



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Physics Letters B

www.elsevier.com/locate/physletb



Studies of charm and beauty hadron long-range correlations in pp and pPb collisions at LHC energies

The CMS Collaboration *

CERN, Geneva, Switzerland

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 15 September 2020
 Received in revised form 30 November 2020
 Accepted 14 December 2020
 Available online xxxx
 Editor: M. Doser

Keywords:

CMS
 Ridge
 Collectivity
 Small systems
 Heavy flavor
 Elliptic flow
 Charm
 Beauty

ABSTRACT

Measurements of the second Fourier harmonic coefficient (v_2) of the azimuthal distributions of prompt and nonprompt D^0 mesons produced in pp and pPb collisions are presented. Nonprompt D^0 mesons come from beauty hadron decays. The data samples are collected by the CMS experiment at nucleon-nucleon center-of-mass energies of 13 and 8.16 TeV, respectively. In high multiplicity pp collisions, v_2 signals for prompt charm hadrons are reported for the first time, and are found to be comparable to those for light-flavor hadron species over a transverse momentum (p_T) range of 2–6 GeV. Compared at similar event multiplicities, the prompt D^0 meson v_2 values in pp and pPb collisions are similar in magnitude. The v_2 values for open beauty hadrons are extracted for the first time via nonprompt D^0 mesons in pPb collisions. For p_T in the range of 2–5 GeV, the results suggest that v_2 for nonprompt D^0 mesons is smaller than that for prompt D^0 mesons. These new measurements indicate a positive charm hadron v_2 in pp collisions and suggest a mass dependence in v_2 between charm and beauty hadrons in the pPb system. These results provide insights into the origin of heavy-flavor quark collectivity in small systems.

© 2020 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). Funded by SCOAP³.

1. Introduction

Strong collectivity in high-energy nucleus-nucleus (AA) collisions at the BNL RHIC [1–4] and at the CERN LHC [5,6], has indicated the formation of a hot, strongly interacting quark gluon plasma (QGP), which exhibits nearly ideal hydrodynamic behavior [7–9]. The collective phenomena manifests itself in long-range (large pseudorapidity gap) particle correlations [10–15]. Although not originally expected, similar long-range collective azimuthal correlations are also being observed in small colliding systems with high final-state particle multiplicity, such as proton-proton (pp) [16–20], proton-nucleus (pA) [21–31], and lighter nucleus-nucleus systems [31–34]. This observation raised the question of whether a fluid-like QGP medium with a size significantly smaller than in AA collisions is created in these other systems [35–37]. At the same time, there is no observation of long-range correlations in e^+e^- and ep collisions, which are even smaller systems compared to pp collisions [38,39]. In the context of hydrodynamic models, the observed azimuthal correlation structure of emitted particles is typically characterized by its Fourier components [40]. The second and third Fourier anisotropy coefficients are known as elliptic (v_2) and triangular (v_3) flow, which most directly reflect the QGP medium response to the initial collision geometry and its fluctua-

tions, respectively [41–44]. The experimental measurements in the small systems are consistent with the dominance of strong final-state interactions [35,37,45–47], such as a hydrodynamic expansion of a tiny QGP droplet [35,37]. Alternative scenarios based on gluon saturation in the initial state can also capture the main features of the correlation data, and are conjectured to play a dominant role as the event multiplicity decreases [35,36].

Heavy-flavor quarks (charm and bottom) are produced via hard scatterings in the very early stages of the high energy collisions. These quarks are available to probe both initial- and final-state effects of the collision dynamics [48,49]. Strong elliptic flow signals of electrons from the decay of heavy-flavor hadrons and open charm D^0 mesons are observed in both gold-gold (AuAu) collisions at RHIC [50,51] and lead-lead (PbPb) collisions at the LHC [52–54]. These findings suggest that charm quarks develop significant collective behavior via their strong interactions with the bulk of the QGP medium. Measurements of elliptic flow of hidden-charm J/ψ mesons provide further evidence for strong rescatterings of charm quarks [55,56].

In small colliding systems, the study of heavy-flavor hadron collectivity has the potential to disentangle possible contributions from both initial- and final-state effects. In particular, heavy flavor hadrons may be more sensitive to possible initial-state gluon saturation effects. Recent observation of a significant elliptic flow signal for prompt D^0 [57] and prompt J/ψ [58,59] mesons in pPb collisions provided the first evidence for charm quark collectivity

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

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2020.136036>

0370-2693/© 2020 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). Funded by SCOAP³.

in small systems. Surprisingly, despite the mass differences, the observed v_2 signal for prompt J/ψ mesons in pPb collisions is found to be comparable to that of prompt D^0 mesons and light-flavor hadrons at a given particle transverse momentum (p_T). This behavior cannot be explained by the final-state effects of a QGP medium, as the contribution from recombinations to J/ψ production is not expected to be significant in small systems [60]. This finding may imply the existence of initial-state correlation effects [61]. Further detailed investigations are important to address many open questions for understanding the origin of heavy-flavor quark collectivity in small systems. These include the multiplicity dependence of charm quark collectivity in both pPb and pp systems and the details of collective behavior of beauty quarks.

This Letter presents the first measurement of the elliptic flow (v_2) for prompt D^0 mesons in pp collisions at center-of-mass energy $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV and for nonprompt D^0 mesons (from decays of beauty hadrons) in pPb collisions at nucleon-nucleon center-of-mass energy $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 8.16$ TeV, using long-range ($|\Delta\eta| > 1$) two-particle angular correlations. The v_2 harmonic coefficient is determined over the 2–8 GeV p_T range for prompt D^0 mesons as a function of multiplicity with results for the pp and pPb collisions. The nonprompt D^0 meson v_2 values are extracted in high-multiplicity pPb collisions for two transverse momentum ranges 2–5 and 5–8 GeV, and are compared to previous measurements of prompt D^0 mesons and light flavor hadrons.

2. Experimental apparatus and data sample

The central feature of the CMS apparatus is a superconducting solenoid of 6 m internal diameter, providing a magnetic field of 3.8 T. Within the solenoid volume, there are four primary sub-detectors including a silicon pixel and strip tracker detector, a lead tungstate crystal electromagnetic calorimeter, and a brass and scintillator hadron calorimeter, each composed of a barrel and two endcap sections. Iron and quartz-fiber Cherenkov hadron forward calorimeters cover the pseudorapidity (η_{lab}) range $2.9 < |\eta_{lab}| < 5.2$ in laboratory frame. Muons are measured in gas-ionization detectors embedded in the steel flux-return yoke outside the solenoid. The silicon tracker measures charged particles within the range $|\eta_{lab}| < 2.5$. For charged particles with $1 < p_T < 10$ GeV and $|\eta_{lab}| < 1.4$, the track resolutions are typically 1.5% in p_T and 25–90 (45–150) μm in the transverse (longitudinal) impact parameter [62]. A detailed description of the CMS detector, together with a definition of the coordinate system used and the relevant kinematic variables, can be found in Ref. [63].

The event samples were collected by the CMS experiment with a two-level trigger system [64]: at level-1 events are selected by custom hardware processors while the high-level trigger uses fast versions of the offline software. The pPb data at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 8.16$ TeV used in this analysis were collected in 2016, and correspond to an integrated luminosity of 186.0 nb^{-1} [65]. The beam energies are 6.5 TeV for the protons and 2.56 TeV per nucleon for the lead nuclei. Because of the asymmetric beam conditions, particles selected in this analysis from midrapidity in the laboratory frame ($|y_{lab}| < 1$) correspond to rapidity in the nucleon-nucleon center-of-mass frame of $-1.46 < y_{cm} < 0.54$, with positive rapidity corresponding to the proton beam direction. The pp data at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV were collected in 2017 and 2018 with integrated luminosities of 1.27 pb^{-1} and 10.22 pb^{-1} during special runs with low beam intensity, resulting in an average number of concurrent pp collisions of about 1 per bunch crossing. The event reconstruction, event selections, and triggers (minimum bias and high multiplicity) are identical to those described in Refs. [19,66,67]. Similar to previous CMS correlation measurements, the pPb and pp data are analyzed for several multiplicity ($N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{offline}}$) classes, where $N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{offline}}$

is the number of offline selected tracks [19,62] with $|\eta_{lab}| < 2.4$ and $p_T > 0.4$ GeV.

3. Prompt and nonprompt D^0 meson reconstruction and selection

The D^0 (and its charge conjugate state \bar{D}^0) mesons are reconstructed through the hadronic decay channel $D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$ ($\bar{D}^0 \rightarrow K^+ \pi^-$). The invariant mass of D^0 candidates is required to be from 1.725–2.000 GeV to cover the world-average D^0 mass [68]. In order to suppress the combinatorial background and improve the momentum and mass resolution, high-purity [62] tracks reconstructed using the silicon tracker with $p_T > 0.7$ GeV, $|\eta_{lab}| < 2.4$, smaller than 10% relative uncertainty in p_T , and the number of valid hits ≥ 11 are used. For each pair of selected tracks, two D^0 candidates are considered by assuming that one of the tracks has the pion mass while the other track has the kaon mass, and vice versa.

The D^0 candidates are selected using a multivariate technique that employs the boosted decision tree (BDT) algorithm in the Toolkit for Multivariate Data Analysis with ROOT [69]. The selection is optimized separately for pp and pPb collisions, and for all p_T ranges, in order to maximize the statistical significance of the prompt or non-prompt D^0 meson signals. The Monte Carlo (MC) signal simulated samples are produced with PYTHIA 8.209 [70] tune CUETP8M1 [71] (embedded into EPOS LHC [72] for the case of pPb analysis) for both prompt and nonprompt D^0 events. The background samples for the multivariate training are taken from data. The training variables related to D^0 mesons include: the χ^2 probability for D^0 vertex fitting; the three-dimensional distance (with and without being normalized by its uncertainty) between the primary and decay vertices; and the three-dimensional pointing angle (defined as the angle between the line segment connecting the primary and decay vertices and the momentum vector of the reconstructed particle candidates). The training variables related to the decay products are: p_T ; pseudorapidity and the longitudinal and transverse track impact parameter significance. In the BDT training for prompt D^0 signals, same-sign (SS) $\pi^\pm K^\pm$ candidates are used, which contain predominantly combinatorial background. For optimizing nonprompt D^0 signals, both prompt D^0 signals and combinatorial candidates are considered as dominant background to be suppressed. For this reason, opposite-sign (OS) candidates (although including fractions $< 5\%$ of nonprompt D^0 signals) are used for the background training sample. This approach is found to give better performance for achieving higher nonprompt D^0 fractions than using SS background candidates, especially at higher p_T .

The optimal selection criterion is the working point with the highest signal significance of prompt and nonprompt D^0 signals. For extracting the nonprompt D^0 yield, the distributions of distance of closest approach (DCA) of the D^0 meson momentum vector, relative to the primary vertex, are fitted using the template probability distribution functions (PDFs) for prompt and nonprompt D^0 signals derived from MC simulation. The residual nonprompt fraction in the BDT prompt-trained sample is found to be no more than 7%, while in the BDT nonprompt-trained sample, the optimal selection yields a nonprompt fraction up to 20%. This procedure is further outlined in Section 4.

4. Data analysis

The azimuthal anisotropies of D^0 mesons are extracted from their long-range ($|\Delta\eta| > 1$) two-particle azimuthal correlations of D^0 candidates with charged particles, as described in Refs. [19,26]. The two-dimensional (2D) correlation function is constructed by pairing each D^0 candidate with reference primary charged-particle tracks with $0.3 < p_T < 3.0$ GeV (denoted “ref” particles), and calculating

$$\frac{1}{N_{D^0}} \frac{d^2 N^{\text{pair}}}{d\Delta\eta d\Delta\phi} = B(0, 0) \frac{S(\Delta\eta, \Delta\phi)}{B(\Delta\eta, \Delta\phi)}, \quad (1)$$

where $\Delta\eta$ and $\Delta\phi$ are the differences in pseudorapidity η_{lab} and azimuthal angle ϕ of each pair. The same-event pair distribution, $S(\Delta\eta, \Delta\phi)$, represents the yield of particle pairs normalized by the number of D^0 candidates (N_{D^0}) from the same event. The mixed-event pair yield distribution, $B(\Delta\eta, \Delta\phi)$, is constructed by pairing D^0 candidates in each event with the reference primary charged-particle tracks from 10 different randomly selected events, from the same $N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{offline}}$ range, and with a primary vertex falling in the same 2 cm wide range of reconstructed z coordinates. The $B(0, 0)$ represents the value of $B(\Delta\eta, \Delta\phi)$ at $\Delta\eta = 0$ and $\Delta\phi = 0$. It is evaluated by interpolating the four nearest bins with a bin width of 0.3 in $\Delta\eta$ and $\pi/16$ in $\Delta\phi$ bilinearly. The interpolation shows a negligible effect on the measurements. The analysis procedure is performed in each D^0 candidate p_T range by dividing it into 14 intervals of invariant mass. The correction for the acceptance and efficiency (derived from simulations using PYTHIA for pp and PYTHIA+EPOS for pPb) of the D^0 meson yield is found to have a negligible effect on the measurements, and is not applied. The corresponding effects are discussed in Section 5. The $\Delta\phi$ correlation functions averaged over $|\Delta\eta| > 1$ (to remove short-range correlations, such as jet fragmentation) are obtained from the projection of 2D correlation functions and fitted by the first three terms of a Fourier series:

$$\frac{1}{N_{D^0}} \frac{dN^{\text{pair}}}{d\Delta\phi} = \frac{N_{\text{assoc}}}{2\pi} \left[1 + \sum_{n=1}^3 2V_{n\Delta} \cos(n\Delta\phi) \right]. \quad (2)$$

Here, $V_{n\Delta}$ are the Fourier coefficients and N_{assoc} represents the total number of pairs per D^0 candidate. The inclusion of additional Fourier terms to the fit has negligible effect. By assuming $V_{n\Delta}$ to be the product of single-particle anisotropies [73], $V_{n\Delta}(D^0, \text{ref}) = v_n(D^0)v_n(\text{ref})$, the v_n anisotropy harmonics for D^0 candidates can be extracted from the equation:

$$v_n(D^0) = V_{n\Delta}(D^0, \text{ref}) / \sqrt{V_{n\Delta}(\text{ref}, \text{ref})}. \quad (3)$$

Because of the limited statistical precision of the available data, only the elliptic anisotropy harmonic results are reported in this analysis.

To extract the $V_{2\Delta}$ values of the inclusive D^0 meson signal ($V_{2\Delta}^S$), a two-step fit to the invariant mass spectrum of D^0 candidates and their $V_{2\Delta}$ as a function of the invariant mass, $V_{2\Delta}^{S+B}(m_{\text{inv}})$, is performed in each p_T interval. The mass spectrum fit function is composed of five components: the sum of two Gaussian functions with the same mean but different widths for the D^0 signal, $S(m_{\text{inv}})$; an additional Gaussian function to describe the invariant mass shape of D^0 candidates with an incorrect mass assignment from the exchange of the pion and kaon designations, $SW(m_{\text{inv}})$; Crystal Ball (CB) functions [74] to describe processes $D^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ ($S(m_{\pi^+\pi^-})$) and $D^0 \rightarrow K^+K^-$ ($S(m_{K^+K^-})$); and a third-order polynomial to model the combinatorial background, $B(m_{\text{inv}})$. The contributions from the processes $D^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ and $D^0 \rightarrow K^+K^-$ are the results of mislabelling Kas π , or vice versa. These two components are emulated by two CB functions at two sides away from the peak region. The width and the ratio of the yields of $SW(m_{\text{inv}})$ and $S(m_{\text{inv}})$ and the CB function shape are fixed according to results obtained from simulation studies using PYTHIA for pp collisions and PYTHIA+EPOS for pPb collisions.

The $V_{2\Delta}^{S+B}(m_{\text{inv}})$ distribution is fit with

$$V_{2\Delta}^{S+B}(m_{\text{inv}}) = \alpha(m_{\text{inv}}) V_{2\Delta}^S + [1 - \alpha(m_{\text{inv}})] V_{2\Delta}^B(m_{\text{inv}}), \quad (4)$$

where




Fig. 1. Example of fits to the invariant mass spectrum and $V_{2\Delta}^{S+B}(m_{\text{inv}})$, for the BDT prompt-trained sample in pp collisions.

$$\alpha(m_{\text{inv}}) = \left[S(m_{\text{inv}}) + SW(m_{\text{inv}}) + S(m_{K^+K^-}) + S(m_{\pi^+\pi^-}) \right] / \left[S(m_{\text{inv}}) + SW(m_{\text{inv}}) + S(m_{K^+K^-}) + S(m_{\pi^+\pi^-}) + B(m_{\text{inv}}) \right]. \quad (5)$$

Here $V_{2\Delta}^B(m_{\text{inv}})$ for the background D^0 candidates is modeled as a linear function of the invariant mass, and $\alpha(m_{\text{inv}})$ is the D^0 signal fraction. The $K-\pi$ swapped, $D^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ and $D^0 \rightarrow K^+K^-$ components are included in the signal fraction because these candidates are from genuine D^0 mesons and should have the same v_2 value as that of the D^0 signal.

Fig. 1 shows an example of fits to the mass spectrum and $V_{2\Delta}^{S+B}(m_{\text{inv}})$, for the BDT prompt-trained sample in the p_T interval 4–6 GeV for the multiplicity range $N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{offline}} \geq 100$ in pp collisions. Similar fits in pPb data can be found in Ref. [57], which are not repeated here.

For extracting the $V_{2\Delta}$ values of nonprompt D^0 mesons, the measurement and fitting procedure described above are repeated in three separate DCA ranges, containing very different nonprompt D^0 fractions. A linear fit by the functional form,

$$V_{2\Delta}^S = f^{b \rightarrow D} V_{2\Delta}^{b \rightarrow D} + (1 - f^{b \rightarrow D}) V_{2\Delta}^{\text{prompt } D}, \quad (6)$$

to the measured D^0 $V_{2\Delta}$ values as a function of nonprompt D^0 fraction is performed to extrapolate to the $V_{2\Delta}$ value at a nonprompt fraction of 100%. The $f^{b \rightarrow D}$ represents the nonprompt D^0 fraction. The v_2 values of nonprompt D^0 are evaluated by using Eq. (3). Fig. 2 shows an example of fits to the mass spectrum and $V_{2\Delta}^{S+B}(m_{\text{inv}})$ for the BDT nonprompt-trained sample for $DCA < 0.008$ cm and $0.008 < DCA < 0.014$ cm, in the p_T interval 2–5 GeV, for the multiplicity range $185 \leq N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{offline}} < 250$ in pPb collisions. The resulting D^0 signal $V_{2\Delta}$ distributions contain contributions from both prompt and nonprompt D^0 mesons.

Inclusive D^0 meson yields, extracted as a function of DCA, by fitting the invariant mass distribution in each DCA bin, are shown in Fig. 3 (left). A template fit to the DCA distribution is performed using template distributions of prompt and nonprompt D^0 mesons obtained from MC simulation to estimate the nonprompt D^0 fractions in each of the three DCA regions used to extract inclusive D^0 $V_{2\Delta}$, as described above. The inclusive D^0 $V_{2\Delta}$ values from




Fig. 2. Example of fits to the invariant mass spectrum and $V_{2\Delta}^{S+B}(m_{inv})$, for the BDT nonprompt-trained sample in pPb collisions. The left plot shows the fit for $DCA < 0.008$ cm and the right plot is for $0.008 < DCA < 0.014$ cm.




Fig. 3. Left: example of template fit to the D^0 meson DCA distribution in the p_T interval 3–4 GeV for events with $185 \leq N_{trk}^{offline} < 250$ of pPb collisions. Right: inclusive D^0 $V_{2\Delta}^S$ values from the three DCA regions as a function of the corresponding nonprompt D^0 fraction, for $2 < p_T < 5$ GeV and $5 < p_T < 8$ GeV. The red line is a linear fit to $V_{2\Delta}^S$ data.

the three DCA regions are then plotted as a function of the corresponding nonprompt D^0 fraction, shown in Fig. 3 (right), for $2 < p_T < 5$ GeV and $5 < p_T < 8$ GeV, respectively. The measurements are well described by a linear-function fit, which is shown as a red line in Fig. 3.

The residual contribution of back-to-back dijets to the measured v_2 results is corrected by subtracting correlations from low-multiplicity events, following an identical procedure established in Refs. [19,73]. The Fourier coefficients, $V_{n\Delta}$, extracted from Eq. (2) for $N_{trk}^{offline} < 35(20)$, in pPb (pp) collisions, are subtracted from the $V_{n\Delta}$ coefficients obtained in the high-multiplicity region, with

$$V_{n\Delta}^{sub} = V_{n\Delta} - V_{n\Delta}(N_{trk}^{offline} < 35) \times \frac{N_{assoc}(N_{trk}^{offline} < 35)}{N_{assoc}} \frac{Y_{jet}}{Y_{jet}(N_{trk}^{offline} < 35)}. \quad (7)$$

Here, Y_{jet} represents the jet yield. It is the difference between integrals of the short-range ($|\Delta\eta| < 1$) and long-range ($|\Delta\eta| > 2$) event-normalized associated yields for each multiplicity class. The

ratio $Y_{jet}/Y_{jet}(N_{trk}^{offline} < 35)$ is introduced to account for the enhanced jet correlations resulting from the selection of higher-multiplicity events. It is observed that the values of jet yield ratio show little dependence on p_T over the full p_T range. For the measurement of nonprompt D^0 mesons, all quantities in Eq. (7) are first extrapolated to values at a nonprompt D^0 fraction of 100%, following the same approach as in Fig. 3, before applying the subtraction procedure. Elliptic flow (v_2^{sub}), corrected for residual jet correlations, is obtained from $V_{2\Delta}^{sub}$ using Eq. (3).

5. Systematic uncertainties

Table 1 summarizes the estimate of systematic uncertainties for the v_2^{sub} of prompt and nonprompt D^0 mesons in pPb collisions as well as that of prompt D^0 mesons in pp collisions. The ranges of systematic uncertainties correspond to the p_T ranges of D^0 mesons.

Systematic uncertainties in the BDT selection of the D^0 candidates are evaluated by studying MC simulated samples. The difference between applying BDT selections and not applying those cri-

Table 1

Summary of systematic uncertainties on v_2^{sub} . The ranges of systematic uncertainties correspond to the p_T ranges of D^0 mesons. Values are in 10^{-3} .

Source	Prompt D^0 in pPb collisions ($\times 10^{-3}$)	Nonprompt D^0 in pPb collisions ($\times 10^{-3}$)	Prompt D^0 in pp collisions ($\times 10^{-3}$)
Nonprompt D^0 contamination	3–8	–	4–5
Nonprompt D^0 fraction estimation	–	1–7	–
Background $V_{2\Delta}$ PD	2–4	2	2–5
Efficiency correction	0.1–13	0.2–0.6	0.8–13
Trigger bias	0.6–1	0.1–1	0.4–2
Effect from pileup	2–5	2–5	4–10
BDT selection	2–5	2	3–8
Jet subtraction	2–7	14–16	5–49
Total	5–18	16–17	13–52

teria is taken as the systematic uncertainty. This procedure yields the v_2 uncertainties of 0.002–0.005 for prompt D^0 mesons and 0.002 for nonprompt D^0 mesons in pPb collisions. In pp collisions, it brings an uncertainty of 0.003–0.008 on the prompt D^0 v_2 measurement.

Other sources of systematic uncertainty include the background mass PD, the D^0 meson yield correction (acceptance and efficiency correction), the background $V_{2\Delta}$ PD, and the jet subtraction method. Changing the background mass PD to a second-order polynomial or an exponential function shows negligible systematic effects. To evaluate the uncertainties arising from the p_T -dependent D^0 meson yield correction, the v_2 values are extracted from the corrected signal D^0 distributions and compared to the uncorrected v_2 values as a conservative estimate. This yields an uncertainty of less than 0.013. For most bins, the uncertainties from the yield correction are less than 0.003 and are small (or negligible) compared to other sources and statistical uncertainties. The systematic uncertainties from the background v_2 PD are evaluated by changing $v_2^B(m_{\text{inv}})$ to a second-order polynomial function of the invariant mass, yielding an uncertainty of less than 0.005. To study potential trigger biases, a comparison to high-multiplicity pPb data for a given multiplicity range that were collected using a lower threshold trigger with 100% efficiency is performed. The uncertainty from trigger bias is quoted as 0.001. Though data collected with low beam intensity are used in this analysis, there are still additional collisions besides the one of interest per bunch crossing, which are known as pileup interactions. The possible contamination by residual pileup interactions is also studied by varying the pileup selection of events in the performed analysis, from no pileup rejection at all to selecting events with only one reconstructed vertex. The variation of D^0 v_2 values is about 0.002–0.005 in pPb collisions, while it is about 0.004–0.010 in pp collisions because of larger pileup. To study the uncertainty from jet subtraction, the ratio $Y_{\text{jet}}/Y_{\text{jet}}(N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{offline}} < 35)$ is varied by one standard deviation. It yields an uncertainty of 0.002–0.007 for prompt D^0 mesons and 0.016–0.017 for nonprompt D^0 in pPb collisions. In pp collisions, it yields an uncertainty of 0.013–0.049 for prompt D^0 mesons. This effect diminishes towards high multiplicity regions because of the small $N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{offline}}$ ratio according to Eq. (7).

For the measurement of prompt D^0 mesons, the contribution from nonprompt D^0 mesons is significantly suppressed. No explicit correction is applied and a systematic uncertainty is quoted instead. Based on the prediction for AA collisions that B mesons have a smaller v_2 than light-flavor particles because of the larger mass of the b quark [75–77], the nonprompt D^0 v_2 values are assumed to lie between 0 and those of strange hadrons. The v_2 for prompt D^0 is thus reestimated with the bounds of nonprompt D^0 v_2 and the extracted nonprompt D^0 fractions and the change in v_2 signal is found to be smaller than 0.008. For the measurement of nonprompt D^0 mesons, a major systematic uncertainty comes from the determination of nonprompt D^0 fraction in different DCA regions. The DCA template distributions of prompt and nonprompt




Fig. 4. Results of v_2^{sub} for prompt D^0 mesons, as a function of p_T for $|y_{\text{lab}}| < 1$, with $N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{offline}} \geq 100$ in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. Published data for charged particles, K_S^0 mesons and Λ baryons are also shown for comparison [19]. The vertical bars correspond to the statistical uncertainties, while the shaded areas denote the systematic uncertainties. The horizontal bars represent the width of the p_T bins.

D^0 mesons from MC simulation are smeared via scaling the width of these distributions. The variation of DCA width is 2–8%, based on the best χ^2 fit to data. The resulting variation in the extracted nonprompt D^0 v_2 is quoted as a systematic uncertainty of 0.007.

All sources of systematic uncertainties are added in quadrature to obtain the total systematic uncertainty. The total systematic uncertainties for prompt and nonprompt D^0 mesons in pPb collisions yield 0.005–0.018 and 0.016–0.017, respectively. For prompt D^0 mesons in pp collisions, the total systematics uncertainties are quoted as 0.013–0.052.

6. Results

The v_2^{sub} results of prompt D^0 mesons in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, are presented in Fig. 4 as a function of p_T for $|y_{\text{lab}}| < 1$, with $N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{offline}} \geq 100$. Published data for light-flavor hadrons including inclusive charged particles (dominated by pions), K_S^0 mesons and Λ baryons are also shown for comparison [19]. The positive v_2 signal (0.061 ± 0.018 (stat) ± 0.013 (syst)) over a p_T range of ~ 2 –4 GeV for prompt charm hadrons provides indications of the collectivity of charm quarks in pp collisions, with a declining trend toward higher p_T . The v_2 magnitude for prompt D^0 mesons is found to be compatible with light-flavor hadron species, though slightly smaller by about one standard deviation. The results suggest that collectivity is being developed for charm hadrons in pp collisions, comparable (or slightly weaker) than that for light-flavor hadrons. This finding is similar to the observation made in pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{\text{NN}}} = 8.16$ TeV over a similar p_T range at higher multiplicities $185 \leq N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{offline}} < 250$ [57].

To further investigate possible system size dependence of collectivity for charm hadrons in small colliding systems, v_2 for prompt D^0 mesons in pPb and pp collisions are both measured




Fig. 5. Results of v_2^{sub} for prompt D^0 mesons, as a function of event multiplicity for three different p_T ranges, with $|y_{\text{lab}}| < 1$ in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV and pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{\text{NN}}} = 8.16$ TeV. The vertical bars correspond to statistical uncertainties, while the shaded areas denote the systematic uncertainties. The y-axis is zoomed in to better display the data; the uncertainties are symmetric with respect to their central values. The horizontal bars represent the width of the $N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{offline}}$ bins. The right-most points with right-hand arrows correspond to $N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{offline}} \geq 100$ for pp collisions and $N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{offline}} \geq 250$ for pPb collisions. The v_2^{sub} values in pPb collisions with $185 \leq N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{offline}} < 250$ are measured in different p_T ranges from Ref. [57] and are found to be consistent with Ref. [57].

in different multiplicity classes. The prompt D^0 v_2 as a function of event multiplicity for three different p_T ranges: $2 < p_T < 4$ GeV, $4 < p_T < 6$ GeV, and $6 < p_T < 8$ GeV are presented in Fig. 5. At similar multiplicities of $N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{offline}} \sim 100$, the prompt D^0 v_2 values are found to be comparable within uncertainties in pp and pPb systems. For $2 < p_T < 4$ GeV, the measured results of prompt D^0 provide indications of positive v_2 down to $N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{offline}} \sim 50$ with a significance of more than 2.4 standard deviations in pPb collisions, while for $6 < p_T < 8$ GeV the prompt D^0 v_2 signal tends to diminish in the low multiplicity regions. No clear multiplicity dependence can be determined for pp data, because of large statistical uncertainties at low multiplicities.

The v_2^{sub} results for nonprompt D^0 mesons from beauty hadron decays are shown in Fig. 6 as a function of p_T for pPb collisions at 8.16 TeV with $185 \leq N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{offline}} < 250$. The extracted v_2^{sub} values are $-0.008 \pm 0.028(\text{stat}) \pm 0.016(\text{syst})$ for $2 < p_T < 5$ GeV and $0.057 \pm 0.029(\text{stat}) \pm 0.017(\text{syst})$ for $5 < p_T < 8$ GeV. At low p_T , the nonprompt D^0 v_2 is consistent with zero, while at high p_T , a hint of a positive v_2 value for beauty mesons is suggested but not significant within statistical and systematic uncertainties. Previously published v_2 data for prompt D^0 mesons and strange hadrons are also shown [57].

At $p_T \sim 2-5$ GeV, the nonprompt D^0 meson v_2 from beauty hadron decays is observed to be smaller than that for prompt D^0 mesons with a significance of 2.7 standard deviations. Based on MC simulations with EVTGEN and PYTHIA [70,79], nonprompt D^0 mesons carry more than 50% of B transverse momenta. The deviation of nonprompt D^0 meson azimuthal distributions from B mesons could reduce the extracted v_2 values at fixed B meson p_T . Taking the gluon saturation model as an example, the maximum v_2 value of B mesons is at $p_T \sim 6$ GeV [78], while the maximum v_2 value of nonprompt D^0 mesons is about 70% of that of B mesons at D^0 $p_T \sim 4$ GeV due to the effects discussed above.




Fig. 6. Results of v_2^{sub} for prompt and nonprompt D^0 mesons, as well as K_S^0 mesons, Λ baryons for $|y_{\text{lab}}| < 1$, and prompt J/ψ mesons for $1.2 < |y_{\text{lab}}| < 2.4$, as functions of p_T with $185 \leq N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{offline}} < 250$ in pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{\text{NN}}} = 8.16$ TeV [57,59]. The vertical bars correspond to statistical uncertainties, while the shaded areas denote the systematic uncertainties. The horizontal bars represent the width of the nonprompt D^0 p_T bins. The dashed, dash-dotted, and solid lines, show the theoretical calculations of prompt D^0 , J/ψ , and nonprompt D^0 mesons, respectively, within the CGC framework [61,78].

These studies suggest a flavor hierarchy of the collectivity signal that tends to diminish for the heavier beauty hadrons. This is qualitatively consistent with the scenario of v_2 being generated via final-state rescatterings, where heavier quarks tend to develop a weaker collective v_2 signal [49]. The ordering of muon v_2 from charm and beauty decay at low p_T is also observed in PbPb collisions where final-state scatterings play an important role [80].

Correlations at the initial stage of the collision between partons originating from projectile protons and dense gluons in the lead nucleus are able to generate sizable elliptic flow in the color glass condensate (CGC) framework [35,61,78]. These CGC calculations of v_2 signals for prompt J/ψ mesons, as well as prompt and nonprompt (from B meson decay) D^0 mesons, are compared with data in Fig. 6. The qualitative agreement between data and theory suggests that initial-state effects may play an important role in the generation of collectivity for these particles in pPb collisions. The CGC framework also predicts a flavor hierarchy between prompt and nonprompt D^0 for $p_T \sim 2-5$ GeV, again consistent with the data within uncertainties.

7. Summary

The first measurements of elliptic azimuthal anisotropies for prompt D^0 mesons in proton-proton (pp) collisions at center-of-mass energy $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, and for nonprompt D^0 mesons from beauty hadron decays in proton-lead (pPb) collisions at nucleon-nucleon center-of-mass energy $\sqrt{s_{\text{NN}}} = 8.16$ TeV are presented. In pp collisions with multiplicities of $N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{offline}} \geq 100$, the second Fourier harmonic coefficient (v_2) of the azimuthal distributions for prompt D^0 mesons are measured over the transverse momentum (p_T) range of 2–8 GeV, with indications of positive v_2 signals over the p_T range of 2–4 GeV. These values are found to be comparable (or slightly smaller) to those of light-flavor hadron species. At similar event multiplicities, the prompt D^0 meson v_2 signals in pp and pPb collisions are found to be comparable in magnitude. The v_2 values of open beauty hadrons are extracted for the first time via non-prompt D^0 mesons in pPb collisions, with magnitudes smaller than those for prompt D^0 mesons for $p_T \sim 2-5$ GeV. The new measurements of charm hadron v_2 in the pp system and the indications of mass dependence of heavy-flavor hadron v_2 in the pPb system provide insights into the origin of heavy-flavor quark collectivity in small colliding systems.

1 Declaration of competing interest

2
3 The authors declare that they have no known competing financial
4 interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to
5 influence the work reported in this paper.

7 Acknowledgements

8
9 We congratulate our colleagues in the CERN accelerator depart-
10 ments for the excellent performance of the LHC and thank the
11 technical and administrative staffs at CERN and at other CMS in-
12 stitutes for their contributions to the success of the CMS effort.
13 In addition, we gratefully acknowledge the computing centers and
14 personnel of the Worldwide LHC Computing Grid for delivering so
15 effectively the computing infrastructure essential to our analyses.
16 Finally, we acknowledge the enduring support for the construc-
17 tion and operation of the LHC and the CMS detector provided by
18 the following funding agencies: BMBWF and FWF (Austria); FNRS
19 and FWO (Belgium); CNPq, CAPES, FAPERJ, FAPERGS, and FAPESP
20 (Brazil); MES (Bulgaria); CERN; CAS, MOST, and NSFC (China);
21 COLCIENCIAS (Colombia); MSES and CSF (Croatia); RIF (Cyprus);
22 SENESCYT (Ecuador); MoER, ERC IUT, PUT and ERDF (Estonia);
23 Academy of Finland, MEC, and HIP (Finland); CEA and CNRS/IN2P3
24 (France); BMBF, DFG, and HGF (Germany); GSRT (Greece); NK-
25 FIA (Hungary); DAE and DST (India); IPM (Iran); SFI (Ireland);
26 INFN (Italy); MSIP and NRF (Republic of Korea); MES (Latvia); LAS
27 (Lithuania); MOE and UM (Malaysia); BUAP, CINVESTAV, CONACYT,
28 LNS, SEP, and UASLP-FAI (Mexico); MOS (Montenegro); MBIE (New
29 Zealand); PAEC (Pakistan); MSHE and NSC (Poland); FCT (Portu-
30 gal); JINR (Dubna); MON, ROSATOM, RAS, RFBR, and NRC KI (Rus-
31 sia); MESTD (Serbia); SEIDI, CPAN, PCTI, and FEDER (Spain); MoSTR
32 (Sri Lanka); Swiss Funding Agencies (Switzerland); MST (Taipei);
33 ThEPcenter, IPST, STAR, and NSTDA (Thailand); TUBITAK and TAEK
34 (Turkey); NASU (Ukraine); STFC (United Kingdom); DOE and NSF
35 (USA).

36 Individuals have received support from the Marie-Curie pro-
37 gram and the European Research Council and Horizon 2020 Grant,
38 contract Nos. 675440, 752730, and 765710 (European Union); the
39 Leventis Foundation; the A.P. Sloan Foundation; the Alexander von
40 Humboldt Foundation; the Belgian Federal Science Policy Office;
41 the Fonds pour la Formation à la Recherche dans l'Industrie et
42 dans l'Agriculture (FRIA-Belgium); the Agentschap voor Innovatie
43 door Wetenschap en Technologie (IWT-Belgium); the F.R.S.-FNRS
44 and FWO (Belgium) under the "Excellence of Science – EOS" – be.h
45 project n. 30820817; the Beijing Municipal Science & Technology
46 Commission, No. Z191100007219010; The Ministry of Education,
47 Youth and Sports (MEYS) of the Czech Republic; the Deutsche
48 Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) under Germany's Excellence Strat-
49 egy – EXC 2121 "Quantum Universe" – 390833306; the Lendület
50 ("Momentum") Program and the János Bolyai Research Scholarship
51 of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, the New National Excel-
52 lence Program ÚNKP, the NKFI research grants 123842, 123959,
53 124845, 124850, 125105, 128713, 128786, and 129058 (Hungary);
54 the Council of Science and Industrial Research, India; the HOM-
55 ING PLUS program of the Foundation for Polish Science, cofin-
56 anced from European Union, Regional Development Fund, the
57 Mobility Plus program of the Ministry of Science and Higher Edu-
58 cation, the National Science Center (Poland), contracts Harmonia
59 2014/14/M/ST2/00428, Opus 2014/13/B/ST2/02543, 2014/15/B/ST2/
60 03998, and 2015/19/B/ST2/02861, Sonata-bis 2012/07/E/ST2/01406;
61 the National Priorities Research Program by Qatar National Re-
62 search Fund; the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the
63 Russian Federation, project no. 02.a03.21.0005 (Russia); the Tomsk
64 Polytechnic University Competitiveness Enhancement Program; the
65 Programa Estatal de Fomento de la Investigación Científica y Téc-
66 nica de Excelencia María de Maeztu, grant MDM-2015-0509 and

the Programa Severo Ochoa del Principado de Asturias; the Thalys
and Aristeia programs cofinanced by EU-ESF and the Greek NSRF;
the Rachadapisek Sompot Fund for Postdoctoral Fellowship, Chula-
longkorn University and the Chulalongkorn Academic into Its 2nd
Century Project Advancement Project (Thailand); The Kavli Founda-
tion; the Nvidia Corporation; the SuperMicro Corporation; The
Welch Foundation, contract C-1845; and the Weston Havens Founda-
tion (USA).

References

- [1] K.H. Ackermann, et al., STAR, Elliptic flow in Au+Au collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 130$ GeV, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 86 (2001) 402, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.86.402>, arXiv:nucl-ex/0009011.
- [2] S.S. Adler, et al., PHENIX, Elliptic flow of identified hadrons in Au+Au collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$ GeV, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 91 (2003) 182301, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.91.182301>, arXiv:nucl-ex/0305013.
- [3] J. Adams, et al., STAR, Distributions of charged hadrons associated with high transverse momentum particles in pp and Au+Au collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$ GeV, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 95 (2005) 152301, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.95.152301>, arXiv:nucl-ex/0501016.
- [4] B. Alver, et al., PHOBOS, System size dependence of cluster properties from two-particle angular correlations in Cu+Cu and Au+Au collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$ GeV, *Phys. Rev. C* 81 (2010) 024904, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.81.024904>, arXiv:0812.1172.
- [5] ALICE Collaboration, Elliptic flow of charged particles in Pb-Pb collisions at 2.76 TeV, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 105 (2010) 252302, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.105.252302>, arXiv:1011.3914.
- [6] CMS Collaboration, Measurement of the elliptic anisotropy of charged particles produced in PbPb collisions at nucleon-nucleon center-of-mass energy = 2.76 TeV, *Phys. Rev. C* 87 (2013) 014902, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.87.014902>, arXiv:1204.1409.
- [7] J.-Y. Ollitrault, Anisotropy as a signature of transverse collective flow, *Phys. Rev. D* 46 (1992) 229, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.46.229>.
- [8] U. Heinz, R. Snellings, Collective flow and viscosity in relativistic heavy-ion collisions, *Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* 63 (2013) 123, <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-nucl-102212-170540>, arXiv:1301.2826.
- [9] C. Gale, S. Jeon, B. Schenke, Hydrodynamic modeling of heavy-ion collisions, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* 28 (2013) 1340011, <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0217751X13400113>, arXiv:1301.5893.
- [10] B. Alver, et al., PHOBOS, High transverse momentum triggered correlations over a large pseudorapidity acceptance in Au+Au collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$ GeV, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 104 (2010) 062301, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.104.062301>, arXiv:0903.2811.
- [11] B.I. Abelev, et al., STAR, Long range rapidity correlations and jet production in high energy nuclear collisions, *Phys. Rev. C* 80 (2009) 064912, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.80.064912>, arXiv:0909.0191.
- [12] CMS Collaboration, Long-range and short-range dihadron angular correlations in central PbPb collisions at a nucleon-nucleon center of mass energy of 2.76 TeV, *J. High Energy Phys.* 07 (2011) 076, [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07\(2011\)076](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07(2011)076), arXiv:1105.2438.
- [13] CMS Collaboration, Centrality dependence of dihadron correlations and azimuthal anisotropy harmonics in PbPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 72 (2012) 2012, <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-012-2012-3>, arXiv:1201.3158.
- [14] ATLAS Collaboration, Measurement of the azimuthal anisotropy for charged particle production in $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV lead-lead collisions with the ATLAS detector, *Phys. Rev. C* 86 (2012) 014907, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.86.014907>, arXiv:1203.3087.
- [15] CMS Collaboration, Studies of azimuthal dihadron correlations in ultra-central PbPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV, *J. High Energy Phys.* 02 (2014) 088, [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP02\(2014\)088](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP02(2014)088), arXiv:1312.1845.
- [16] CMS Collaboration, Observation of long-range near-side angular correlations in proton-proton collisions at the LHC, *J. High Energy Phys.* 09 (2010) 091, [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP09\(2010\)091](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP09(2010)091), arXiv:1009.4122.
- [17] ATLAS Collaboration, Observation of long-range elliptic azimuthal anisotropies in $\sqrt{s} = 13$ and 2.76 TeV pp collisions with the ATLAS detector, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 116 (2016) 172301, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.172301>, arXiv:1509.04776.
- [18] CMS Collaboration, Measurement of long-range near-side two-particle angular correlations in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 116 (2016) 172302, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.172302>, arXiv:1510.03068.
- [19] CMS Collaboration, Evidence for collectivity in pp collisions at the LHC, *Phys. Lett. B* 765 (2017) 193, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2016.12.009>, arXiv:1606.06198.
- [20] ATLAS Collaboration, Measurement of azimuthal anisotropy of muons from charm and bottom hadrons in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 124 (2020) 082301, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.124.082301>, arXiv:1909.01650.

- [21] CMS Collaboration, Observation of long-range near-side angular correlations in proton-lead collisions at the LHC, Phys. Lett. B 718 (2013) 795, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2012.11.025>, arXiv:1210.5482.
- [22] ALICE Collaboration, Long-range angular correlations on the near and away side in pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV, Phys. Lett. B 719 (2013) 29, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2013.01.012>, arXiv:1212.2001.
- [23] ATLAS Collaboration, Observation of associated near-side and away-side long-range correlations in $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV proton-lead collisions with the ATLAS detector, Phys. Rev. Lett. 110 (2013) 182302, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.110.182302>, arXiv:1212.5198.
- [24] LHCb Collaboration, Measurements of long-range near-side angular correlations in $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5$ TeV proton-lead collisions in the forward region, Phys. Lett. B 762 (2016) 473, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2016.09.064>, arXiv:1512.00439.
- [25] ALICE Collaboration, Long-range angular correlations of pi, K and p in p-Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV, Phys. Lett. B 726 (2013) 164, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2013.08.024>, arXiv:1307.3237.
- [26] CMS Collaboration, Long-range two-particle correlations of strange hadrons with charged particles in pPb and PbPb collisions at LHC energies, Phys. Lett. B 742 (2015) 200, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2015.01.034>, arXiv:1409.3392.
- [27] CMS Collaboration, Evidence for collective multi-particle correlations in pPb collisions, Phys. Rev. Lett. 115 (2015) 012301, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.012301>, arXiv:1502.05382.
- [28] ATLAS Collaboration, Measurement of multi-particle azimuthal correlations in pp, p+Pb and low-multiplicity Pb+Pb collisions with the ATLAS detector, Eur. Phys. J. C 77 (2017) 428, <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-4988-1>, arXiv:1705.04176.
- [29] ATLAS Collaboration, Measurement of long-range multiparticle azimuthal correlations with the subevent cumulant method in pp and p+Pb collisions with the ATLAS detector at the CERN Large Hadron Collider, Phys. Rev. C 97 (2018) 024904, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.97.024904>, arXiv:1708.03559.
- [30] C. Aidala, et al., PHENIX, Measurement of long-range angular correlations and azimuthal anisotropies in high-multiplicity p+Au collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$ GeV, Phys. Rev. C 95 (2017) 034910, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.95.034910>, arXiv:1609.02894.
- [31] C. Aidala, et al., PHENIX, Creation of quark-gluon plasma droplets with three distinct geometries, Nat. Phys. 15 (2019) 214, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41567-018-0360-0>, arXiv:1805.02973.
- [32] L. Adamczyk, et al., STAR, Long-range pseudorapidity dihadron correlations in d+Au collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$ GeV, Phys. Lett. B 747 (2015) 265, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2015.05.075>, arXiv:1502.07652.
- [33] A. Adare, et al., PHENIX, Measurements of elliptic and triangular flow in high-multiplicity $^3\text{He}+\text{Au}$ collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$ GeV, Phys. Rev. Lett. 115 (2015) 142301, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.142301>, arXiv:1507.06273.
- [34] C. Aidala, et al., PHENIX, Measurements of multiparticle correlations in d+Au collisions at 200, 62.4, 39, and 19.6 GeV and p+Au collisions at 200 GeV and implications for collective behavior, Phys. Rev. Lett. 120 (2018) 062302, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.120.062302>, arXiv:1707.06108.
- [35] K. Dusling, W. Li, B. Schenke, Novel collective phenomena in high-energy proton-proton and proton-nucleus collisions, Int. J. Mod. Phys. E 25 (2016) 1630002, <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218301316300022>, arXiv:1509.07939.
- [36] Sören Schlichting, Prithwish Tribedy, Collectivity in small collision systems: an initial-state perspective, Adv. High Energy Phys. 2016 (2016) 8460349, <https://doi.org/10.1155/2016/8460349>, arXiv:1611.00329.
- [37] J.L. Nagle, W.A. Zajc, Small system collectivity in relativistic hadronic and nuclear collisions, Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. 68 (2018) 211, <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-nucl-101916-123209>, arXiv:1801.03477.
- [38] A. Badae, A. Baty, P. Chang, G.M. Innocenti, M. Maggi, C. McGinn, M. Peters, T.-A. Sheng, J. Thaler, Y.-J. Lee, Measurements of two-particle correlations in e^+e^- collisions at 91 GeV with ALEPH archived data, Phys. Rev. Lett. 123 (2019) 212002, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.123.212002>, arXiv:1906.00489.
- [39] I. Abt, et al., ZEUS, Two-particle azimuthal correlations as a probe of collective behaviour in deep inelastic ep scattering at HERA, J. High Energy Phys. 04 (2020) 070, [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP04\(2020\)070](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP04(2020)070), arXiv:1912.07431.
- [40] S. Voloshin, Y. Zhang, Flow study in relativistic nuclear collisions by Fourier expansion of azimuthal particle distributions, Z. Phys. C 70 (1996) 665, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s002880050141>, arXiv:hep-ph/9407282.
- [41] B.H. Alver, C. Gombaud, M. Luzum, J.-Y. Ollitrault, Triangular flow in hydrodynamics and transport theory, Phys. Rev. C 82 (2010) 034913, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.82.034913>, arXiv:1007.5469.
- [42] B. Schenke, S. Jeon, C. Gale, Elliptic and triangular flow in event-by-event $D=3+1$ viscous hydrodynamics, Phys. Rev. Lett. 106 (2011) 042301, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.106.042301>, arXiv:1009.3244.
- [43] Z. Qiu, C. Shen, U. Heinz, Hydrodynamic elliptic and triangular flow in Pb-Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV, Phys. Lett. B 707 (2012) 151, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2011.12.041>, arXiv:1110.3033.
- [44] B. Alver, G. Roland, Collision geometry fluctuations and triangular flow in heavy-ion collisions, Phys. Rev. C 81 (2010) 054905, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.82.039903>, arXiv:1003.0194.
- [45] L. He, T. Edmonds, Z.-W. Lin, F. Liu, D. Molnar, F. Wang, Anisotropic parton escape is the dominant source of azimuthal anisotropy in transport models, Phys. Lett. B 753 (2016) 506, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2015.12.051>, arXiv:1502.05572.
- [46] C. Bierlich, G. Gustafson, L. Lönnblad, H. Shah, The Angantyr model for heavy-ion collisions in pythia 8, J. High Energy Phys. 10 (2018) 134, [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP10\(2018\)134](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP10(2018)134), arXiv:1806.10820.
- [47] A. Kurkela, U.A. Wiedemann, B. Wu, Flow in AA and pA as an interplay of fluid-like and non-fluid like excitations, Eur. Phys. J. C 79 (2019) 965, <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-019-7428-6>, arXiv:1905.05139.
- [48] A. Andronic, et al., Heavy-flavour and quarkonium production in the LHC era: from proton-proton to heavy-ion collisions, Eur. Phys. J. C 76 (2016) 107, <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-015-3819-5>, arXiv:1506.03981.
- [49] X. Dong, Y.-J. Lee, R. Rapp, Open heavy-flavor production in heavy-ion collisions, Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. 69 (2019) 417, <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-nucl-101918-023806>, arXiv:1903.07709.
- [50] A. Adare, et al., PHENIX, Energy loss and flow of heavy quarks in Au+Au collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$ GeV, Phys. Rev. Lett. 98 (2007) 172301, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.98.172301>, arXiv:nucl-ex/0611018.
- [51] L. Adamczyk, et al., STAR, Measurement of D^0 azimuthal anisotropy at midrapidity in Au+Au collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$ GeV, Phys. Rev. Lett. 118 (2017) 212301, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.118.212301>, arXiv:1701.06060.
- [52] ALICE Collaboration, Azimuthal anisotropy of D meson production in Pb-Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV, Phys. Rev. C 90 (2014) 034904, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.90.034904>, arXiv:1405.2001.
- [53] ALICE Collaboration, D-meson azimuthal anisotropy in midcentral Pb-Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV, Phys. Rev. Lett. 120 (2018) 102301, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.120.102301>, arXiv:1707.01005.
- [54] CMS Collaboration, Measurement of prompt D^0 meson azimuthal anisotropy in Pb-Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV, Phys. Rev. Lett. 120 (2018) 202301, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.120.202301>, arXiv:1708.03497.
- [55] CMS Collaboration, Suppression and azimuthal anisotropy of prompt and non-prompt J/ψ production in PbPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV, Eur. Phys. J. C 77 (2017) 252, <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-4781-1>, arXiv:1610.00613.
- [56] ALICE Collaboration, J/ψ elliptic flow in Pb-Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV, Phys. Rev. Lett. 119 (2017) 242301, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.119.242301>, arXiv:1709.05260.
- [57] CMS Collaboration, Elliptic flow of charm and strange hadrons in high-multiplicity pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 8.16$ TeV, Phys. Rev. Lett. 121 (2018) 082301, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.121.082301>, arXiv:1804.09767.
- [58] ALICE Collaboration, Search for collectivity with azimuthal J/ψ -hadron correlations in high multiplicity p-Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ and 8.16 TeV, Phys. Lett. B 780 (2018) 7, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2018.02.039>, arXiv:1709.06807.
- [59] CMS Collaboration, Observation of prompt J/ψ meson elliptic flow in high-multiplicity pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 8.16$ TeV, Phys. Lett. B 791 (2019) 172, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2019.02.018>, arXiv:1810.01473.
- [60] X. Du, R. Rapp, In-medium charmonium production in proton-nucleus collisions, J. High Energy Phys. 03 (2019) 015, [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP03\(2019\)015](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP03(2019)015), arXiv:1808.10014.
- [61] C. Zhang, C. Marquet, G.-Y. Qin, S.-Y. Wei, B.-W. Xiao, Elliptic flow of heavy quarkonia in pA collisions, Phys. Rev. Lett. 122 (2019) 172302, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.122.172302>, arXiv:1901.10320.
- [62] CMS Collaboration, Description and performance of track and primary-vertex reconstruction with the CMS tracker, J. Instrum. 9 (2014) P10009, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/9/10/P10009>, arXiv:1405.6569.
- [63] CMS Collaboration, The CMS experiment at the CERN LHC, J. Instrum. 3 (2008) S08004, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08004>.
- [64] CMS Collaboration, The CMS trigger system, J. Instrum. 12 (2017) P01020, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/12/01/P01020>, arXiv:1609.02366.
- [65] CMS Collaboration, CMS luminosity measurement using 2016 proton-nucleus collisions at nucleon-nucleon center-of-mass energy of 8.16 TeV, <http://cds.cern.ch/record/2628652>, 2018, Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-LUM-17-002, CERN, Geneva.
- [66] CMS Collaboration, Constraints on the chiral magnetic effect using charge-dependent azimuthal correlations in pPb and PbPb collisions at the CERN Large Hadron Collider, Phys. Rev. C 97 (2018) 044912, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.97.044912>, arXiv:1708.01602.
- [67] CMS Collaboration, Observation of correlated azimuthal anisotropy fourier harmonics in pp and p+Pb collisions at the LHC, Phys. Rev. Lett. 120 (2018) 092301, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.120.092301>, arXiv:1709.09189.
- [68] P.A. Zyla, et al., Particle Data Group, Rev. Part. Phys., PTEP 2020 (2020) 083C01, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ptep/ptaa104>.
- [69] H. Voss, A. Höcker, J. Stelzer, F. Teegenfeldt, TMVA – the toolkit for multivariate data analysis, in: XIth International Workshop on Advanced Computing and Analysis Techniques in Physics Research (ACAT), 2009, p. 40, http://pos.sissa.it/archive/conferences/050/040/ACAT_040.pdf, arXiv:physics/0703039.

- [70] T. Sjöstrand, S. Ask, J.R. Christiansen, R. Corke, N. Desai, P. Ilten, S. Mrenna, S. Prestel, C.O. Rasmussen, P.Z. Skands, An introduction to pythia 8.2, Comput. Phys. Commun. 191 (2015) 159, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpc.2015.01.024>, arXiv:1410.3012.
- [71] CMS Collaboration, Event generator tunes obtained from underlying event and multiparton scattering measurements, Eur. Phys. J. C 76 (2016) 155, <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-3988-x>, arXiv:1512.00815.
- [72] T. Pierog, I. Karpenko, J.M. Katzy, E. Yatsenko, K. Werner, EPOS LHC: test of collective hadronization with data measured at the CERN Large Hadron Collider, Phys. Rev. C 92 (2015) 034906, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.92.034906>, arXiv:1306.0121.
- [73] S. Chatrchyan, et al., CMS, Multiplicity and transverse momentum dependence of two- and four-particle correlations in pPb and PbPb collisions, Phys. Lett. B 724 (2013) 213, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2013.06.028>, arXiv:1305.0609.
- [74] M.J. Oreglia, A study of the reactions $\psi' \rightarrow \gamma\gamma\psi$, Ph.D. thesis, Stanford University, 1980, <http://www.slac.stanford.edu/cgi-wrap/getdoc/slac-r-236.pdf>, SLAC Report SLAC-R-236.
- [75] M. Nahrgang, J. Aichelin, S. Bass, P.B. Gossiaux, K. Werner, Elliptic and triangular flow of heavy flavor in heavy-ion collisions, Phys. Rev. C 91 (2015) 014904, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.91.014904>, arXiv:1410.5396.
- [76] M. He, R.J. Fries, R. Rapp, Heavy flavor at the Large Hadron Collider in a strong coupling approach, Phys. Lett. B 735 (2014) 445, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2014.05.050>, arXiv:1401.3817.
- [77] J. Xu, J. Liao, M. Gyulassy, Bridging soft-hard transport properties of quark-gluon plasmas with CUJET3.0, J. High Energy Phys. 02 (2016) 169, [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP02\(2016\)169](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP02(2016)169), arXiv:1508.00552.
- [78] C. Zhang, C. Marquet, G.-Y. Qin, Y. Shi, L. Wang, S.-Y. Wei, B.-W. Xiao, Collectivity of heavy mesons in proton-nucleus collisions, Phys. Rev. D 102 (2020) 034010, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.102.034010>, arXiv:2002.09878.
- [79] D.J. Lange, The evtgen particle decay simulation package, Nucl. Instrum. Methods A 462 (2001) 152, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9002\(01\)00089-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9002(01)00089-4).
- [80] ATLAS Collaboration, Measurement of azimuthal anisotropy of muons from charm and bottom hadrons in Pb+Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV with the ATLAS detector, Phys. Lett. B 807 (2020) 135595, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2020.135595>, arXiv:2003.03565.

The CMS Collaboration

A.M. Sirunyan[†], A. Tumasyan

Yerevan Physics Institute, Yerevan, Armenia

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

Institut für Hochenergiephysik, Wien, Austria

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

Institute for Nuclear Problems, Minsk, Belarus

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

Universiteit Antwerpen, Antwerpen, Belgium

F. Blekman, E.S. Bols, S.S. Chhibra, J. D'Hondt, J. De Clercq, D. Lontkovskyi, S. Lowette, I. Marchesini, S. Moortgat, Q. Python, S. Tavernier, W. Van Doninck, P. Van Mulders

Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussel, Belgium

D. Beghin, B. Bilin, B. Clerboux, G. De Lentdecker, H. Delannoy, B. Dorney, L. Favart, A. Grebenyuk, A.K. Kalsi, L. Moureaux, A. Popov, N. Postiau, E. Starling, L. Thomas, C. Vander Velde, P. Vanlaer, D. Vannerom

Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium

T. Cornelis, D. Dobur, I. Khvastunov³, M. Niedziela, C. Roskas, K. Skovpen, M. Tytgat, W. Verbeke, B. Vermassen, M. Vit

Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

G. Bruno, C. Caputo, P. David, C. Delaere, M. Delcourt, A. Giammanco, V. Lemaitre, J. Prisciandaro, A. Saggio, P. Vischia, J. Zobec

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

G.A. Alves, G. Correia Silva, C. Hensel, A. Moraes

Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Físicas, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

1 E. Belchior Batista Das Chagas, W. Carvalho, J. Chinellato⁴, E. Coelho, E.M. Da Costa, G.G. Da Silveira⁵, 67
 2 D. De Jesus Damiao, C. De Oliveira Martins, S. Fonseca De Souza, H. Malbouisson, J. Martins⁶, 68
 3 D. Matos Figueiredo, M. Medina Jaime⁷, M. Melo De Almeida, C. Mora Herrera, L. Mundim, H. Nogima, 69
 4 W.L. Prado Da Silva, P. Rebello Teles, L.J. Sanchez Rosas, A. Santoro, A. Sznajder, M. Thiel, 70
 5 E.J. Tonelli Manganote⁴, F. Torres Da Silva De Araujo, A. Vilela Pereira 71
 6 72

7 *Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil* 73
 8 74

9 C.A. Bernardes^a, L. Calligaris^a, T.R. Fernandez Perez Tomei^a, E.M. Gregores^b, D.S. Lemos^a, 75
 10 P.G. Mercadante^b, S.F. Novaes^a, Sandra S. Padula^a 76
 11 77

12 ^a *Universidade Estadual Paulista, São Paulo, Brazil* 78
 13 ^b *Universidade Federal do ABC, São Paulo, Brazil* 79

14 80
 15 A. Aleksandrov, G. Antchev, R. Hadjiiska, P. Iaydjiev, M. Misheva, M. Rodozov, M. Shopova, G. Sultanov 81
 16 82

17 *Institute for Nuclear Research and Nuclear Energy, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia, Bulgaria* 83
 18 84

19 M. Bonchev, A. Dimitrov, T. Ivanov, L. Litov, B. Pavlov, P. Petkov, A. Petrov 85
 20 86

21 *University of Sofia, Sofia, Bulgaria* 87
 22 88

23 W. Fang², X. Gao², L. Yuan 89
 24 90

25 *Beihang University, Beijing, China* 91
 26 92

27 M. Ahmad, Z. Hu, Y. Wang 93
 28 94

29 *Department of Physics, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China* 95
 30 96

31 G.M. Chen⁸, H.S. Chen⁸, M. Chen, C.H. Jiang, D. Leggat, H. Liao, Z. Liu, A. Spiezia, J. Tao, E. Yazgan, 97
 32 H. Zhang, S. Zhang⁸, J. Zhao 98
 33 99

34 *Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing, China* 100
 35 101

36 A. Agapitos, Y. Ban, G. Chen, A. Levin, J. Li, L. Li, Q. Li, Y. Mao, S.J. Qian, D. Wang, Q. Wang 102
 37 103

38 *State Key Laboratory of Nuclear Physics and Technology, Peking University, Beijing, China* 104
 39 105

40 M. Xiao 106
 41 107

42 *Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China* 108
 43 109

44 C. Avila, A. Cabrera, C. Florez, C.F. González Hernández, M.A. Segura Delgado 110
 45 111

46 *Universidad de Los Andes, Bogota, Colombia* 112
 47 113

48 J. Mejia Guisao, J.D. Ruiz Alvarez, C.A. Salazar González, N. Vanegas Arbelaez 114
 49 115

50 *Universidad de Antioquia, Medellin, Colombia* 116
 51 117

52 D. Giljanović, N. Godinovic, D. Lelas, I. Puljak, T. Sculac 118
 53 119

54 *University of Split, Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering and Naval Architecture, Split, Croatia* 120
 55 121

56 Z. Antunovic, M. Kovac 122
 57 123

58 *University of Split, Faculty of Science, Split, Croatia* 124
 59 125

60 V. Brigljevic, D. Ferencek, K. Kadija, D. Majumder, B. Mesic, M. Roguljic, A. Starodumov⁹, T. Susa 126
 61 127

62 *Institute Rudjer Boskovic, Zagreb, Croatia* 128
 63 129

64 M.W. Ather, A. Attikis, E. Erodou, A. Ioannou, M. Kolosova, S. Konstantinou, G. Mavromanolakis, 130
 65 J. Mousa, C. Nicolaou, F. Ptochos, P.A. Razis, H. Rykaczewski, H. Saka, D. Tsiakkouri 131
 66 132

University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus

1	M. Finger ¹⁰ , M. Finger Jr. ¹⁰ , A. Kveton, J. Tomsa	67
2		68
3	<i>Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic</i>	69
4		70
5	E. Ayala	71
6		72
7	<i>Escuela Politecnica Nacional, Quito, Ecuador</i>	73
8		74
9	E. Carrera Jarrin	75
10		76
11	<i>Universidad San Francisco de Quito, Quito, Ecuador</i>	77
12	Y. Assran ^{11,12} , E. Salama ^{12,13}	78
13		79
14	<i>Academy of Scientific Research and Technology of the Arab Republic of Egypt, Egyptian Network of High Energy Physics, Cairo, Egypt</i>	80
15		81
16	S. Bhowmik, A. Carvalho Antunes De Oliveira, R.K. Dewanjee, K. Ehataht, M. Kadastik, M. Raidal,	82
17	C. Veelken	83
18		84
19	<i>National Institute of Chemical Physics and Biophysics, Tallinn, Estonia</i>	85
20		86
21	P. Eerola, L. Forthomme, H. Kirschenmann, K. Osterberg, M. Voutilainen	87
22		88
23	<i>Department of Physics, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland</i>	89
24		90
25	E. Brücken, F. Garcia, J. Havukainen, J.K. Heikkilä, V. Karimäki, M.S. Kim, R. Kinnunen, T. Lampén,	91
26	K. Lassila-Perini, S. Laurila, S. Lehti, T. Lindén, H. Siikonen, E. Tuominen, J. Tuominiemi	92
27		93
28	<i>Helsinki Institute of Physics, Helsinki, Finland</i>	94
29		95
30	P. Luukka, T. Tuuva	96
31		97
32	<i>Lappeenranta University of Technology, Lappeenranta, Finland</i>	98
33		99
34	M. Besancon, F. Couderc, M. Dejardin, D. Denegri, B. Fabbro, J.L. Faure, F. Ferri, S. Ganjour, A. Givernaud,	100
35	P. Gras, G. Hamel de Monchenault, P. Jarry, C. Leloup, B. Lenzi, E. Locci, J. Malcles, J. Rander,	101
36	A. Rosowsky, M.Ö. Sahin, A. Savoy-Navarro ¹⁴ , M. Titov, G.B. Yu	102
37		103
38	<i>IRFU, CEA, Université Paris-Saclay, Gif-sur-Yvette, France</i>	104
39		105
40	S. Ahuja, C. Amendola, F. Beaudette, M. Bonanomi, P. Busson, C. Charlot, B. Diab, G. Falmagne,	106
41	R. Granier de Cassagnac, I. Kucher, A. Lobanov, C. Martin Perez, M. Nguyen, C. Ochando, P. Paganini,	107
42	J. Rembser, R. Salerno, J.B. Sauvan, Y. Sirois, A. Zabi, A. Zghiche	108
43		109
44	<i>Laboratoire Leprince-Ringuet, CNRS/IN2P3, Ecole Polytechnique, Institut Polytechnique de Paris, Palaiseau, France</i>	110
45		111
46	J.-L. Agram ¹⁵ , J. Andrea, D. Bloch, G. Bourgatte, J.-M. Brom, E.C. Chabert, C. Collard, E. Conte ¹⁵ ,	112
47	J.-C. Fontaine ¹⁵ , D. Gelé, U. Goerlach, C. Grimault, A.-C. Le Bihan, N. Tonon, P. Van Hove	113
48		114
49	<i>Université de Strasbourg, CNRS, IPHC UMR 7178, Strasbourg, France</i>	115
50		116
51	S. Gadrat	117
52		118
53	<i>Centre de Calcul de l'Institut National de Physique Nucleaire et de Physique des Particules, CNRS/IN2P3, Villeurbanne, France</i>	119
54		120
55	S. Beauceron, C. Bernet, G. Boudoul, C. Camen, A. Carle, N. Chanon, R. Chierici, D. Contardo, P. Depasse,	121
56	H. El Mamouni, J. Fay, S. Gascon, M. Gouzevitch, B. Ille, Sa. Jain, I.B. Laktineh, H. Lattaud, A. Lesauvage,	122
57	M. Lethuillier, L. Mirabito, S. Perries, V. Sordini, L. Torterotot, G. Touquet, M. Vander Donckt, S. Viret	123
58		124
59	<i>Université de Lyon, Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, CNRS-IN2P3, Institut de Physique Nucléaire de Lyon, Villeurbanne, France</i>	125
60		126
61	G. Adamov	127
62		128
63	<i>Georgian Technical University, Tbilisi, Georgia</i>	129
64		130
65	Z. Tsamalaidze ¹⁰	131
66		132

1	<i>Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia</i>	67
2		68
3	C. Autermann, L. Feld, K. Klein, M. Lipinski, D. Meuser, A. Pauls, M. Preuten, M.P. Rauch, J. Schulz,	69
4	M. Teroerde	70
5		71
6	<i>RWTH Aachen University, I. Physikalisches Institut, Aachen, Germany</i>	72
7		73
8	M. Erdmann, B. Fischer, S. Ghosh, T. Hebbeker, K. Hoepfner, H. Keller, L. Mastrolorenzo,	74
9	M. Merschmeyer, A. Meyer, P. Millet, G. Mocellin, S. Mondal, S. Mukherjee, D. Noll, A. Novak, T. Pook,	75
10	A. Pozdnyakov, T. Quast, M. Radziej, Y. Rath, H. Reithler, J. Roemer, A. Schmidt, S.C. Schuler, A. Sharma,	76
11	S. Wiedenbeck, S. Zaleski	77
12		78
13	<i>RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut A, Aachen, Germany</i>	79
14		80
15	G. Flügge, W. Haj Ahmad¹⁶, O. Hlushchenko, T. Kress, T. Müller, A. Nowack, C. Pistone, O. Pooth, D. Roy,	81
16	H. Sert, A. Stahl¹⁷	82
17		83
18	<i>RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut B, Aachen, Germany</i>	84
19		85
20		86
21	M. Aldaya Martin, P. Asmuss, I. Babounikau, H. Bakhshiansohi, K. Beernaert, O. Behnke,	87
22	A. Bermúdez Martínez, A.A. Bin Anuar, K. Borras¹⁸, V. Botta, A. Campbell, A. Cardini, P. Connor,	88
23	S. Consuegra Rodríguez, C. Contreras-Campana, V. Danilov, A. De Wit, M.M. Defranchis, C. Diez Pardos,	89
24	D. Domínguez Damiani, G. Eckerlin, D. Eckstein, T. Eichhorn, A. Elwood, E. Eren, L.I. Estevez Banos,	90
25	E. Gallo¹⁹, A. Geiser, A. Grohsjean, M. Guthoff, M. Haranko, A. Harb, A. Jafari, N.Z. Jomhari, H. Jung,	91
26	A. Kasem¹⁸, M. Kasemann, H. Kaveh, J. Keaveney, C. Kleinwort, J. Knolle, D. Krücker, W. Lange, T. Lenz,	92
27	J. Lidrych, K. Lipka, W. Lohmann²⁰, R. Mankel, I.-A. Melzer-Pellmann, A.B. Meyer, M. Meyer, M. Missiroli,	93
28	J. Mnich, A. Mussgiller, V. Myronenko, D. Pérez Adán, S.K. Pflitsch, D. Pitzl, A. Raspereza, A. Saibel,	94
29	M. Savitskyi, V. Scheurer, P. Schütze, C. Schwanenberger, R. Shevchenko, A. Singh, R.E. Sosa Ricardo,	95
30	H. Tholen, O. Turkot, A. Vagnerini, M. Van De Klundert, R. Walsh, Y. Wen, K. Wichmann, C. Wissing,	96
31	O. Zenaiev, R. Zlebck	97
32		98
33		99
34	<i>Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Hamburg, Germany</i>	100
35		101
36		102
37	R. Aggleton, S. Bein, L. Benato, A. Benecke, T. Dreyer, A. Ebrahimi, F. Feindt, A. Fröhlich, C. Garbers,	103
38	E. Garutti, D. Gonzalez, P. Gunnellini, J. Haller, A. Hinzmann, A. Karavdina, G. Kasieczka, R. Klanner,	104
39	R. Kogler, N. Kovalchuk, S. Kurz, V. Kutzner, J. Lange, T. Lange, A. Malara, J. Multhaupt, C.E.N. Niemeyer,	105
40	A. Reimers, O. Rieger, P. Schleper, S. Schumann, J. Schwandt, J. Sonneveld, H. Stadie, G. Steinbrück,	106
41	B. Vormwald, I. Zoi	107
42		108
43	<i>University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany</i>	109
44		110
45		111
46	M. Akbiyik, M. Baselga, S. Baur, T. Berger, E. Butz, R. Caspart, T. Chwalek, W. De Boer, A. Dierlamm,	112
47	K. El Morabit, N. Faltermann, M. Giffels, A. Gottmann, F. Hartmann¹⁷, C. Heidecker, U. Husemann,	113
48	M.A. Iqbal, S. Kudella, S. Maier, S. Mitra, M.U. Mozer, D. Müller, Th. Müller, M. Musich, A. Nürnberg,	114
49	G. Quast, K. Rabbertz, D. Savoie, D. Schäfer, M. Schnepf, M. Schröder, I. Shvetsov, H.J. Simonis, R. Ulrich,	115
50	M. Wassmer, M. Weber, C. Wöhrmann, R. Wolf, S. Wozniowski	116
51		117
52	<i>Karlsruher Institut fuer Technologie, Karlsruhe, Germany</i>	118
53		119
54		120
55	G. Anagnostou, P. Asenov, G. Daskalakis, T. Geralis, A. Kyriakis, D. Loukas, G. Paspalaki, A. Stakia	121
56	<i>Institute of Nuclear and Particle Physics (INPP), NCSR Demokritos, Aghia Paraskevi, Greece</i>	122
57		123
58	M. Diamantopoulou, G. Karathanasis, P. Kontaxakis, A. Manousakis-katsikakis, A. Panagiotou,	124
59	I. Papavergou, N. Saoulidou, K. Theofilatos, K. Vellidis, E. Vourliotis	125
60		126
61	<i>National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece</i>	127
62		128
63	G. Bakas, K. Kousouris, I. Papakrivopoulos, G. Tsipolitis, A. Zacharopoulou	129
64		130
65	<i>National Technical University of Athens, Athens, Greece</i>	131
66		132

1	I. Evangelou, C. Foudas, P. Gianneios, P. Katsoulis, P. Kokkas, S. Mallios, K. Manitaras, N. Manthos,	67
2	I. Papadopoulos, J. Strologas, F.A. Triantis, D. Tsitsonis	68
3		69
4	<i>University of Ioánnina, Ioánnina, Greece</i>	70
5		71
6	M. Bartók ²¹ , R. Chudasama, M. Csanad, P. Major, K. Mandal, A. Mehta, G. Pasztor, O. Surányi, G.I. Veres	72
7		73
8	<i>MTA-ELTE Lendület CMS Particle and Nuclear Physics Group, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary</i>	74
9		75
10	G. Bencze, C. Hajdu, D. Horvath ²² , F. Sikler, V. Veszpremi, G. Vesztergombi [†]	76
11		77
12	<i>Wigner Research Centre for Physics, Budapest, Hungary</i>	78
13		79
14	N. Beni, S. Czellar, J. Karancsi ²¹ , J. Molnar, Z. Szillasi	80
15		81
16	<i>Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary</i>	82
17		83
18	P. Raics, D. Teyssier, Z.L. Trocsanyi, B. Ujvari	84
19		85
20	<i>Institute of Physics, University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary</i>	86
21		87
22	T. Csorgo, W.J. Metzger, F. Nemes, T. Novak	88
23		89
24	<i>Eszterhazy Karoly University, Karoly Robert Campus, Gyogyos, Hungary</i>	90
25		91
26	S. Choudhury, J.R. Komaragiri, P.C. Tiwari	92
27		93
28	<i>Indian Institute of Science (IISc), Bangalore, India</i>	94
29		95
30	S. Bahinipati ²³ , C. Kar, G. Kole, P. Mal, V.K. Muraleedharan Nair Bindhu, A. Nayak ²⁴ , D.K. Sahoo ²³ ,	96
31	S.K. Swain	97
32		98
33	<i>National Institute of Science Education and Research, HBNI, Bhubaneswar, India</i>	99
34		100
35	S. Bansal, S.B. Beri, V. Bhatnagar, S. Chauhan, N. Dhingra ²⁵ , R. Gupta, A. Kaur, M. Kaur, S. Kaur,	101
36	P. Kumari, M. Lohan, M. Meena, K. Sandeep, S. Sharma, J.B. Singh, A.K. Viridi	102
37		103
38	<i>Panjab University, Chandigarh, India</i>	104
39		105
40	A. Bhardwaj, B.C. Choudhary, R.B. Garg, M. Gola, S. Keshri, Ashok Kumar, M. Naimuddin, P. Priyanka,	106
41	K. Ranjan, Aashaq Shah, R. Sharma	107
42		108
43	<i>University of Delhi, Delhi, India</i>	109
44		110
45	R. Bhardwaj ²⁶ , M. Bharti ²⁶ , R. Bhattacharya, S. Bhattacharya, U. Bhawandeep ²⁶ , D. Bhowmik, S. Dutta,	111
46	S. Ghosh, B. Gomber ²⁷ , M. Maity ²⁸ , K. Mondal, S. Nandan, A. Purohit, P.K. Rout, G. Saha, S. Sarkar,	112
47	M. Sharan, B. Singh ²⁶ , S. Thakur ²⁶	113
48		114
49	<i>Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, HBNI, Kolkata, India</i>	115
50		116
51	P.K. Behera, S.C. Behera, P. Kalbhor, A. Muhammad, P.R. Pujahari, A. Sharma, A.K. Sikdar	117
52		118
53	<i>Indian Institute of Technology Madras, Madras, India</i>	119
54		120
55	D. Dutta, V. Jha, D.K. Mishra, P.K. Netrakanti, L.M. Pant, P. Shukla	121
56		122
57	<i>Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, Mumbai, India</i>	123
58		124
59	T. Aziz, M.A. Bhat, S. Dugad, G.B. Mohanty, N. Sur, Ravindra Kumar Verma	125
60		126
61	<i>Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-A, Mumbai, India</i>	127
62		128
63	S. Banerjee, S. Bhattacharya, S. Chatterjee, P. Das, M. Guchait, S. Karmakar, S. Kumar, G. Majumder,	129
64	K. Mazumdar, N. Sahoo, S. Sawant	130
65		131
66	<i>Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-B, Mumbai, India</i>	132

1 S. Dube, B. Kansal, A. Kapoor, K. Kotheekar, S. Pandey, A. Rane, A. Rastogi, S. Sharma 67

2 *Indian Institute of Science Education and Research (IISER), Pune, India* 68

3 69

4 S. Chenarani, S.M. Etesami, M. Khakzad, M. Mohammadi Najafabadi, M. Naseri, F. Rezaei Hosseinabadi 70

5 *Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM), Tehran, Iran* 71

6 72

7 73

8 M. Felcini, M. Grunewald 74

9 *University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland* 75

10 76

11 77

12 M. Abbrescia^{a,b}, R. Aly^{a,b,29}, C. Calabria^{a,b}, A. Colaleo^a, D. Creanza^{a,c}, L. Cristella^{a,b}, N. De Filippis^{a,c}, 78

13 M. De Palma^{a,b}, A. Di Florio^{a,b}, W. Elmetenawee^{a,b}, L. Fiore^a, A. Gelmi^{a,b}, G. Iaselli^{a,c}, M. Ince^{a,b}, 79

14 S. Lezki^{a,b}, G. Maggi^{a,c}, M. Maggi^a, J.A. Merlin^a, G. Miniello^{a,b}, S. My^{a,b}, S. Nuzzo^{a,b}, A. Pompili^{a,b}, 80

15 G. Pugliese^{a,c}, R. Radogna^a, A. Ranieri^a, G. Selvaggi^{a,b}, L. Silvestris^a, F.M. Simone^{a,b}, R. Venditti^a, 81

16 P. Verwilligen^a 82

17 83

18 84

19 ^a INFN Sezione di Bari, Bari, Italy 85

20 ^b Università di Bari, Bari, Italy 86

21 ^c Politecnico di Bari, Bari, Italy 87

22 88

23 G. Abbiendi^a, C. Battilana^{a,b}, D. Bonacorsi^{a,b}, L. Borgonovi^{a,b}, S. Braibant-Giacomelli^{a,b}, 89

24 R. Campanini^{a,b}, P. Capiluppi^{a,b}, A. Castro^{a,b}, F.R. Cavallo^a, C. Ciocca^a, G. Codispoti^{a,b}, M. Cuffiani^{a,b}, 90

25 G.M. Dallavalle^a, F. Fabbri^a, A. Fanfani^{a,b}, E. Fontanesi^{a,b}, P. Giacomelli^a, L. Giommi^{a,b}, C. Grandi^a, 91

26 L. Guiducci^{a,b}, F. Iemmi^{a,b}, S. Lo Meo^{a,30}, S. Marcellini^a, G. Masetti^a, F.L. Navarria^{a,b}, A. Perrotta^a, 92

27 F. Primavera^{a,b}, T. Rovelli^{a,b}, G.P. Siroli^{a,b}, N. Tosi^a 93

28 94

29 ^a INFN Sezione di Bologna, Bologna, Italy 95

30 ^b Università di Bologna, Bologna, Italy 96

31 97

32 S. Albergo^{a,b,31}, S. Costa^{a,b}, A. Di Mattia^a, R. Potenza^{a,b}, A. Tricomi^{a,b,31}, C. Tuve^{a,b} 98

33 99

34 ^a INFN Sezione di Catania, Catania, Italy 100

35 ^b Università di Catania, Catania, Italy 101

36 102

37 G. Barbagli^a, A. Cassese^a, R. Ceccarelli^{a,b}, V. Ciulli^{a,b}, C. Civinini^a, R. D'Alessandro^{a,b}, F. Fiori^a, 103

38 E. Focardi^{a,b}, G. Latino^{a,b}, P. Lenzi^{a,b}, M. Lizzo^{a,b}, M. Meschini^a, S. Paoletti^a, R. Seidita^{a,b}, 104

39 G. Sguazzoni^a, L. Viliani^a 105

40 106

41 ^a INFN Sezione di Firenze, Firenze, Italy 107

42 ^b Università di Firenze, Firenze, Italy 108

43 109

44 L. Benussi, S. Bianco, D. Piccolo 110

45 *INFN Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, Frascati, Italy* 111

46 112

47 113

48 M. Bozzo^{a,b}, F. Ferro^a, R. Mulargia^{a,b}, E. Robutti^a, S. Tosi^{a,b} 114

49 115

50 ^a INFN Sezione di Genova, Genova, Italy 116

51 ^b Università di Genova, Genova, Italy 117

52 118

53 A. Benaglia^a, A. Beschi^{a,b}, F. Brivio^{a,b}, V. Ciriolo^{a,b,17}, M.E. Dinardo^{a,b}, P. Dini^a, S. Gennai^a, 119

54 A. Ghezzi^{a,b}, P. Govoni^{a,b}, L. Guzzi^{a,b}, M. Malberti^a, S. Malvezzi^a, D. Menasce^a, F. Monti^{a,b}, L. Moroni^a, 120

55 M. Paganoni^{a,b}, D. Pedrini^a, S. Ragazzi^{a,b}, T. Tabarelli de Fatis^{a,b}, D. Valsecchi^{a,b,17}, D. Zuolo^{a,b} 121

56 122

57 ^a INFN Sezione di Milano-Bicocca, Milano, Italy 123

58 ^b Università di Milano-Bicocca, Milano, Italy 124

59 125

60 S. Buontempo^a, N. Cavallo^{a,c}, A. De Iorio^{a,b}, A. Di Crescenzo^{a,b}, F. Fabozzi^{a,c}, F. Fienga^a, G. Galati^a, 126

61 A.O.M. Iorio^{a,b}, L. Layer^{a,b}, L. Lista^{a,b}, S. Meola^{a,d,17}, P. Paolucci^{a,17}, B. Rossi^a, C. Sciacca^{a,b}, 127

62 E. Voevodina^{a,b} 128

63 129

64 ^a INFN Sezione di Napoli, Napoli, Italy 130

65 ^b Università di Napoli 'Federico II', Napoli, Italy 131

66 ^c Università della Basilicata, Potenza, Italy 132

^d *Università G. Marconi, Roma, Italy*

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

^a *INFN Sezione di Padova, Padova, Italy*

^b *Università di Padova, Padova, Italy*

^c *Università di Trento, Trento, Italy*

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

^a *INFN Sezione di Pavia, Pavia, Italy*

^b *Università di Pavia, Pavia, Italy*

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

^a *INFN Sezione di Perugia, Perugia, Italy*

^b *Università di Perugia, Perugia, Italy*

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

^a *INFN Sezione di Pisa, Pisa, Italy*

^b *Università di Pisa, Pisa, Italy*

^c *Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Pisa, Italy*

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

^a *INFN Sezione di Roma, Rome, Italy*

^b *Sapienza Università di Roma, Rome, Italy*

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

^a *INFN Sezione di Torino, Torino, Italy*

^b *Università di Torino, Torino, Italy*

^c *Università del Piemonte Orientale, Novara, Italy*

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

^a *INFN Sezione di Trieste, Trieste, Italy*

^b *Università di Trieste, Trieste, Italy*

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

Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Republic of Korea

H. Kim, D.H. Moon

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

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

1 Hanyang University, Seoul, Republic of Korea

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

3 Korea University, Seoul, Republic of Korea

4 J. Goh

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

6 H.S. Kim

7 Sejong University, Seoul, Republic of Korea

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

10 Seoul National University, Seoul, Republic of Korea

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

12 University of Seoul, Seoul, Republic of Korea

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

14 Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon, Republic of Korea

15 V. Veckalns³²

16 Riga Technical University, Riga, Latvia

17 V. Dudenas, A. Juodagalvis, A. Rinkevicius, G. Tamulaitis, J. Vaitkus

18 Vilnius University, Vilnius, Lithuania

19 F. Mohamad Idris³³, W.A.T. Wan Abdullah, M.N. Yusli, Z. Zolkapli

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

21 J.F. Benitez, A. Castaneda Hernandez, J.A. Murillo Quijada, L. Valencia Palomo

22 Universidad de Sonora (UNISON), Hermosillo, Mexico

23 H. Castilla-Valdez, E. De La Cruz-Burelo, I. Heredia-De La Cruz³⁴, R. Lopez-Fernandez,
24 A. Sanchez-Hernandez

25 Centro de Investigacion y de Estudios Avanzados del IPN, Mexico City, Mexico

26 S. Carrillo Moreno, C. Oropeza Barrera, M. Ramirez-Garcia, F. Vazquez Valencia

27 Universidad Iberoamericana, Mexico City, Mexico

28 J. Eysermans, I. Pedraza, H.A. Salazar Ibarguen, C. Uribe Estrada

29 Benemerita Universidad Autonoma de Puebla, Puebla, Mexico

30 A. Morelos Pineda

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

32 J. Mijuskovic³, N. Raicevic

33 University of Montenegro, Podgorica, Montenegro

34 D. Krofcheck

35 University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132

1	S. Bheesette, P.H. Butler, P. Lujan	67
2		68
3	<i>University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand</i>	69
4		70
5	A. Ahmad, M. Ahmad, M.I.M. Awan, Q. Hassan, H.R. Hoorani, W.A. Khan, M.A. Shah, M. Shoaib, M. Waqas	71
6		72
7	<i>National Centre for Physics, Quaid-I-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan</i>	73
8		74
9	V. Avati, L. Grzanka, M. Malawski	75
10		76
11	<i>AGH University of Science and Technology Faculty of Computer Science, Electronics and Telecommunications, Krakow, Poland</i>	77
12		78
13	H. Bialkowska, M. Bluj, B. Boimska, M. Górski, M. Kazana, M. Szleper, P. Zalewski	79
14		80
15	<i>National Centre for Nuclear Research, Swierk, Poland</i>	81
16		82
17	K. Bunkowski, A. Byszuk ³⁵ , K. Doroba, A. Kalinowski, M. Konecki, J. Krolikowski, M. Olszewski,	83
18	M. Walczak	84
19		85
20	<i>Institute of Experimental Physics, Faculty of Physics, University of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland</i>	86
21		87
22	M. Araujo, P. Bargassa, D. Bastos, A. Di Francesco, P. Faccioli, B. Galinhas, M. Gallinaro, J. Hollar,	88
23	N. Leonardo, T. Niknejad, J. Seixas, K. Shchelina, G. Strong, O. Toldaiev, J. Varela	89
24		90
25	<i>Laboratório de Instrumentação e Física Experimental de Partículas, Lisboa, Portugal</i>	91
26		92
27	S. Afanasiev, P. Bunin, I. Golutvin, I. Gorbunov, A. Kamenev, V. Karjavine, V. Korenkov, A. Lanev,	93
28	A. Malakhov, V. Matveev ^{36,37} , P. Moisenz, V. Palichik, V. Perelygin, S. Shmatov, S. Shulha, N. Skatchkov,	94
29	V. Smirnov, B.S. Yuldashev ³⁸ , A. Zarubin, V. Zhiltsov	95
30		96
31	<i>Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia</i>	97
32		98
33	L. Chtchypounov, V. Golovtcov, Y. Ivanov, V. Kim ³⁹ , E. Kuznetsova ⁴⁰ , P. Levchenko, V. Murzin,	99
34	V. Oreshkin, I. Smirnov, D. Sosnov, V. Sulimov, L. Uvarov, A. Vorobyev	100
35		101
36	<i>Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, Gatchina (St. Petersburg), Russia</i>	102
37		103
38	Yu. Andreev, A. Dermenev, S. Gninenko, N. Golubev, A. Karneyeu, M. Kirsanov, N. Krasnikov,	104
39	A. Pashenkov, D. Tlisov, A. Toropin	105
40		106
41	<i>Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia</i>	107
42		108
43	V. Epshteyn, V. Gavrilov, N. Lychkovskaya, A. Nikitenko ⁴¹ , V. Popov, I. Pozdnyakov, G. Safronov,	109
44	A. Spiridonov, A. Stepenov, M. Toms, E. Vlasov, A. Zhokin	110
45		111
46	<i>Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics named by A.I. Alikhanov of NRC 'Kurchatov Institute', Moscow, Russia</i>	112
47		113
48	T. Aushev	114
49		115
50	<i>Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Moscow, Russia</i>	116
51		117
52	M. Chadeeva ⁴² , P. Parygin, D. Philippov, E. Popova, V. Rusinov	118
53		119
54	<i>National Research Nuclear University 'Moscow Engineering Physics Institute' (MEPhI), Moscow, Russia</i>	120
55		121
56	V. Andreev, M. Azarkin, I. Dremin, M. Kirakosyan, A. Terkulov	122
57		123
58	<i>P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia</i>	124
59		125
60	A. Belyaev, E. Boos, A. Demiyarov, A. Ershov, A. Gribushin, O. Kodolova, V. Korotkikh, I. Lokhtin,	126
61	S. Obraztsov, S. Petrushanko, V. Savrin, A. Snigirev, I. Vardanyan	127
62		128
63	<i>Skobeltsyn Institute of Nuclear Physics, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia</i>	129
64		130
65	A. Barnyakov ⁴³ , V. Blinov ⁴³ , T. Dimova ⁴³ , L. Kardapoltsev ⁴³ , Y. Skovpen ⁴³	131
66		132
	<i>Novosibirsk State University (NSU), Novosibirsk, Russia</i>	

1 I. Azhgirey, I. Bayshev, S. Bitioukov, V. Kachanov, D. Konstantinov, P. Mandrik, V. Petrov, R. Ryutin, 67
 2 S. Slabospitskii, A. Sobol, S. Troshin, N. Tyurin, A. Uzunian, A. Volkov 68

3
 4 *Institute for High Energy Physics of National Research Centre 'Kurchatov Institute', Protvino, Russia* 69
 5 70

6 A. Babaev, A. Iuzhakov, V. Okhotnikov 71

7
 8 *National Research Tomsk Polytechnic University, Tomsk, Russia* 72
 9 73
 10 74

11 V. Borchsh, V. Ivanchenko, E. Tcherniaev 75

12
 13 *Tomsk State University, Tomsk, Russia* 76
 14 77

15 P. Adzic⁴⁴, P. Cirkovic, M. Dordevic, P. Milenovic, J. Milosevic, M. Stojanovic 78
 16 79

17
 18 *University of Belgrade: Faculty of Physics and VINCA Institute of Nuclear Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia* 80
 19 81
 20 82

21 M. Aguilar-Benitez, J. Alcaraz Maestre, A. Álvarez Fernández, I. Bachiller, M. Barrio Luna, 83
 22 Cristina F. Bedoya, J.A. Brochero Cifuentes, C.A. Carrillo Montoya, M. Cepeda, M. Cerrada, N. Colino, 84
 23 B. De La Cruz, A. Delgado Peris, J.P. Fernández Ramos, J. Flix, M.C. Fouz, O. Gonzalez Lopez, S. Goy Lopez, 85
 24 J.M. Hernandez, M.I. Josa, D. Moran, Á. Navarro Tobar, A. Pérez-Calero Yzquierdo, J. Puerta Pelayo, 86
 25 I. Redondo, L. Romero, S. Sánchez Navas, M.S. Soares, A. Triossi, C. Willmott 87
 26 88
 27 89

28
 29 *Centro de Investigaciones Energéticas Medioambientales y Tecnológicas (CIEMAT), Madrid, Spain* 90
 30 91

31 C. Albajar, J.F. de Trocóniz, R. Reyes-Almanza 92

32
 33 *Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain* 93
 34 94
 35 95

36 B. Alvarez Gonzalez, J. Cuevas, C. Erice, J. Fernandez Menendez, S. Folgueras, I. Gonzalez Caballero, 96
 37 E. Palencia Cortezon, C. Ramón Álvarez, V. Rodríguez Bouza, S. Sanchez Cruz 97
 38 98

39
 40 *Universidad de Oviedo, Instituto Universitario de Ciencias y Tecnologías Espaciales de Asturias (ICTEA), Oviedo, Spain* 99
 41 100

42 I.J. Cabrillo, A. Calderon, B. Chazin Quero, J. Duarte Campderros, M. Fernandez, P.J. Fernández Manteca, 101
 43 A. García Alonso, G. Gomez, C. Martinez Rivero, P. Martinez Ruiz del Arbol, F. Matorras, J. Piedra Gomez, 102
 44 C. Prieels, F. Ricci-Tam, T. Rodrigo, A. Ruiz-Jimeno, L. Russo⁴⁵, L. Scodellaro, I. Vila, J.M. Vizan Garcia 103
 45 104

46
 47 *Instituto de Física de Cantabria (IFCA), CSIC-Universidad de Cantabria, Santander, Spain* 105
 48 106

49 D.U.J. Sonnadara 107

50
 51 *University of Colombo, Colombo, Sri Lanka* 108
 52 109
 53 110

54 W.G.D. Dharmaratna, N. Wickramage 111

55
 56 *University of Ruhuna, Department of Physics, Matara, Sri Lanka* 112
 57 113
 58 114

59 T.K. Aarrestad, D. Abbaneo, B. Akgun, E. Auffray, G. Auzinger, J. Baechler, P. Baillon, A.H. Ball, D. Barney, 115
 60 J. Bendavid, M. Bianco, A. Bocci, P. Bortignon, E. Bossini, E. Brondolin, T. Camporesi, A. Caratelli, 116
 61 G. Cerminara, E. Chapon, G. Cucciati, D. d'Enterria, A. Dabrowski, N. Daci, V. Daponte, A. David, 117
 62 O. Davignon, A. De Roeck, M. Deile, R. Di Maria, M. Dobson, M. Dünser, N. Dupont, A. Elliott-Peisert, 118
 63 N. Emriskova, F. Fallavollita⁴⁶, D. Fasanella, S. Fiorendi, G. Franzoni, J. Fulcher, W. Funk, S. Giani, D. Gigi, 119
 64 K. Gill, F. Glege, L. Gouskos, M. Gruchala, M. Guilbaud, D. Gulhan, J. Hegeman, C. Heidegger, Y. Iiyama, 120
 65 V. Innocente, T. James, P. Janot, O. Karacheban²⁰, J. Kaspar, J. Kieseler, M. Krammer¹, N. Kratochwil, 121
 66 C. Lange, P. Lecoq, K. Long, C. Lourenço, L. Malgeri, M. Mannelli, A. Massironi, F. Meijers, S. Mersi, 122
 67 E. Meschi, F. Moortgat, M. Mulders, J. Ngadiuba, J. Niedziela, S. Nourbakhsh, S. Orfanelli, L. Orsini, 123
 68 F. Pantaleo¹⁷, L. Pape, E. Perez, M. Peruzzi, A. Petrilli, G. Petrucciani, A. Pfeiffer, M. Pierini, F.M. Pitters, 124
 69 D. Rabaday, A. Racz, M. Rieger, M. Rovere, H. Sakulin, J. Salfeld-Nebgen, S. Scarfi, C. Schäfer, C. Schwick, 125
 70 M. Selvaggi, A. Sharma, P. Silva, W. Snoeys, P. Sphicas⁴⁷, J. Steggemann, S. Summers, V.R. Tavolaro, 126
 71 D. Treille, A. Tsirou, G.P. Van Onsem, A. Vartak, M. Verzetti, K.A. Wozniak, W.D. Zeuner 127
 72 128
 73 129
 74 130
 75 131
 76 132

77
 78 *CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland*

1 L. Caminada⁴⁸, K. Deiters, W. Erdmann, R. Horisberger, Q. Ingram, H.C. Kaestli, D. Kotlinski,
2 U. Langenegger, T. Rohe

3
4 *Paul Scherrer Institut, Villigen, Switzerland*

5
6 M. Backhaus, P. Berger, A. Calandri, N. Chernyavskaya, G. Dissertori, M. Dittmar, M. Donegà, C. Dorfer,
7 T.A. Gómez Espinosa, C. Grab, D. Hits, W. Luster, R.A. Manzoni, M.T. Meinhard, F. Micheli,
8 P. Musella, F. Nessi-Tedaldi, F. Pauss, V. Perovic, G. Perrin, L. Perrozzi, S. Pigazzini, M.G. Ratti,
9 M. Reichmann, C. Reissel, T. Reitspiess, B. Ristic, D. Ruini, D.A. Sanz Becerra, M. Schönenberger,
10 L. Shchutska, M.L. Vesterbacka Olsson, R. Wallny, D.H. Zhu

11
12 *ETH Zurich – Institute for Particle Physics and Astrophysics (IPA), Zurich, Switzerland*

13
14
15 C. Amsler⁴⁹, C. Botta, D. Brzhechko, M.F. Canelli, A. De Cosa, R. Del Burgo, B. Kilminster, S. Leontsinis,
16 V.M. Mikuni, I. Neutelings, G. Rauco, P. Robmann, K. Schweiger, Y. Takahashi, S. Wertz

17
18 *Universität Zürich, Zurich, Switzerland*

19
20 C.M. Kuo, W. Lin, A. Roy, T. Sarkar²⁸, S.S. Yu

21
22 *National Central University, Chung-Li, Taiwan*

23
24 P. Chang, Y. Chao, K.F. Chen, P.H. Chen, W.-S. Hou, Y.y. Li, R.-S. Lu, E. Paganis, A. Psallidas, A. Steen

25
26 *National Taiwan University (NTU), Taipei, Taiwan*

27
28 B. Asavapibhop, C. Asawatangtrakuldee, N. Srimanobhas, N. Suwonjandee

29
30 *Chulalongkorn University, Faculty of Science, Department of Physics, Bangkok, Thailand*

31
32 A. Bat, F. Boran, A. Celik⁵⁰, S. Damarseckin⁵¹, Z.S. Demiroglu, F. Dolek, C. Dozen⁵², I. Dumanoglu⁵³,
33 G. Gokbulut, Emine Gurpinar Guler⁵⁴, Y. Guler, I. Hos⁵⁵, C. Isik, E.E. Kangal⁵⁶, O. Kara, A. Kayis Topaksu,
34 U. Kiminsu, G. Onengut, K. Ozdemir⁵⁷, A.E. Simsek, U.G. Tok, S. Turkcapar, I.S. Zorbakir, C. Zorbilmez

35
36 *Çukurova University, Physics Department, Science and Art Faculty, Adana, Turkey*

37
38 B. Isildak⁵⁸, G. Karapinar⁵⁹, M. Yalvac⁶⁰

39
40 *Middle East Technical University, Physics Department, Ankara, Turkey*

41
42 I.O. Atakisi, E. Gülmez, M. Kaya⁶¹, O. Kaya⁶², Ö. Özçelik, S. Tekten⁶³, E.A. Yetkin⁶⁴

43
44 *Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey*

45
46 A. Cakir, K. Cankocak⁵³, Y. Komurcu, S. Sen⁶⁵

47
48 *Istanbul Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey*

49
50 S. Cerci⁶⁶, B. Kaynak, S. Ozkorucuklu, D. Sunar Cerci⁶⁶

51
52 *Istanbul University, Istanbul, Turkey*

53
54 B. Grynyov

55
56 *Institute for Scintillation Materials of National Academy of Science of Ukraine, Kharkov, Ukraine*

57
58 L. Levchuk

59
60 *National Scientific Center, Kharkov Institute of Physics and Technology, Kharkov, Ukraine*

61
62 E. Bhal, S. Bologna, J.J. Brooke, D. Burns⁶⁷, E. Clement, D. Cussans, H. Flacher, J. Goldstein, G.P. Heath,
63 H.F. Heath, L. Kreczko, B. Krikler, S. Paramesvaran, T. Sakuma, S. Seif El Nasr-Storey, V.J. Smith, J. Taylor,
64 A. Titterton

65
66 *University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom*

- 1 K.W. Bell, A. Belyaev⁶⁸, C. Brew, R.M. Brown, D.J.A. Cockerill, J.A. Coughlan, K. Harder, S. Harper, 67
 2 J. Linacre, K. Manolopoulos, D.M. Newbold, E. Olaiya, D. Petyt, T. Reis, T. Schuh, 68
 3 C.H. Shepherd-Themistocleous, A. Thea, I.R. Tomalin, T. Williams 69
 4 70
 5 *Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom* 71
 6 72
 7 R. Bainbridge, P. Bloch, S. Bonomally, J. Borg, S. Breeze, O. Buchmuller, A. Bundock, 73
 8 Gurpreet Singh Chahal⁶⁹, D. Colling, P. Dauncey, G. Davies, M. Della Negra, P. Everaerts, G. Hall, G. Iles, 74
 9 M. Komm, J. Langford, L. Lyons, A.-M. Magnan, S. Malik, A. Martelli, V. Milosevic, A. Morton, J. Nash⁷⁰, 75
 10 V. Palladino, M. Pesaresi, D.M. Raymond, A. Richards, A. Rose, E. Scott, C. Seez, A. Shtipliyski, M. Stoye, 76
 11 T. Strebler, A. Tapper, K. Uchida, T. Virdee¹⁷, N. Wardle, S.N. Webb, D. Winterbottom, A.G. Zecchinelli, 77
 12 S.C. Zenz 78
 13 79
 14 80
 15 *Imperial College, London, United Kingdom* 81
 16 82
 17 J.E. Cole, P.R. Hobson, A. Khan, P. Kyberd, C.K. Mackay, I.D. Reid, L. Teodorescu, S. Zahid 83
 18 84
 19 *Brunel University, Uxbridge, United Kingdom* 85
 20 86
 21 A. Brinkerhoff, K. Call, B. Caraway, J. Dittmann, K. Hatakeyama, C. Madrid, B. McMaster, N. Pastika, 87
 22 C. Smith 88
 23 89
 24 *Baylor University, Waco, USA* 90
 25 91
 26 R. Bartek, A. Dominguez, R. Uniyal, A.M. Vargas Hernandez 92
 27 93
 28 *Catholic University of America, Washington, DC, USA* 94
 29 95
 30 A. Buccilli, S.I. Cooper, S.V. Gleyzer, C. Henderson, P. Rumerio, C. West 96
 31 97
 32 *The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, USA* 98
 33 99
 34 A. Albert, D. Arcaro, Z. Demiragli, D. Gastler, C. Richardson, J. Rohlf, D. Sperka, D. Spitzbart, I. Suarez, 100
 35 L. Sulak, D. Zou 101
 36 102
 37 *Boston University, Boston, USA* 103
 38 104
 39 G. Benelli, B. Burklee, X. Coubez¹⁸, D. Cutts, Y.t. Duh, M. Hadley, U. Heintz, J.M. Hogan⁷¹, K.H.M. Kwok, 105
 40 E. Laird, G. Landsberg, K.T. Lau, J. Lee, M. Narain, S. Sagir⁷², R. Syarif, E. Usai, W.Y. Wong, D. Yu, W. Zhang 106
 41 107
 42 *Brown University, Providence, USA* 108
 43 109
 44 R. Band, C. Brainerd, R. Breedon, M. Calderon De La Barca Sanchez, M. Chertok, J. Conway, R. Conway, 110
 45 P.T. Cox, R. Erbacher, C. Flores, G. Funk, F. Jensen, W. Ko[†], O. Kukral, R. Lander, M. Mulhearn, D. Pellett, 111
 46 J. Pilot, M. Shi, D. Taylor, K. Tos, M. Tripathi, Z. Wang, F. Zhang 112
 47 113
 48 *University of California, Davis, Davis, USA* 114
 49 115
 50 M. Bachtis, C. Bravo, R. Cousins, A. Dasgupta, A. Florent, J. Hauser, M. Ignatenko, N. Mccoll, W.A. Nash, 116
 51 S. Regnard, D. Saltzberg, C. Schnaible, B. Stone, V. Valuev 117
 52 118
 53 *University of California, Los Angeles, USA* 119
 54 120
 55 K. Burt, Y. Chen, R. Clare, J.W. Gary, S.M.A. Ghiasi Shirazi, G. Hanson, G. Karapostoli, O.R. Long, 121
 56 N. Manganelli, M. Olmedo Negrete, M.I. Paneva, W. Si, S. Wimpenny, B.R. Yates, Y. Zhang 122
 57 123
 58 *University of California, Riverside, Riverside, USA* 124
 59 125
 60 J.G. Branson, P. Chang, S. Cittolin, S. Cooperstein, N. Deelen, M. Derdzinski, J. Duarte, R. Gerosa, 126
 61 D. Gilbert, B. Hashemi, D. Klein, V. Krutelyov, J. Letts, M. Masciovecchio, S. May, S. Padhi, M. Pieri, 127
 62 V. Sharma, M. Tadel, F. Würthwein, A. Yagil, G. Zevi Della Porta 128
 63 129
 64 *University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, USA* 130
 65 131
 66 132

1	N. Amin, R. Bhandari, C. Campagnari, M. Citron, V. Dutta, J. Incandela, B. Marsh, H. Mei, A. Ovcharova,	67
2	H. Qu, J. Richman, U. Sarica, D. Stuart, S. Wang	68
3		69
4	<i>University of California, Santa Barbara – Department of Physics, Santa Barbara, USA</i>	70
5		71
6	D. Anderson, A. Bornheim, O. Cerri, I. Dutta, J.M. Lawhorn, N. Lu, J. Mao, H.B. Newman, T.Q. Nguyen,	72
7	J. Pata, M. Spiropulu, J.R. Vlimant, S. Xie, Z. Zhang, R.Y. Zhu	73
8		74
9	<i>California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA</i>	75
10		76
11	J. Alison, M.B. Andrews, T. Ferguson, T. Mudholkar, M. Paulini, M. Sun, I. Vorobiev, M. Weinberg	77
12		78
13	<i>Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, USA</i>	79
14		80
15	J.P. Cumalat, W.T. Ford, E. MacDonald, T. Mulholland, R. Patel, A. Perloff, K. Stenson, K.A. Ulmer,	81
16	S.R. Wagner	82
17		83
18	<i>University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, USA</i>	84
19		85
20	J. Alexander, Y. Cheng, J. Chu, A. Datta, A. Frankenthal, K. Mcdermott, J.R. Patterson, D. Quach, A. Ryd,	86
21	S.M. Tan, Z. Tao, J. Thom, P. Wittich, M. Zientek	87
22		88
23	<i>Cornell University, Ithaca, USA</i>	89
24		90
25	S. Abdullin, M. Albrow, M. Alyari, G. Apollinari, A. Apresyan, A. Apyan, S. Banerjee, L.A.T. Bauerdick,	91
26	A. Beretvas, D. Berry, J. Berryhill, P.C. Bhat, K. Burkett, J.N. Butler, A. Canepa, G.B. Cerati, H.W.K. Cheung,	92
27	F. Chlebana, M. Cremonesi, V.D. Elvira, J. Freeman, Z. Gecse, E. Gottschalk, L. Gray, D. Green,	93
28	S. Grünendahl, O. Gutsche, J. Hanlon, R.M. Harris, S. Hasegawa, R. Heller, J. Hirschauer, B. Jayatilaka,	94
29	S. Jindariani, M. Johnson, U. Joshi, T. Klijnsma, B. Klima, M.J. Kortelainen, B. Kreis, S. Lammel, J. Lewis,	95
30	D. Lincoln, R. Lipton, M. Liu, T. Liu, J. Lykken, K. Maeshima, J.M. Marraffino, D. Mason, P. McBride,	96
31	P. Merkel, S. Mrenna, S. Nahn, V. O'Dell, V. Papadimitriou, K. Pedro, C. Pena ⁷³ , F. Ravera,	97
32	A. Reinsvold Hall, L. Ristori, B. Schneider, E. Sexton-Kennedy, N. Smith, A. Soha, W.J. Spalding, L. Spiegel,	98
33	S. Stoynev, J. Strait, L. Taylor, S. Tkaczyk, N.V. Tran, L. Uplegger, E.W. Vaandering, R. Vidal, M. Wang,	99
34	H.A. Weber, A. Woodard	100
35		101
36		102
37	<i>Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, USA</i>	103
38		104
39		105
40	D. Acosta, P. Avery, D. Bourilkov, L. Cadamuro, V. Cherepanov, F. Errico, R.D. Field, D. Guerrero,	106
41	B.M. Joshi, M. Kim, J. Konigsberg, A. Korytov, K.H. Lo, K. Matchev, N. Menendez, G. Mitselmakher,	107
42	D. Rosenzweig, K. Shi, J. Wang, S. Wang, X. Zuo	108
43		109
44	<i>University of Florida, Gainesville, USA</i>	110
45		111
46	Y.R. Joshi	112
47		113
48	<i>Florida International University, Miami, USA</i>	114
49		115
50	T. Adams, A. Askew, R. Habibullah, S. Hagopian, V. Hagopian, K.F. Johnson, R. Khurana, T. Kolberg,	116
51	G. Martinez, T. Perry, H. Prosper, C. Schiber, R. Yohay, J. Zhang	117
52		118
53	<i>Florida State University, Tallahassee, USA</i>	119
54		120
55	M.M. Baarmand, M. Hohlmann, D. Noonan, M. Rahmani, M. Saunders, F. Yumiceva	121
56		122
57	<i>Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, USA</i>	123
58		124
59	M.R. Adams, L. Apanasevich, R.R. Betts, R. Cavanaugh, X. Chen, S. Dittmer, O. Evdokimov, C.E. Gerber,	125
60	D.A. Hangal, D.J. Hofman, V. Kumar, C. Mills, G. Oh, T. Roy, M.B. Tonjes, N. Varelas, J. Viinikainen,	126
61	H. Wang, X. Wang, Z. Wu	127
62		128
63	<i>University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC), Chicago, USA</i>	129
64		130
65		131
66		132

- 1 M. Alhusseini, B. Bilki⁵⁴, K. Dilsiz⁷⁴, S. Durgut, R.P. Gandrajula, M. Haytmyradov, V. Khristenko, 67
 2 O.K. Köseyan, J.-P. Merlo, A. Mestvirishvili⁷⁵, A. Moeller, J. Nachtman, H. Ogul⁷⁶, Y. Onel, F. Ozok⁷⁷, 68
 3 A. Penzo, C. Snyder, E. Tiras, J. Wetzel, K. Yi⁷⁸ 69
 4 70
 5 *The University of Iowa, Iowa City, USA* 71
 6 72
 7 B. Blumenfeld, A. Cocoros, N. Eminizer, A.V. Gritsan, W.T. Hung, S. Kyriacou, P. Maksimovic, C. Mantilla, 73
 8 J. Roskes, M. Swartz, T.Á. Vámi 74
 9 75
 10 *Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA* 76
 11 77
 12 C. Baldenegro Barrera, P. Baringer, A. Bean, S. Boren, A. Bylinkin, T. Isidori, S. Khalil, J. King, G. Krintiras, 78
 13 A. Kropivnitskaya, C. Lindsey, W. Mcbrayer, N. Minafra, M. Murray, C. Rogan, C. Royon, S. Sanders, 79
 14 E. Schmitz, J.D. Tapia Takaki, Q. Wang, J. Williams, G. Wilson 80
 15 81
 16 *The University of Kansas, Lawrence, USA* 82
 17 83
 18 S. Duric, A. Ivanov, K. Kaadze, D. Kim, Y. Maravin, D.R. Mendis, T. Mitchell, A. Modak, A. Mohammadi 84
 19 85
 20 *Kansas State University, Manhattan, USA* 86
 21 87
 22 F. Rebassoo, D. Wright 88
 23 89
 24 *Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, USA* 90
 25 91
 26 A. Baden, O. Baron, A. Belloni, S.C. Eno, Y. Feng, N.J. Hadley, S. Jabeen, G.Y. Jeng, R.G. Kellogg, 92
 27 A.C. Mignerey, S. Nabili, M. Seidel, A. Skuja, S.C. Tonwar, L. Wang, K. Wong 93
 28 94
 29 *University of Maryland, College Park, USA* 95
 30 96
 31 D. Abercrombie, B. Allen, R. Bi, S. Brandt, W. Busza, I.A. Cali, M. D'Alfonso, G. Gomez Ceballos, 97
 32 M. Goncharov, P. Harris, D. Hsu, M. Hu, M. Klute, D. Kovalskyi, Y.-J. Lee, P.D. Luckey, B. Maier, 98
 33 A.C. Marini, C. Mcginn, C. Mironov, S. Narayanan, X. Niu, C. Paus, D. Rankin, C. Roland, G. Roland, Z. Shi, 99
 34 G.S.F. Stephans, K. Sumorok, K. Tatar, D. Velicanu, J. Wang, T.W. Wang, B. Wyslouch 100
 35 101
 36 *Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, USA* 102
 37 103
 38 R.M. Chatterjee, A. Evans, S. Guts[†], P. Hansen, J. Hiltbrand, Sh. Jain, Y. Kubota, Z. Lesko, J. Mans, 104
 39 M. Revering, R. Rusack, R. Saradhy, N. Schroeder, N. Strobbe, M.A. Wadud 105
 40 106
 41 *University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, USA* 107
 42 108
 43 J.G. Acosta, S. Oliveros 109
 44 110
 45 *University of Mississippi, Oxford, USA* 111
 46 112
 47 K. Bloom, S. Chauhan, D.R. Claes, C. Fangmeier, L. Finco, F. Golf, R. Kamalieddin, I. Kravchenko, J.E. Siado, 113
 48 G.R. Snow[†], B. Stieger, W. Tabb 114
 49 115
 50 *University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, USA* 116
 51 117
 52 118
 53 G. Agarwal, C. Harrington, I. Iashvili, A. Kharchilava, C. McLean, D. Nguyen, A. Parker, J. Pekkanen, 119
 54 S. Rappoccio, B. Roozbahani 120
 55 121
 56 *State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, USA* 122
 57 123
 58 G. Alverson, E. Barberis, C. Freer, Y. Haddad, A. Hortiangtham, G. Madigan, B. Marzocchi, D.M. Morse, 124
 59 V. Nguyen, T. Orimoto, L. Skinnari, A. Tishelman-Charny, T. Wamorkar, B. Wang, A. Wisecarver, D. Wood 125
 60 126
 61 *Northeastern University, Boston, USA* 127
 62 128
 63 S. Bhattacharya, J. Bueghly, G. Fedi, A. Gilbert, T. Gunter, K.A. Hahn, N. Odell, M.H. Schmitt, K. Sung, 129
 64 M. Velasco 130
 65 131
 66 *Northwestern University, Evanston, USA* 132

- 1 R. Bucci, N. Dev, R. Goldouzian, M. Hildreth, K. Hurtado Anampa, C. Jessop, D.J. Karmgard, K. Lannon, 67
 2 W. Li, N. Loukas, N. Marinelli, I. Mcalister, F. Meng, Y. Musienko³⁶, R. Ruchti, P. Siddireddy, G. Smith, 68
 3 S. Taroni, M. Wayne, A. Wightman, M. Wolf 69
 4 70
 5 *University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, USA* 71
 6 72
 7 J. Alimena, B. Bylsma, B. Cardwell, L.S. Durkin, B. Francis, C. Hill, W. Ji, A. Lefeld, T.Y. Ling, B.L. Winer 73
 8 74
 9 *The Ohio State University, Columbus, USA* 75
 10 76
 11 G. Dezoort, P. Elmer, J. Hardenbrook, N. Haubrich, S. Higginbotham, A. Kalogeropoulos, S. Kwan, D. Lange, 77
 12 M.T. Lucchini, J. Luo, D. Marlow, K. Mei, I. Ojalvo, J. Olsen, C. Palmer, P. Piroué, D. Stickland, C. Tully 78
 13 79
 14 *Princeton University, Princeton, USA* 80
 15 81
 16 S. Malik, S. Norberg 82
 17 83
 18 *University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez, USA* 84
 19 85
 20 A. Barker, V.E. Barnes, R. Chawla, S. Das, L. Gutay, M. Jones, A.W. Jung, B. Mahakud, D.H. Miller, 86
 21 G. Negro, N. Neumeister, C.C. Peng, S. Piperov, H. Qiu, J.F. Schulte, N. Trevisani, F. Wang, R. Xiao, W. Xie 87
 22 88
 23 *Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA* 89
 24 90
 25 T. Cheng, J. Dolen, N. Parashar 91
 26 92
 27 *Purdue University Northwest, Hammond, USA* 93
 28 94
 29 A. Baty, U. Behrens, S. Dildick, K.M. Ecklund, S. Freed, F.J.M. Geurts, M. Kilpatrick, Arun Kumar, W. Li, 95
 30 B.P. Padley, R. Redjimi, J. Roberts, J. Rorie, W. Shi, A.G. Stahl Leiton, Z. Tu, S. Yang, A. Zhang, L. Zhang, 96
 31 Y. Zhang 97
 32 98
 33 *Rice University, Houston, USA* 99
 34 100
 35 A. Bodek, P. de Barbaro, R. Demina, J.L. Dulemba, C. Fallon, T. Ferbel, M. Galanti, A. Garcia-Bellido, 101
 36 O. Hindrichs, A. Khukhunaishvili, E. Ranken, R. Taus 102
 37 103
 38 *University of Rochester, Rochester, USA* 104
 39 105
 40 B. Chiarito, J.P. Chou, A. Gandrakota, Y. Gershtein, E. Halkiadakis, A. Hart, M. Heindl, E. Hughes, 106
 41 S. Kaplan, I. Laflotte, A. Lath, R. Montalvo, K. Nash, M. Osherson, S. Salur, S. Schnetzer, S. Somalwar, 107
 42 R. Stone, S. Thomas 108
 43 109
 44 *Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, Piscataway, USA* 110
 45 111
 46 H. Acharya, A.G. Delannoy, S. Spanier 112
 47 113
 48 *University of Tennessee, Knoxville, USA* 114
 49 115
 50 O. Bouhali⁷⁹, M. Dalchenko, A. Delgado, R. Eusebi, J. Gilmore, T. Huang, T. Kamon⁸⁰, H. Kim, S. Luo, 116
 51 S. Malhotra, D. Marley, R. Mueller, D. Overton, L. Perniè, D. Rathjens, A. Safonov 117
 52 118
 53 *Texas A&M University, College Station, USA* 119
 54 120
 55 N. Akchurin, J. Damgov, F. De Guio, V. Hegde, S. Kunori, K. Lamichhane, S.W. Lee, T. Mengke, 121
 56 S. Muthumuni, T. Peltola, S. Undleeb, I. Volobouev, Z. Wang, A. Whitbeck 122
 57 123
 58 *Texas Tech University, Lubbock, USA* 124
 59 125
 60 S. Greene, A. Gurrola, R. Janjam, W. Johns, C. Maguire, A. Melo, H. Ni, K. Padeken, F. Romeo, P. Sheldon, 126
 61 S. Tuo, J. Velkovska, M. Verweij 127
 62 128
 63 *Vanderbilt University, Nashville, USA* 129
 64 130
 65 131
 66 132

1 M.W. Arenton, P. Barria, B. Cox, G. Cummings, J. Hakala, R. Hirosky, M. Joyce, A. Ledovskoy, C. Neu, 67
 2 B. Tannenwald, Y. Wang, E. Wolfe, F. Xia 68

3
 4 *University of Virginia, Charlottesville, USA* 69
 5 70

6 R. Harr, P.E. Karchin, N. Poudyal, J. Sturdy, P. Thapa 71
 7 72

8 *Wayne State University, Detroit, USA* 73
 9 74

10 K. Black, T. Bose, J. Buchanan, C. Caillol, D. Carlsmith, S. Dasu, I. De Bruyn, L. Dodd, C. Galloni, H. He, 75
 11 M. Herndon, A. Hervé, U. Hussain, A. Lanaro, A. Loeliger, R. Loveless, J. Madhusudanan Sreekala, 76
 12 A. Mallampalli, D. Pinna, T. Ruggles, A. Savin, V. Sharma, W.H. Smith, D. Teague, S. Trembath-reichert 77
 13 78
 14 79

15 *University of Wisconsin – Madison, Madison, WI, USA* 80
 16 81

17 † Deceased. 82

18 ¹ Also at Vienna University of Technology, Vienna, Austria. 83

19 ² Also at Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium. 84

20 ³ Also at IRFU, CEA, Université Paris-Saclay, Gif-sur-Yvette, France. 85

21 ⁴ Also at Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, Brazil. 86

22 ⁵ Also at Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, Brazil. 87

23 ⁶ Also at UFMS, Nova Andradina, Brazil. 88

24 ⁷ Also at Universidade Federal de Pelotas, Pelotas, Brazil. 89

25 ⁸ Also at University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China. 90

26 ⁹ Also at Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics named by A.I. Alikhanov of NRC 'Kurchatov Institute', Moscow, Russia. 91

27 ¹⁰ Also at Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia. 92

28 ¹¹ Also at Suez University, Suez, Egypt. 93

29 ¹² Now at British University in Egypt, Cairo, Egypt. 94

30 ¹³ Now at Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt. 95

31 ¹⁴ Also at Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA. 96

32 ¹⁵ Also at Université de Haute Alsace, Mulhouse, France. 97

33 ¹⁶ Also at Erzincan Binali Yildirim University, Erzincan, Turkey. 98

34 ¹⁷ Also at CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland. 99

35 ¹⁸ Also at RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut A, Aachen, Germany. 100

36 ¹⁹ Also at University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany. 101

37 ²⁰ Also at Brandenburg University of Technology, Cottbus, Germany. 102

38 ²¹ Also at Institute of Physics, University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary, Debrecen, Hungary. 103

39 ²² Also at Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary. 104

40 ²³ Also at IIT Bhubaneswar, Bhubaneswar, India, Bhubaneswar, India. 105

41 ²⁴ Also at Institute of Physics, Bhubaneswar, India. 106

42 ²⁵ Also at G.H.G. Khalsa College, Punjab, India. 107

43 ²⁶ Also at Shoolini University, Solan, India. 108

44 ²⁷ Also at University of Hyderabad, Hyderabad, India. 109

45 ²⁸ Also at University of Visva-Bharati, Santiniketan, India. 110

46 ²⁹ Now at INFN Sezione di Bari ^a, Università di Bari ^b, Politecnico di Bari ^c, Bari, Italy. 111

47 ³⁰ Also at Italian National Agency for New Technologies, Energy and Sustainable Economic Development, Bologna, Italy. 112

48 ³¹ Also at Centro Siciliano di Fisica Nucleare e di Struttura Della Materia, Catania, Italy. 113

49 ³² Also at Riga Technical University, Riga, Latvia, Riga, Latvia. 114

50 ³³ Also at Malaysian Nuclear Agency, MOSTI, Kajang, Malaysia. 115

51 ³⁴ Also at Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología, Mexico City, Mexico. 116

52 ³⁵ Also at Warsaw University of Technology, Institute of Electronic Systems, Warsaw, Poland. 117

53 ³⁶ Also at Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia. 118

54 ³⁷ Now at National Research Nuclear University 'Moscow Engineering Physics Institute' (MEPhI), Moscow, Russia. 119

55 ³⁸ Also at Institute of Nuclear Physics of the Uzbekistan Academy of Sciences, Tashkent, Uzbekistan. 120

56 ³⁹ Also at St. Petersburg State Polytechnical University, St. Petersburg, Russia. 121

57 ⁴⁰ Also at University of Florida, Gainesville, USA. 122

58 ⁴¹ Also at Imperial College, London, United Kingdom. 123

59 ⁴² Also at P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia. 124

60 ⁴³ Also at Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, Novosibirsk, Russia. 125

61 ⁴⁴ Also at Faculty of Physics, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia. 126

62 ⁴⁵ Also at Università degli Studi di Siena, Siena, Italy. 127

63 ⁴⁶ Also at INFN Sezione di Pavia ^a, Università di Pavia ^b, Pavia, Italy, Pavia, Italy. 128

64 ⁴⁷ Also at National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece. 129

65 ⁴⁸ Also at Universität Zürich, Zurich, Switzerland. 130

66 ⁴⁹ Also at Stefan Meyer Institute for Subatomic Physics, Vienna, Austria, Vienna, Austria. 131

⁵⁰ Also at Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, BURDUR, Turkey. 132

⁵¹ Also at Şırnak University, Şırnak, Turkey.

⁵² Also at Department of Physics, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China, Beijing, China.

⁵³ Also at Near East University, Research Center of Experimental Health Science, Nicosia, Turkey.

1	54	Also at Beykent University, Istanbul, Turkey, Istanbul, Turkey.	67
2	55	Also at Istanbul Aydin University, Application and Research Center for Advanced Studies (App. & Res. Cent. for Advanced Studies), Istanbul, Turkey.	68
3	56	Also at Mersin University, Mersin, Turkey.	69
4	57	Also at Piri Reis University, Istanbul, Turkey.	70
5	58	Also at Ozyegin University, Istanbul, Turkey.	71
6	59	Also at Izmir Institute of Technology, Izmir, Turkey.	72
7	60	Also at Bozok Universitetesi Rektörlüğü, Yozgat, Turkey.	73
8	61	Also at Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey.	74
9	62	Also at Milli Savunma University, Istanbul, Turkey.	75
10	63	Also at Kafkas University, Kars, Turkey.	76
11	64	Also at Istanbul Bilgi University, Istanbul, Turkey.	77
12	65	Also at Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.	78
13	66	Also at Adiyaman University, Adiyaman, Turkey.	79
14	67	Also at Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussel, Belgium.	80
15	68	Also at School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southampton, Southampton, United Kingdom.	81
16	69	Also at IPPP Durham University, Durham, United Kingdom.	82
17	70	Also at Monash University, Faculty of Science, Clayton, Australia.	83
18	71	Also at Bethel University, St. Paul, Minneapolis, USA, St. Paul, USA.	84
19	72	Also at Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University, Karaman, Turkey.	85
20	73	Also at California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA.	86
21	74	Also at Bingol University, Bingol, Turkey.	87
22	75	Also at Georgian Technical University, Tbilisi, Georgia.	88
23	76	Also at Sinop University, Sinop, Turkey.	89
24	77	Also at Mimar Sinan University, Istanbul, Istanbul, Turkey.	90
25	78	Also at Nanjing Normal University Department of Physics, Nanjing, China.	91
26	79	Also at Texas A&M University at Qatar, Doha, Qatar.	92
27	80	Also at Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea, Daegu, Republic of Korea.	93
28			94
29			95
30			96
31			97
32			98
33			99
34			100
35			101
36			102
37			103
38			104
39			105
40			106
41			107
42			108
43			109
44			110
45			111
46			112
47			113
48			114
49			115
50			116
51			117
52			118
53			119
54			120
55			121
56			122
57			123
58			124
59			125
60			126
61			127
62			128
63			129
64			130
65			131
66			132