria, S. S. Chhibra, M. De Palma, B. Marangelli, S. Nuzzo, A. Pompili, R. Radogna, G. Selvaggi, G. Singh, R. Venditti

Politecnico di Bari, Bari, Italy

D. Creanza, N. De Filippis, G. Iaselli, G. Maggi, S. My, G. Pugliese

INFN Sezione di Bologna, Bologna, Italy

G. Abbiendi, A. C. Benvenuti, D. Bonacorsi, S. Braibant-Giacomelli, L. Brigliadori, R. Campanini, P. Capiluppi, A. Castro, F. R. Cavallo, G. Codispoti, M. Cuffiani, G. M. Dallavalle, F. Fabbri, A. Fanfani, D. Fasanella, P. Giacomelli, C. Grandi, L. Guiducci, S. Marcellini, G. Masetti, M. Meneghelli, A. Montanari, F. L. Navarria, F. Odorici, A. Perrotta, F. Primavera, A. M. Rossi, T. Rovelli, G. P. Siroli, N. Tosi, R. Travaglini

Università di Bologna, Bologna, Italy

D. Bonacorsi, S. Braibant-Giacomelli, L. Brigliadori, R. Campanini, P. Capiluppi, A. Castro, G. Codispoti, M. Cuffiani, A. Fanfani, D. Fasanella, L. Guiducci, M. Meneghelli, F. L. Navarria, F. Primavera, A. M. Rossi, T. Rovelli, G. P. Siroli, N. Tosi, R. Travaglini

INFN Sezione di Catania, Catania, Italy

S. Albergo, G. Cappello, M. Chiorboli, S. Costa, F. Giordano², R. Potenza, A. Tricomi, C. Tuve

Università di Catania, Catania, Italy

S. Albergo, M. Chiorboli, S. Costa, R. Potenza, A. Tricomi, C. Tuve

INFN Sezione di Firenze, Firenze, Italy

G. Barbagli, V. Ciulli, C. Civinini, R. D'Alessandro, E. Focardi, E. Gallo, S. Gonzi, V. Gori, P. Lenzi, M. Meschini, S. Paoletti, G. Sguazzoni, A. Tropiano

Università di Firenze, Firenze, Italy

V. Ciulli, R. D'Alessandro, E. Focardi, S. Gonzi, V. Gori, P. Lenzi, A. Tropiano

INFN Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, Frascati, Italy

L. Benussi, S. Bianco, F. Fabbri, D. Piccolo

INFN Sezione di Genova, Genova, Italy

P. Fabbriatore, R. Ferretti, F. Ferro, M. Lo Vetere, R. Musenich, E. Robutti, S. Tosi

Università di Genova, Genova, Italy

R. Ferretti, M. Lo Vetere, S. Tosi

INFN Sezione di Milano-Bicocca, Milan, Italy

A. Benaglia, M. E. Dinardo, S. Fiorendi², S. Gennai, A. Ghezzi, P. Govoni, M. T. Lucchini², S. Malvezzi, R. A. Manzoni², A. Martelli², D. Menasce, L. Moroni, M. Paganoni, D. Pedrini, S. Ragazzi, N. Redaelli, T. Tabarelli de Fatis

Università di Milano-Bicocca, Milan, Italy

M. E. Dinardo, S. Fiorendi², A. Ghezzi, P. Govoni, M. T. Lucchini², R. A. Manzoni², A. Martelli², M. Paganoni, S. Ragazzi, T. Tabarelli de Fatis

INFN Sezione di Napoli, Naples, Italy

S. Buontempo, N. Cavallo, F. Fabozzi, A. O. M. Iorio, L. Lista, S. Meola², M. Merola, P. Paolucci²

Università di Napoli 'Federico II', Naples, Italy

A. O. M. Iorio

Università della Basilicata (Potenza), Naples, Italy

N. Cavallo, F. Fabozzi

Università G. Marconi (Roma), Naples, Italy

S. Meola²

INFN Sezione di Padova, Padua, Italy

P. Azzi, N. Bacchetta, M. Bellato, D. Bisello, A. Branca, R. Carlin, T. Dorigo, F. Fanzago, M. Galanti², F. Gasparini, U. Gasparini, P. Giubilato, F. Gonella, A. Gozzelino, K. Kanishchev, S. Lacaprara, I. Lazzizzera, M. Margoni, A.T. Meneguzzo, J. Pazzini, N. Pozzobon, P. Ronchese, F. Simonetto, E. Torassa, M. Tosi, S. Vanini, P. Zotto, A. Zucchetta, G. Zumerle

Università di Padova, Padua, Italy

D. Bisello, A. Branca, R. Carlin, M. Galanti, F. Gasparini, U. Gasparini, P. Giubilato, M. Margoni, A.T. Meneguzzo, J. Pazzini, N. Pozzobon, P. Ronchese, F. Simonetto, M. Tosi, S. Vanini, P. Zotto, A. Zucchetta, G. Zumerle

Università di Trento (Trento), Padua, Italy

K. Kanishchev, I. Lazzizzera

INFN Sezione di Pavia, Pavia, Italy

M. Gabusi, S. P. Ratti, C. Riccardi, P. Vitulo

Università di Pavia, Pavia, Italy

M. Gabusi, S. P. Ratti, C. Riccardi, P. Vitulo

INFN Sezione di Perugia, Pavia, Italy

M. Biasini, G. M. Bilei, L. Fanò, P. Lariccia, G. Mantovani, M. Menichelli, F. Romeo, A. Saha, A. Santocchia, A. Spiezia

Università di Perugia, Pavia, Italy

M. Biasini, L. Fanò, P. Lariccia, G. Mantovani, F. Romeo, A. Santocchia, A. Spiezia

INFN Sezione di Pisa, Pisa, Italy

K. Androsov²⁸, P. Azzurri, G. Bagliesi, J. Bernardini, T. Boccali, G. Broccolo, R. Castaldi, M. A. Ciocci²⁸, R. Dell'Orso, F. Fiori, L. Foà, A. Giassi, M. T. Grippo²⁸, A. Kraan, F. Ligabue, T. Lomtadze, L. Martini, A. Messineo, C. S. Moon²⁹, F. Palla, A. Rizzi, A. Savoy-Navarro³⁰, A. T. Serban, P. Spagnolo, P. Squillacioti²⁸, R. Tenchini, G. Tonelli, A. Venturi, P. G. Verdini, C. Vernieri

Università di Pisa, Pisa, Italy

L. Martini, A. Messineo, A. Rizzi

Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Pisa, Italy

G. Broccolo, F. Fiori, L. Foà, F. Ligabue, C. Vernieri

INFN Sezione di Roma, Rome, Italy

L. Barone, F. Cavallari, D. Del Re, M. Diemoz, M. Grassi, C. Jorda, E. Longo, F. Margaroli, P. Meridiani, F. Micheli, S. Nourbakhsh, G. Organtini, R. Paramatti, S. Rahatlou, C. Rovelli, L. Soffi, P. Traczyk

Università di Roma, Rome, Italy

L. Barone, D. Del Re, M. Grassi, E. Longo, F. Margaroli, F. Micheli, S. Nourbakhsh, G. Organtini, S. Rahatlou, L. Soffi, P. Traczyk

INFN Sezione di Torino, Turin, Italy

N. Amapane, R. Arcidiacono, S. Argiro, M. Arneodo, R. Bellan, C. Biino, N. Cartiglia, S. Casasso, M. Costa, A. Degano, N. Demaria, C. Mariotti, S. Maselli, E. Migliore, V. Monaco, M. Musich, M. M. Obertino, G. Ortona, L. Pacher, N. Pastrone, M. Pelliccioni², A. Potenza, A. Romero, M. Ruspa, R. Sacchi, A. Solano, A. Staiano, U. Tamponi

Università di Torino, Turin, Italy

N. Amapane, S. Argiro, R. Bellan, S. Casasso, M. Costa, A. Degano, E. Migliore, V. Monaco, G. Ortona, L. Pacher, A. Potenza, A. Romero, R. Sacchi, A. Solano

Università del Piemonte Orientale (Novara), Turin, Italy

R. Arcidiacono, M. Arneodo, M. M. Obertino, M. Ruspa

INFN Sezione di Trieste, Trieste, Italy

S. Belforte, V. Candelise, M. Casarsa, F. Cossutti, G. Della Ricca, B. Gobbo, C. La Licata, M. Marone, D. Montanino, A. Penzo, A. Schizzi, T. Umer, A. Zanetti

Università di Trieste, Trieste, Italy

V. Candelise, G. Della Ricca, C. La Licata, M. Marone, D. Montanino, A. Schizzi, T. Umer

Kangwon National University, Chunchon, Korea

S. Chang, T. Y. Kim, S. K. Nam

Kyungpook National University, Taegu, Korea

D. H. Kim, G. N. Kim, J. E. Kim, D. J. Kong, S. Lee, Y. D. Oh, H. Park, D. C. Son

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

J. Y. Kim, Zero J. Kim, S. Song

Korea University, Seoul, Korea

S. Choi, D. Gyun, B. Hong, M. Jo, H. Kim, Y. Kim, K. S. Lee, S. K. Park, Y. Roh

University of Seoul, Seoul, Korea

M. Choi, J. H. Kim, C. Park, I. C. Park, S. Park, G. Ryu

Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon, Korea

Y. Choi, Y. K. Choi, J. Goh, M. S. Kim, E. Kwon, B. Lee, J. Lee, S. Lee, H. Seo, I. Yu

Vilnius University, Vilnius, Lithuania

A. Juodagalvis

National Centre for Particle Physics, Universiti Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

J. R. Komaragiri

Centro de Investigacion y de Estudios Avanzados del IPN, Mexico City, MexicoH. Castilla-Valdez, E. De La Cruz-Burelo, I. Heredia-de La Cruz³¹, R. Lopez-Fernandez, J. Martínez-Ortega, A. Sanchez-Hernandez, L. M. Villasenor-Cendejas**Universidad Iberoamericana, Mexico City, Mexico**

S. Carrillo Moreno, F. Vazquez Valencia

Benemerita Universidad Autonoma de Puebla, Puebla, Mexico

H. A. Salazar Ibarquen

Universidad Autónoma de San Luis Potosí, San Luis Potosí, Mexico

E. Casimiro Linares, A. Morelos Pineda

University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

D. Krofcheck

University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand

P. H. Butler, R. Doesburg, S. Reucroft, H. Silverwood

National Centre for Physics, Quaid-I-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan

M. Ahmad, M. I. Asghar, J. Butt, H. R. Hoorani, W. A. Khan, T. Khurshid, S. Qazi, M. A. Shah, M. Shoaib

National Centre for Nuclear Research, Swierk, PolandH. Bialkowska, M. Bluj³², B. Boimska, T. Frueboes, M. Górski, M. Kazana, K. Nawrocki, K. Romanowska-Rybinska, M. Szleper, G. Wrochna, P. Zalewski**Institute of Experimental Physics, Faculty of Physics, University of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland**

G. Brona, K. Bunkowski, M. Cwiok, W. Dominik, K. Doroba, A. Kalinowski, M. Konecki, J. Krolikowski, M. Misiura, W. Wolszczak

Laboratório de Instrumentação e Física Experimental de Partículas, Lisbon, PortugalP. Bargassa, C. Beirão Da Cruz E Silva, P. Faccioli, P. G. Ferreira Parracho, M. Gallinaro, F. Nguyen, J. Rodrigues Antunes, J. Seixas², J. Varela, P. Vischia**Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia**S. Afanasiev, P. Bunin, I. Golutvin, I. Gorbunov, A. Kamenev, V. Karjavin, V. Konoplyanikov, G. Kozlov, A. Lanev, A. Malakhov, V. Matveev³³, P. Moisezenz, V. Palichik, V. Perelygin, S. Shmatov, N. Skatchkov, V. Smirnov, A. Zarubin**Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, Gatchina (St. Petersburg), Russia**

V. Golovtsov, Y. Ivanov, V. Kim, P. Levchenko, V. Murzin, V. Oreshkin, I. Smirnov, V. Sulimov, L. Uvarov, S. Vavilov, A. Vorobyev, An. Vorobyev

Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia

Yu. Andreev, A. Dermenev, S. Gninenko, N. Golubev, M. Kirsanov, N. Krasnikov, A. Pashenkov, D. Tlisov, A. Toropin

Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia

V. Epshteyn, V. Gavrilov, N. Lychkovskaya, V. Popov, G. Safronov, S. Semenov, A. Spiridonov, V. Stolin, E. Vlasov, A. Zhokin

P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia

V. Andreev, M. Azarkin, I. Dremin, M. Kirakosyan, A. Leonidov, G. Mesyats, S. V. Rusakov, A. Vinogradov

Skobeltsyn Institute of Nuclear Physics, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia

A. Belyaev, E. Boos, A. Ershov, A. Gribushin, V. Klyukhin, O. Kodolova, V. Korotkikh, I. Lokhtin, S. Obraztsov, S. Petrushanko, V. Savrin, A. Snigirev, I. Vardanyan

State Research Center of Russian Federation, Institute for High Energy Physics, Protvino, Russia

I. Azhgirey, I. Bayshev, S. Bitioukov, V. Kachanov, A. Kalinin, D. Konstantinov, V. Krychkin, V. Petrov, R. Ryutin, A. Sobol, L. Tourtchanovitch, S. Troshin, N. Tyurin, A. Uzunian, A. Volkov

Faculty of Physics and Vinca Institute of Nuclear Sciences, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia

P. Adzic³⁴, M. Djordjevic, M. Ekmedzic, J. Milosevic

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

M. Aguilar-Benitez, J. Alcaraz Maestre, C. Battilana, E. Calvo, M. Cerrada, M. Chamizo Llatas², N. Colino, B. De La Cruz, A. Delgado Peris, D. Domínguez Vázquez, C. Fernandez Bedoya, J. P. Fernández Ramos, A. Ferrando, J. Flix, M. C. Fouz, P. Garcia-Abia, O. Gonzalez Lopez, S. Goy Lopez, J. M. Hernandez, M. I. Josa, G. Merino, E. Navarro De Martino, J. Puerta Pelayo, A. Quintario Olmeda, I. Redondo, L. Romero, M. S. Soares, C. Willmott

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain

C. Albajar, J. F. de Trocóniz

Universidad de Oviedo, Oviedo, Spain

H. Brun, J. Cuevas, J. Fernandez Menendez, S. Folgueras, I. Gonzalez Caballero, L. Lloret Iglesias

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

J. A. Brochero Cifuentes, I. J. Cabrillo, A. Calderon, S. H. Chuang, J. Duarte Campderros, M. Fernandez, G. Gomez, J. Gonzalez Sanchez, A. Graziano, A. Lopez Virto, J. Marco, R. Marco, C. Martinez Rivero, F. Matorras, F. J. Munoz Sanchez, J. Piedra Gomez, T. Rodrigo, A. Y. Rodríguez-Marrero, A. Ruiz-Jimeno, L. Scodellaro, I. Vila, R. Vilar Cortabitarte

CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland

D. Abbaneo, E. Auffray, G. Auzinger, M. Bachtis, P. Baillon, A. H. Ball, D. Barney, J. Bendavid, L. Benhabib, J. F. Benitez, C. Bernet⁸, G. Bianchi, P. Bloch, A. Bocci, A. Bonato, O. Bondu, C. Botta, H. Breuker, T. Camporesi, G. Cerminara, T. Christiansen, J. A. Coarasa Perez, S. Colafranceschi³⁵, M. D'Alfonso, D. d'Enterria, A. Dabrowski, A. David, F. De Guio, A. De Roeck, S. De Visscher, S. Di Guida, M. Dobson, N. Dupont-Sagorin, A. Elliott-Peisert, J. Eugster, G. Franzoni, W. Funk, M. Giffels, D. Gigi, K. Gill, M. Girone, M. Giunta, F. Glege, R. Gomez-Reino Garrido, S. Gowdy, R. Guida, J. Hammer, M. Hansen, P. Harris, V. Innocente, P. Janot, E. Karavakis, K. Kousouris, K. Krajczar, P. Lecoq, C. Lourenço, N. Magini, L. Malgeri, M. Mannelli, L. Masetti, F. Meijers, S. Mersi, E. Meschi, F. Moortgat, M. Mulders, P. Musella, L. Orsini, E. Palencia Cortezon, E. Perez, L. Perrozzi, A. Petrilli, G. Petrucciani, A. Pfeiffer, M. Pierini, M. Pimiä, D. Piparo, M. Plagge, A. Racz, W. Reece, G. Rolandi³⁶, M. Rovere, H. Sakulin, F. Santanastasio, C. Schäfer, C. Schwick, S. Sekmen, A. Sharma, P. Siegrist, P. Silva, M. Simon, P. Sphicas³⁷, J. Steggemann, B. Stieger, M. Stoye, A. Tsiros, G. I. Veres²⁰, J. R. Vlimant, H. K. Wöhri, W. D. Zeuner

Paul Scherrer Institut, Villigen, Switzerland

W. Bertl, K. Deiters, W. Erdmann, R. Horisberger, Q. Ingram, H. C. Kaestli, S. König, D. Kotlinski, U. Langenegger, D. Renker, T. Rohe

Institute for Particle Physics, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

F. Bachmair, L. Bäni, L. Bianchini, P. Bortignon, M. A. Buchmann, B. Casal, N. Chanon, A. Deisher, G. Dissertori, M. Dittmar, M. Donegà, M. Dünser, P. Eller, C. Grab, D. Hits, W. Luster, B. Mangano, A. C. Marini, P. Martinez Ruiz del Arbol, D. Meister, N. Mohr, C. Nageli³⁸, P. Nef, F. Nessi-Tedaldi, F. Pandolfi, L. Pape, F. Pauss, M. Peruzzi, M. Quittnat, F. J. Ronga, M. Rossini, A. Starodumov³⁹, M. Takahashi, L. Tauscher, K. Theofilatos, D. Treille, R. Wallny, H. A. Weber

Universität Zürich, Zurich, Switzerland

C. AMSLER⁴⁰, V. Chiochia, A. De Cosa, C. Favaro, A. Hinzmann, T. Hreus, M. Ivova Rikova, B. Kilminster, B. Millan Mejias, J. Ngadiuba, P. Robmann, H. Snoek, S. Taroni, M. Verzetti, Y. Yang

National Central University, Chung-Li, Taiwan

M. Cardaci, K. H. Chen, C. Ferro, C. M. Kuo, S. W. Li, W. Lin, Y. J. Lu, R. Volpe, S. S. Yu

National Taiwan University (NTU), Taipei, Taiwan

P. Bartalini, P. Chang, Y. H. Chang, Y. W. Chang, Y. Chao, K. F. Chen, P. H. Chen, C. Dietz, U. Grundler, W.-S. Hou, Y. Hsiung, K. Y. Kao, Y. J. Lei, Y. F. Liu, R.-S. Lu, D. Majumder, E. Petrakou, X. Shi, J. G. Shiu, Y. M. Tzeng, M. Wang, R. Wilken

Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand

B. Asavapibhop, N. Suwonjandee

Cukurova University, Adana, Turkey

A. Adiguzel, M. N. Bakirci⁴¹, S. Cerci⁴², C. Dozen, I. Dumanoglu, E. Eskut, S. Girgis, G. Gokbulut, E. Gurpinar, I. Hos, E. E. Kangal, A. Kayis Topaksu, G. Onengut⁴³, K. Ozdemir, S. Ozturk⁴¹, A. Polatoz, K. Sogut⁴⁴, D. Sunar Cerci⁴², B. Tali⁴², H. Topakli⁴¹, M. Vergili

Physics Department, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey

I. V. Akin, T. Aliev, B. Bilin, S. Bilmis, M. Deniz, H. Gamsizkan, A. M. Guler, G. Karapinar⁴⁵, K. Ocalan, A. Ozpineci, M. Serin, R. Sever, U. E. Surat, M. Yalvac, M. Zeyrek

Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey

E. Gülmez, B. Isildak⁴⁶, M. Kaya⁴⁷, O. Kaya⁴⁷, S. Ozkorucuklu⁴⁸

Istanbul Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey

H. Bahtiyar⁴⁹, E. Barlas, K. Cankocak, Y. O. Günaydin⁵⁰, F. I. Vardarli, M. Yücel

National Scientific Center, Kharkov Institute of Physics and Technology, Kharkov, Ukraine

L. Levchuk, P. Sorokin

University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

J. J. Brooke, E. Clement, D. Cussans, H. Flacher, R. Frazier, J. Goldstein, M. Grimes, G. P. Heath, H. F. Heath, J. Jacob, L. Kreczko, C. Lucas, Z. Meng, D. M. Newbold⁵¹, S. Paramesvaran, A. Poll, S. Senkin, V. J. Smith, T. Williams

Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, UK

A. Belyaev⁵², C. Brew, R. M. Brown, D. J. A. Cockerill, J. A. Coughlan, K. Harder, S. Harper, J. Ilic, E. Olaiya, D. Petyt, C. H. Shepherd-Themistocleous, A. Thea, I. R. Tomalin, W. J. Womersley, S. D. Worm

Imperial College, London, UK

M. Baber, R. Bainbridge, O. Buchmuller, D. Burton, D. Colling, N. Cripps, M. Cutajar, P. Dauncey, G. Davies, M. Della Negra, W. Ferguson, J. Fulcher, D. Futyan, A. Gilbert, A. Guneratne Bryer, G. Hall, Z. Hatherell, J. Hays, G. Iles, M. Jarvis, G. Karapostoli, M. Kenzie, R. Lane, R. Lucas⁵¹, L. Lyons, A.-M. Magnan, J. Marrouche, B. Mathias, R. Nandi, J. Nash, A. Nikitenko³⁹, J. Pela, M. K. Petridis, M. Pioppi⁵³, D. M. Raymond, S. Rogerson, A. Rose, C. Seez, P. Sharp[†], A. Sparrow, A. Tapper, M. Vazquez Acosta, T. Virdee, S. Wakefield, N. Wardle

Brunel University, Uxbridge, UK

J. E. Cole, P. R. Hobson, A. Khan, P. Kyberd, D. Leggat, D. Leslie, W. Martin, I. D. Reid, P. Symonds, L. Teodorescu, M. Turner

Baylor University, Waco, USA

J. Dittmann, K. Hatakeyama, A. Kasmai, H. Liu, T. Scarborough

The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, USA

O. Charaf, S. I. Cooper, C. Henderson, P. Rumerio

Boston University, Boston, USA

A. Avetisyan, T. Bose, C. Fantasia, A. Heister, P. Lawson, D. Lazic, J. Rohlf, D. Sperka, J. St. John, L. Sulak

Brown University, Providence, USA

J. Alimena, S. Bhattacharya, G. Christopher, D. Cutts, Z. Demiragli, A. Ferapontov, A. Garabedian, U. Heintz, S. Jabeen, G. Kukartsev, E. Laird, G. Landsberg, M. Luk, M. Narain, M. Segala, T. Sinthuprasith, T. Speer, J. Swanson

University of California, Davis, Davis, USA

R. Breedon, G. Breto, M. Calderon De La Barca Sanchez, S. Chauhan, M. Chertok, J. Conway, R. Conway, P. T. Cox,

R. Erbacher, M. Gardner, W. Ko, A. Kopecky, R. Lander, T. Miceli, D. Pellett, J. Pilot, F. Ricci-Tam, B. Rutherford, M. Searle, S. Shalhout, J. Smith, M. Squires, M. Tripathi, S. Wilbur, R. Yohay

University of California, Los Angeles, USA

V. Andreev, D. Cline, R. Cousins, S. Erhan, P. Everaerts, C. Farrell, M. Felcini, J. Hauser, M. Ignatenko, C. Jarvis, G. Rakness, P. Schlein[†], E. Takasugi, V. Valuev, M. Weber

University of California, Riverside, Riverside, USA

J. Babb, R. Clare, J. Ellison, J. W. Gary, G. Hanson, J. Heilman, P. Jandir, F. Lacroix, H. Liu, O. R. Long, A. Luthra, M. Malberti, H. Nguyen, A. Shrinivas, J. Sturdy, S. Sumowidagdo, S. Wimpenny

University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, USA

W. Andrews, J. G. Branson, G. B. Cerati, S. Cittolin, R. T. D'Agnolo, D. Evans, A. Holzner, R. Kelley, D. Kovalskyi, M. Lebourgeois, J. Letts, I. Macneill, S. Padhi, C. Palmer, M. Pieri, M. Sani, V. Sharma, S. Simon, E. Sudano, M. Tadel, Y. Tu, A. Vartak, S. Wasserbaech⁵⁴, F. Würthwein, A. Yagil, J. Yoo

University of California, Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, USA

D. Barge, C. Campagnari, T. Danielson, K. Flowers, P. Geffert, C. George, F. Golf, J. Incandela, C. Justus, R. Magaña Villalba, N. Mccoll, V. Pavlunin, J. Richman, R. Rossin, D. Stuart, W. To, C. West

California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA

A. Apresyan, A. Bornheim, J. Bunn, Y. Chen, E. Di Marco, J. Duarte, D. Kcira, A. Mott, H. B. Newman, C. Pena, C. Rogan, M. Spiropulu, V. Timciuc, R. Wilkinson, S. Xie, R. Y. Zhu

Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, USA

V. Azzolini, A. Calamba, R. Carroll, T. Ferguson, Y. Iiyama, D. W. Jang, M. Paulini, J. Russ, H. Vogel, I. Vorobiev

University of Colorado at Boulder, Boulder, USA

J. P. Cumalat, B. R. Drell, W. T. Ford, A. Gaz, E. Luiggi Lopez, U. Nauenberg, J. G. Smith, K. Stenson, K. A. Ulmer, S. R. Wagner

Cornell University, Ithaca, USA

J. Alexander, A. Chatterjee, N. Eggert, L. K. Gibbons, W. Hopkins, A. Khukhunaishvili, B. Kreis, N. Mirman, G. Nicolas Kaufman, J. R. Patterson, A. Ryd, E. Salvati, W. Sun, W. D. Teo, J. Thom, J. Thompson, J. Tucker, Y. Weng, L. Winstrom, P. Wittich

Fairfield University, Fairfield, USA

D. Winn

Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, USA

S. Abdullin, M. Albrow, J. Anderson, G. Apollinari, L. A. T. Bauerdick, A. Beretvas, J. Berryhill, P. C. Bhat, K. Burkett, J. N. Butler, V. Chetluru, H. W. K. Cheung, F. Chlebana, S. Cihangir, V. D. Elvira, I. Fisk, J. Freeman, Y. Gao, E. Gottschalk, L. Gray, D. Green, S. Grünendahl, O. Gutsche, D. Hare, R. M. Harris, J. Hirschauer, B. Hooberman, S. Jindariani, M. Johnson, U. Joshi, K. Kaadze, B. Klima, S. Kwan, J. Linacre, D. Lincoln, R. Lipton, J. Lykken, K. Maeshima, J. M. Marraffino, V. I. Martinez Outschoorn, S. Maruyama, D. Mason, P. McBride, K. Mishra, S. Mrenna, Y. Musienko³³, S. Nahn, C. Newman-Holmes, V. O'Dell, O. Prokofyev, N. Ratnikova, E. Sexton-Kennedy, S. Sharma, W. J. Spalding, L. Spiegel, L. Taylor, S. Tkaczyk, N. V. Tran, L. Uplegger, E. W. Vaandering, R. Vidal, A. Whitbeck, J. Whitmore, W. Wu, F. Yang, J. C. Yun

University of Florida, Gainesville, USA

D. Acosta, P. Avery, D. Bourilkov, T. Cheng, S. Das, M. De Gruttola, G. P. Di Giovanni, D. Dobur, R. D. Field, M. Fisher, Y. Fu, I. K. Furic, J. Hugon, B. Kim, J. Konigsberg, A. Korytov, A. Kropivnitskaya, T. Kypreos, J. F. Low, K. Matchev, P. Milenovic⁵⁵, G. Mitselmakher, L. Muniz, A. Rinkevicius, L. Shchutska, N. Skhirtladze, M. Snowball, J. Yelton, M. Zakaria

Florida International University, Miami, USA

V. Gaultney, S. Hewamanage, S. Linn, P. Markowitz, G. Martinez, J. L. Rodriguez

Florida State University, Tallahassee, USA

T. Adams, A. Askew, J. Bochenek, J. Chen, B. Diamond, J. Haas, S. Hagopian, V. Hagopian, K. F. Johnson, H. Prosper, V. Veeraraghavan, M. Weinberg

Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, USA

M. M. Baarmand, B. Dorney, M. Hohlmann, H. Kalakhety, F. Yumiceva

University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC), Chicago, USA

M. R. Adams, L. Apanasevich, V. E. Bazterra, R. R. Betts, I. Bucinskaite, R. Cavanaugh, O. Evdokimov, L. Gauthier, C. E. Gerber, D. J. Hofman, S. Khalatyan, P. Kurt, D. H. Moon, C. O'Brien, C. Silkworth, P. Turner, N. Varelas

The University of Iowa, Iowa, USA

U. Akgun, E. A. Albayrak⁴⁹, B. Bilki⁵⁶, W. Clarida, K. Dilsiz, F. Duru, M. Haytmyradov, J.-P. Merlo, H. Mermerkaya⁵⁷, A. Mestvirishvili, A. Moeller, J. Nachtman, H. Ogul, Y. Onel, F. Ozok⁴⁹, S. Sen, P. Tan, E. Tiras, J. Wetzel, T. Yetkin⁵⁸, K. Yi

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA

B. A. Barnett, B. Blumenfeld, S. Bolognesi, D. Fehling, A. V. Gritsan, P. Maksimovic, C. Martin, M. Swartz

The University of Kansas, Lawrence, USA

P. Baringer, A. Bean, G. Benelli, R. P. Kenny III, M. Murray, D. Noonan, S. Sanders, J. Sekaric, R. Stringer, Q. Wang, J. S. Wood

Kansas State University, Manhattan, USA

A. F. Barfuss, I. Chakaberia, A. Ivanov, S. Khalil, M. Makouski, Y. Maravin, L. K. Saini, S. Shrestha, I. Svintradze

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, USA

J. Gronberg, D. Lange, F. Rebassoo, D. Wright

University of Maryland, College Park, USA

A. Baden, B. Calvert, S. C. Eno, J. A. Gomez, N. J. Hadley, R. G. Kellogg, T. Kolberg, Y. Lu, M. Marionneau, A. C. Mignerey, K. Pedro, A. Skuja, J. Temple, M. B. Tonjes, S. C. Tonwar

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, USA

A. Apyan, R. Barbieri, G. Bauer, W. Busza, I. A. Cali, M. Chan, L. Di Matteo, V. Dutta, G. Gomez Ceballos, M. Goncharov, D. Gulhan, M. Klute, Y. S. Lai, Y.-J. Lee, A. Levin, P. D. Luckey, T. Ma, C. Paus, D. Ralph, C. Roland, G. Roland, G. S. F. Stephans, F. Stöckli, K. Sumorok, D. Velicanu, J. Veverka, B. Wyslouch, M. Yang, A. S. Yoon, M. Zanetti, V. Zhukova

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, USA

B. Dahmes, A. De Benedetti, A. Gude, S. C. Kao, K. Klapoetke, Y. Kubota, J. Mans, N. Pastika, R. Rusack, A. Singovsky, N. Tambe, J. Turkewitz

University of Mississippi, Oxford, USA

J. G. Acosta, L. M. Cremaldi, R. Kroeger, S. Oliveros, L. Perera, R. Rahmat, D. A. Sanders, D. Summers

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, USA

E. Avdeeva, K. Bloom, S. Bose, D. R. Claes, A. Dominguez, R. Gonzalez Suarez, J. Keller, D. Knowlton, I. Kravchenko, J. Lazo-Flores, S. Malik, F. Meier, G. R. Snow

State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, USA

J. Dolen, A. Godshalk, I. Iashvili, S. Jain, A. Kharchilava, A. Kumar, S. Rappoccio, Z. Wan

Northeastern University, Boston, USA

G. Alverson, E. Barberis, D. Baumgartel, M. Chasco, J. Haley, A. Massironi, D. Nash, T. Orimoto, D. Trocino, D. Wood, J. Zhang

Northwestern University, Evanston, USA

A. Anastassov, K. A. Hahn, A. Kubik, L. Lusito, N. Mucia, N. Odell, B. Pollack, A. Pozdnyakov, M. Schmitt, S. Stoynev, K. Sung, M. Velasco, S. Won

University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, USA

D. Berry, A. Brinkerhoff, K. M. Chan, A. Drozdetskiy, M. Hildreth, C. Jessop, D. J. Karmgard, N. Kellams, J. Kolb, K. Lannon, W. Luo, S. Lynch, N. Marinelli, D. M. Morse, T. Pearson, M. Planer, R. Ruchti, J. Slaunwhite, N. Valls, M. Wayne, M. Wolf, A. Woodard

The Ohio State University, Columbus, USA

L. Antonelli, B. Bylsma, L. S. Durkin, S. Flowers, C. Hill, R. Hughes, K. Kotov, T. Y. Ling, D. Puigh, M. Rodenburg, G. Smith, C. Vuosalo, B. L. Winer, H. Wolfe, H. W. Wulsin

Princeton University, Princeton, USA

E. Berry, P. Elmer, V. Halyo, P. Hebda, J. Hegeman, A. Hunt, P. Jindal, S. A. Koay, P. Lujan, D. Marlow, T. Medvedeva, M. Mooney, J. Olsen, P. Piroué, X. Quan, A. Raval, H. Saka, D. Stickland, C. Tully, J. S. Werner, S. C. Zenz, A. Zuranski

University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez, USA

E. Brownson, A. Lopez, H. Mendez, J. E. Ramirez Vargas

Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA

E. Alagoz, D. Benedetti, G. Bolla, D. Bortoletto, M. De Mattia, A. Everett, Z. Hu, M. Jones, K. Jung, M. Kress, N. Leonardo, D. Lopes Pegna, V. Maroussov, P. Merkel, D. H. Miller, N. Neumeister, B. C. Radburn-Smith, I. Shipsey, D. Silvers, A. Svyatkovskiy, F. Wang, W. Xie, L. Xu, H. D. Yoo, J. Zablocki, Y. Zheng

Purdue University Calumet, Hammond, USA

N. Parashar

Rice University, Houston, USA

A. Adair, B. Akgun, K. M. Ecklund, F. J. M. Geurts, W. Li, B. Michlin, B. P. Padley, R. Redjimi, J. Roberts, J. Zabel

University of Rochester, Rochester, USA

B. Betchart, A. Bodek, R. Covarelli, P. de arbaro, R. Demina, Y. Eshaq, T. Ferbel, A. Garcia-Bellido, P. Goldenzweig, J. Han, A. Harel, D. C. Miner, G. Petrillo, D. Vishnevskiy, M. Zielinski

The Rockefeller University, New York, USA

A. Bhatti, R. Ciesielski, L. Demortier, K. Goulianos, G. Lungu, S. Malik, C. Mesropian

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, Piscataway, USA

S. Arora, A. Barker, J. P. Chou, C. Contreras-Campana, E. Contreras-Campana, D. Duggan, D. Ferencek, Y. Gershtein, R. Gray, E. Halkiadakis, D. Hidas, A. Lath, S. Panwalkar, M. Park, R. Patel, V. Rekovic, J. Robles, S. Salur, S. Schnetzer, C. Seitz, S. Somalwar, R. Stone, S. Thomas, P. Thomassen, M. Walker

University of Tennessee, Knoxville, USA

K. Rose, S. Spanier, Z. C. Yang, A. York

Texas A&M University, College Station, USA

O. Bouhali⁵⁹, R. Eusebi, W. Flanagan, J. Gilmore, T. Kamon⁶⁰, V. Khotilovich, V. Krutelyov, R. Montalvo, I. Osipenkov, Y. Pakhotin, A. Perloff, J. Roe, A. Safonov, T. Sakuma, I. Suarez, A. Tatarinov, D. Toback

Texas Tech University, Lubbock, USA

N. Akchurin, C. Cowden, J. Damgov, C. Dragoiu, P. R. Duerdo, K. Kovitanggoon, S. Kunori, S. W. Lee, T. Libeiro, I. Volobouev

Vanderbilt University, Nashville, USA

E. Appelt, A. G. Delannoy, S. Greene, A. Gurrola, W. Johns, C. Maguire, Y. Mao, A. Melo, M. Sharma, P. Sheldon, B. Snook, S. Tuo, J. Velkovska

University of Virginia, Charlottesville, USA

M. W. Arenton, S. Boutle, B. Cox, B. Francis, J. Goodell, R. Hirosky, A. Ledovskoy, C. Lin, C. Neu, J. Wood

Wayne State University, Detroit, USA

S. Gollapinni, R. Harr, P. E. Karchin, C. Kottachchi Kankanamge Don, P. Lamichhane

University of Wisconsin, Madison, USA

D. A. Belknap, L. Borrello, D. Carlsmith, M. Cepeda, S. Dasu, S. Duric, E. Friis, M. Grothe, R. Hall-Wilton, M. Herndon, A. Hervé, P. Klabbers, J. Klukas, A. Lanaro, A. Levine, R. Loveless, A. Mohapatra, I. Ojalvo, T. Perry, G. A. Pierro, G. Polese, I. Ross, A. Sakharov, T. Sarangi, A. Savin, W. H. Smith

† Deceased

- 1: Also at Vienna University of Technology, Vienna, Austria
- 2: Also at CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland
- 3: Also at Institut Pluridisciplinaire Hubert Curien, Université de Strasbourg, Université de Haute Alsace Mulhouse, CNRS/IN2P3, Strasbourg, France
- 4: Also at National Institute of Chemical Physics and Biophysics, Tallinn, Estonia
- 5: Also at Skobeltsyn Institute of Nuclear Physics, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia
- 6: Also at Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, Brazil
- 7: Also at California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA
- 8: Also at Laboratoire Leprince-Ringuet, Ecole Polytechnique, IN2P3-CNRS, Palaiseau, France
- 9: Also at Zewail City of Science and Technology, Zewail, Egypt
- 10: Also at Suez Canal University, Suez, Egypt
- 11: Also at Cairo University, Cairo, Egypt
- 12: Also at Fayoum University, El-Fayoum, Egypt
- 13: Also at British University in Egypt, Cairo, Egypt
- 14: Now at Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt
- 15: Also at Université de Haute Alsace, Mulhouse, France
- 16: Also at Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia
- 17: Also at Brandenburg University of Technology, Cottbus, Germany
- 18: Also at The University of Kansas, Lawrence, USA
- 19: Also at Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary
- 20: Also at Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary
- 21: Also at Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-HECR, Mumbai, India
- 22: Now at King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
- 23: Also at University of Visva-Bharati, Santiniketan, India
- 24: Also at University of Ruhuna, Matara, Sri Lanka
- 25: Also at Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, Iran
- 26: Also at Sharif University of Technology, Tehran, Iran
- 27: Also at Plasma Physics Research Center, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
- 28: Also at Università degli Studi di Siena, Siena, Italy
- 29: Also at Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS)-IN2P3, Paris, France
- 30: Also at Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA
- 31: Also at Universidad Michoacana de San Nicolas de Hidalgo, Morelia, Mexico
- 32: Also at National Centre for Nuclear Research, Swierk, Poland
- 33: Also at Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia
- 34: Also at Faculty of Physics, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia
- 35: Also at Facoltà Ingegneria, Università di Roma, Roma, Italy
- 36: Also at Scuola Normale e Sezione dell'INFN, Pisa, Italy
- 37: Also at University of Athens, Athens, Greece
- 38: Also at Paul Scherrer Institut, Villigen, Switzerland
- 39: Also at Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia
- 40: Also at Albert Einstein Center for Fundamental Physics, Bern, Switzerland
- 41: Also at Gaziosmanpasa University, Tokat, Turkey
- 42: Also at Adiyaman University, Adiyaman, Turkey
- 43: Also at Cag University, Mersin, Turkey
- 44: Also at Mersin University, Mersin, Turkey
- 45: Also at Izmir Institute of Technology, Izmir, Turkey
- 46: Also at Ozyegin University, Istanbul, Turkey

- 47: Also at Kafkas University, Kars, Turkey
48: Also at Faculty of Science, Istanbul University, Istanbul, Turkey
49: Also at Mimar Sinan University Istanbul, Istanbul, Turkey
50: Also at Kahramanmaras Sütcü Imam University, Kahramanmaras, Turkey
51: Also at Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, UK
52: Also at School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK
53: Also at INFN Sezione di Perugia; Università di Perugia, Perugia, Italy
54: Also at Utah Valley University, Orem, USA
55: Also at Faculty of Physics and Vinca Institute of Nuclear Sciences, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia
56: Also at Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, USA
57: Also at Erzincan University, Erzincan, Turkey
58: Also at Yildiz Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey
59: Also at Texas A&M University at Qatar, Doha, Qatar
60: Also at Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea