



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Physics Letters B

www.elsevier.com/locate/physletb



Coherent J/ψ photoproduction in ultra-peripheral PbPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV with the CMS experiment

The CMS Collaboration*

CERN, Switzerland

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 23 May 2016

Received in revised form 21 June 2017

Accepted 3 July 2017

Available online xxx

Editor: M. Doser

Keywords:

CMS

Physics

Heavy ion collisions

Ultra-peripheral collisions

UPC

J/ψ

ABSTRACT

The cross section for coherent J/ψ photoproduction accompanied by at least one neutron on one side of the interaction point and no neutron activity on the other side, $X_n 0_n$, is measured with the CMS experiment in ultra-peripheral PbPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV. The analysis is based on a data sample corresponding to an integrated luminosity of $159 \mu\text{b}^{-1}$, collected during the 2011 PbPb run. The J/ψ mesons are reconstructed in the dimuon decay channel, while neutrons are detected using zero degree calorimeters. The measured cross section is $d\sigma_{X_n 0_n}^{\text{coh}}/dy(J/\psi) = 0.36 \pm 0.04(\text{stat}) \pm 0.04(\text{syst})\text{mb}$ in the rapidity interval $1.8 < |y| < 2.3$. Using a model for the relative rate of coherent photoproduction processes, this $X_n 0_n$ measurement gives a total coherent photoproduction cross section of $d\sigma^{\text{coh}}/dy(J/\psi) = 1.82 \pm 0.22(\text{stat}) \pm 0.20(\text{syst}) \pm 0.19(\text{theo})\text{mb}$. The data strongly disfavor the impulse approximation model prediction, indicating that nuclear effects are needed to describe coherent J/ψ photoproduction in $\gamma + \text{Pb}$ interactions. The data are found to be consistent with the leading twist approximation, which includes nuclear gluon shadowing.

© 2017 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

Photon-induced reactions are dominant in Ultra-Peripheral Collisions (UPC) of heavy ions, which involve electromagnetic interactions at large impact parameters of the colliding nuclei. Because of the extremely high photon flux in ultra-peripheral heavy-ion collisions which is proportional to Z^2 , where Z is the charge of the nucleus, photon-nucleus collisions at the LHC are abundant [1–3]. Furthermore, in UPCs the LHC can reach unprecedented photon-lead and photon-proton center-of-mass energies.

Vector meson photoproduction in UPCs has received recent interest [3]. Exclusive J/ψ photoproduction off protons is defined by the reaction $\gamma + p \rightarrow J/\psi + p$, with the characteristic features that, apart from the vector meson in the final state, no other particles are produced and the vector meson has a mean transverse momentum significantly lower than in inclusive reactions. Another characteristic feature is that in exclusive photoproduction the quantum numbers of the final state can be studied unambiguously. The $\gamma + p \rightarrow J/\psi + p$ production process has been studied by H1 and ZEUS collaborations at the electron-proton collider HERA [4–6], by the CDF collaboration in proton-antiproton collisions at the Tevatron [7], and by the ALICE and LHCb collaborations

at the LHC, in proton-lead [8] and proton-proton collisions [9], respectively. Since the cross section of photoproduced vector mesons such as J/ψ , $\psi(2S)$, and $\Upsilon(nS)$, in leading order perturbative QCD, is proportional to the gluon density squared in the target [10,11], the study of such diffractive processes in high-energy collisions is expected to provide insights into the role played by gluons in hadronic matter. As an example, a J/ψ produced at rapidity y is sensitive to the gluon distribution at $x = (M_{J/\psi}/\sqrt{s})e^{\pm y}$ at hard scales $Q^2 \sim M_{J/\psi}^2/4$, where $M_{J/\psi}$ is the J/ψ mass, \sqrt{s} is the center-of-mass energy of the colliding system and y is the rapidity of the J/ψ [10,11]. The relevant values of x that can be explored in this analysis are in the 10^{-2} to 10^{-5} range.

In ultra-peripheral nucleus-nucleus collisions, vector mesons can be produced in $\gamma + A$ interactions off one of the nuclei [12–20]. Such interactions are characterized by very low multiplicity, and indeed the majority of such events are exclusive, i.e. $\gamma + A \rightarrow J/\psi + A$. The interaction that produces the vector meson is classified as coherent if the photon interacts with the whole nucleus, leaving the nucleus intact. In incoherent interactions, the photon interacts with a single nucleon, and the nucleus breaks apart. The requirement of having coherent photoproduction constrains the mean transverse momentum of the vector mesons to be of the order of $p_T \approx 60$ MeV for PbPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV [1–3]. This follows from the fact that the transverse momentum distribution is driven by the target form factor. Because the nucleon radius

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

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2017.07.001>

0370-2693/© 2017 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.

is smaller than that of the nuclei, the momentum transfer to the vector meson from incoherent photoproduction is higher, of the order of 500 MeV at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV. Such a momentum transfer causes the target nucleus to break up and, in most cases, it produces neutrons at very small angles with respect to the Pb beams (forward neutrons). However, vector mesons produced coherently can also be accompanied by forward neutrons. Owing to the intense electromagnetic fields present in ultra-peripheral nucleus–nucleus collisions, additional independent soft electromagnetic interactions can occur between the nuclei giving rise to forward neutrons. The emission of such neutrons is understood in terms of giant dipole resonances [21]. Neutron-differential studies are considered as a promising tool to decouple low- x and high- x contributions in vector meson photoproduction, e.g. [22].

Ultimately, UPC studies at hadron colliders and similar measurements at the proposed electron–ion colliders [23,24] are expected to reduce uncertainties in our knowledge of the initial state of a high-energy nucleus–nucleus collision, in particular, regarding the intrinsic distribution and fluctuations of gluons in the nuclei. The uncertainty over the initial state is currently an impediment to measuring fundamental properties of the quark–gluon plasma, such as viscosity, to a high precision [25]. The largest theoretical uncertainty comes from the gluon distribution function in nuclei, which at a given value of the Bjorken variable x may be depleted (shadowing) or enhanced (anti-shadowing) with respect to the scaled gluon distribution function in the proton. These parton distribution functions (PDFs) have been parameterized using global fitting techniques, such as EPS09 [26], that evolve quark, antiquark, and gluon distributions as a function of Q^2 . The fitting results from EPS09 have a large uncertainty for gluon PDFs for $x < 10^{-2}$ and low Q^2 due to the lack of experimental data. The data from ultra-peripheral collisions at the LHC have the potential to provide new constraints to the gluon PDFs in protons and nuclei. Recent theoretical work has been carried out to include the study of UPC vector meson photoproduction in global PDF fits [27, 28].

The STAR and PHENIX collaborations at RHIC have studied ρ^0 and J/ψ photoproduction in ultra-peripheral AuAu collisions [29–31]. Although RHIC studies have demonstrated the feasibility of measuring these processes, it was not possible to significantly constrain the nuclear gluon PDFs. The J/ψ analysis was statistically limited [29], while for UPC ρ^0 analyses a hard scale cannot be established to perform perturbative QCD calculations. The production rate for UPC physics processes is much higher at the LHC. The ALICE collaboration has measured coherent photoproduction of J/ψ mesons in ultra-peripheral PbPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV [32,33]. These data have been used to compute the nuclear suppression factor $R = (G_A/AG_N)^2$, where G_A and G_N are the gluon distributions in a nucleus ($A = 208$ in the case of the Pb nuclei) and in a free proton, respectively, obtaining $R = 0.61^{+0.05}_{-0.04}$ for $x \sim 10^{-3}$ [34]. These results have provided evidence that the nuclear gluon density is below that expected for a simple superposition of protons and neutrons in the nucleus [32,33]. Models that neglect nuclear gluon shadowing such as STARLIGHT [35] and the impulse approximation [19], or models that maximize the gluon shadowing, such as EPS08 [36], have been ruled out by these measurements.

This Letter reports the study of the coherent J/ψ photoproduction cross section measured in ultra-peripheral PbPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV, as well as the dependence of this cross section on the associated production of forward or backward neutrons, i.e. on the so-called neutron break-up mode ratios [18]. To focus on events with low backgrounds, following the experience at RHIC [30], the UPC trigger selected events with at least one neutron in either the forward or backward direction from the in-

teraction point using zero degree calorimeters. Using this trigger, both coherent and incoherent J/ψ mesons and $\gamma + \gamma \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ events in conjunction with at least one neutron can be studied. This data sample is then used to measure the cross section for coherent J/ψ photoproduction accompanied by at least one neutron from soft independent processes. The J/ψ candidates are reconstructed through the dimuon decay channel in the rapidity interval $1.8 < |y| < 2.3$, adding a new rapidity range to recent measurements of coherent J/ψ photoproduction at the LHC [32,33].

This paper is organized as follows: Section 2 describes the CMS detector, Section 3 reports on the event selection and analysis strategy, Section 4 describes the signal extraction and corrections, Section 5 summarizes the uncertainties of the measurement, and Section 6 discusses the results. Finally, in Section 7 the summary is given.

2. The CMS detector

The central feature of the CMS apparatus is a superconducting solenoid of 6 m internal diameter, providing a magnetic field of 3.8 T. Within the solenoid volume are a silicon pixel and strip tracker, a lead tungstate crystal electromagnetic calorimeter (ECAL), and a brass and scintillator hadron calorimeter (HCAL), each composed of a barrel and two endcap sections. The silicon tracker measures charged particles within the pseudorapidity range $|\eta| < 2.5$. It consists of 1440 silicon pixel and 15 148 silicon strip detector modules and is located in the 3.8 T field of the superconducting solenoid. The pseudorapidity coverage for the ECAL and HCAL detectors is $|\eta| < 3.0$. Muons are measured using the CMS detector in the pseudorapidity range $|\eta| < 2.4$. The muon detection planes are made using three technologies: drift tubes, cathode strip chambers, and resistive plate chambers. The p_T of the muons matched to reconstructed tracks is measured with a resolution better than 1.5% [37]. The Hadronic Forward (HF) calorimeters ($3.0 < |\eta| < 5.2$) complement the coverage provided by the barrel and endcap detectors. The beam scintillator counters (BSCs) are plastic scintillators that partially cover the face of the HF calorimeters. They have a pseudorapidity range between 3.9 and 4.4, with a time resolution of 3 ns. The zero degree calorimeters (ZDCs) are two Čerenkov calorimeters composed of alternating layers of tungsten and quartz fibers, situated in between the two proton beam lines. They are sensitive to neutrons and photons with $|\eta| > 8.3$. The HF, BSC and ZDC systems each consist of two detectors at either side of the interaction point: HF $^\pm$, BSC $^\pm$, ZDC $^\pm$, respectively. A more detailed description of the CMS detector, together with a definition of the coordinate system used and the relevant kinematic variables, can be found in [38].

3. Event selection and Monte Carlo samples

This analysis uses the data sample collected with the CMS detector in the 2011 PbPb run, which corresponds to an integrated luminosity of $159 \mu\text{b}^{-1}$ [39]. The events are selected with a dedicated trigger designed to record UPC J/ψ vector mesons and $\gamma + \gamma \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ events. The UPC trigger has the following requirements: an energy deposit consistent with at least one neutron in either of the ZDCs; no activity in at least one of the BSC+ or BSC– scintillators; the presence of at least one single muon without a p_T threshold requirement, and at least one track in the pixel detector. The first three trigger requirements are implemented in hardware, while the last requirement is carried out by the software trigger. To reject beam–gas interactions and suppress non-UPC events the following requirements are imposed offline. The z position of the primary vertex is required to be within 25 cm of the beam spot centre. The length of the pixel clusters must be consistent

with tracks originating from this vertex. This requirement removes beam-background events that produce elongated pixel clusters. In addition, events are rejected if the time difference between two hits from the BSCs is above 20 ns with respect to the mean flight time between them (73 ns). This requirement removes beam-halo events, while keeping all the ultra-peripheral PbPb events.

As mentioned above, one of the UPC trigger requirements is the presence of at least one neutron. The events studied in this analysis are classified by the pattern of neutron deposition measured in the ZDCs [40–42]. The ZDC energy spectrum shows a clear one neutron peak and the detectors have an energy resolution of about 20% for single neutrons in PbPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV [40–42]. This resolution allows a good separation between events with zero, one, or multiple neutrons in a given ZDC detector. A given event is considered to have no neutrons in the ZDC if the calorimeter energy is less than 420 GeV, one neutron if the energy lies between 420 GeV and 1600 GeV, and more than one neutron if the energy is above 1600 GeV. The coherent J/ψ cross section is measured for the case when the J/ψ mesons are accompanied by at least one neutron on one side of the interaction point and no neutron activity on the other side ($X_n 0_n$). The $X_n 0_n$ break-up mode, which is conventionally written as $Pb + Pb \rightarrow Pb + Pb + J/\psi$ ($X_n 0_n$), is a subset of the triggered events. This break-up mode is well suited for rejecting non-UPC background due to its asymmetric configuration [43].

Apart from the $X_n 0_n$ break-up mode, the UPC trigger also selects the $X_n X_n$, $1_n 0_n$, and $1_n 1_n$ break-up modes. The $X_n X_n$ mode requires that both ZDCs record at least one neutron. The $1_n 0_n$ mode requires that one of the ZDCs detects exactly one neutron with no neutron activity on the other ZDC side. Finally, the $1_n 1_n$ mode requires both ZDCs to have exactly one neutron.

In addition to the ZDC requirement, two selections are applied to reject non-UPC events. First, only events with exactly two reconstructed tracks are kept. Second, the HF cell with the largest energy deposit is required to have an energy below 3.85 GeV. This requirement, which is determined studying events triggered on empty bunches, ensures that the HF energy is consistent with the presence of photon-induced processes which leave very low signal in both the HF+ and HF– detectors.

In this analysis, both muons have to satisfy the quality criteria described below, and must lie within the phase space region $1.2 < |\eta| < 2.4$ and $1.2 < p_T < 1.8$ GeV. This phase space region is chosen to ensure good statistical precision on the data-driven measurement of the single-muon efficiency (see Section 4). The CMS collaboration has developed several types of muon identification [37]. In this analysis, all tracks in the silicon tracker that are identified as muons, based on information of the muon detectors, are used. The algorithm extrapolates each reconstructed silicon track outward to its most probable location within each detector of interest (ECAL, HCAL, muon system). This procedure enables the identification of single muons with very low transverse momenta. To reduce additional muons or charged particle tracks that can be misidentified as muons and to ensure good-quality reconstructed tracks, the single muons are required to pass the following criteria: more than 4 hits in the tracker, at least one of which is required to be in a pixel layer, a track fit with a χ^2 per degree of freedom less than three, and a transverse (longitudinal) impact parameter of less than 0.3 (20) cm from the measured vertex. For this analysis, only events with dimuons having $p_T < 1.0$ GeV, in the rapidity interval $1.8 < |y| < 2.3$, are considered. The dimuon candidates are required to be within the invariant mass region $2.6 < m(\mu^+ \mu^-) < 3.5$ GeV. No like-sign dimuon pairs are found in this region. Applying the muon quality requirements, after all other analysis selections, only rejects one dimuon candidate out of 518 events.

In order to compute acceptance and efficiency corrections and for signal extraction purposes, Monte Carlo (MC) samples for coherent J/ψ , incoherent J/ψ and $\gamma + \gamma$ events in the dimuon decay channel are generated, using the STARLIGHT MC event generator [15,35,44,45]. These events are processed with the full CMS simulation and reconstruction software. The STARLIGHT generator models two-photon and photon-hadron interactions at ultra-relativistic energies. In the case of photon-nuclear reactions, it models both coherent and incoherent events using the vector meson dominance model. It uses the Glauber approach for calculating hadron-nucleus cross sections from hadron-nucleon ones, and makes use of exclusive J/ψ photoproduction in $\gamma + p$ results from HERA to compute the coherent J/ψ cross section in $\gamma + Pb$ interactions [15]. The STARLIGHT generator is also used to simulate the various break-up modes for one or both Pb nuclei, which assumes that the probabilities for exchange of multiple photons in a single event factorize in impact parameter space [46].

4. Signal extraction and corrections

After applying the selections described in Section 3, the dimuon invariant mass and p_T distributions are simultaneously fitted in order to extract the number of coherent J/ψ , incoherent J/ψ , and $\gamma + \gamma \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ events. The fit uses a maximum likelihood algorithm that takes unbinned projections of the data in invariant mass and p_T as inputs. The shapes of the p_T distributions for these three processes are determined from STARLIGHT simulation. The yield for each of these processes in the p_T distribution is a free parameter of the fit. The dimuon invariant mass distribution of the sum of coherent and incoherent J/ψ events is described with a Crystal Ball function [47], which accounts for the detector resolution as well as the radiative tail from internal bremsstrahlung. A second-order polynomial accounts for the underlying dimuon continuum that originates from $\gamma + \gamma \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ events. The fit has nine free parameters: three for the yields of each of the processes, two for the shape of the Crystal Ball function tail, two for the mean and width of the Crystal Ball function, and two parameters for the shape of the second-order polynomial. The fit constrains the number of coherent J/ψ , incoherent J/ψ , and dimuon continuum events to be the same in the invariant mass and p_T distributions. The projections of the $X_n 0_n$ break-up data onto the dimuon invariant mass and p_T axes are shown in Fig. 1. As discussed in Section 1, the average p_T distribution for the coherent events is peaked at lower p_T values than those from incoherent events. Reconstructed coherent J/ψ events are dominant for $p_T < 0.15$ GeV, whereas reconstructed incoherent J/ψ events are dominant for $p_T > 0.15$ GeV. For events with $p_T < 0.15$ GeV and in the rapidity interval $1.8 < |y| < 2.3$, the fit yields 207 ± 18 (stat) for the coherent J/ψ candidates, 75 ± 13 (stat) for incoherent J/ψ events and 75 ± 13 (stat) for $\gamma + \gamma$ events.

In addition, the data sample is studied in terms of the following two cases: (i) neutrons emitted in the same rapidity hemisphere as the J/ψ , and (ii) neutrons emitted in the opposite rapidity hemisphere than the J/ψ . The number of coherent J/ψ events is found to be consistent, within the statistical and systematic uncertainty, between the two cases. This suggests that the emitted neutrons and the photoproduced J/ψ events are independent processes, within the current uncertainty. On the other hand, for incoherent J/ψ photoproduction most of the events are found in the configuration where the neutrons and the J/ψ mesons are produced in the same hemisphere. This suggests that in incoherent J/ψ photoproduction the low- x and high- x contributions are decoupled and can be more easily observed than in coherent J/ψ events. A similar qualitative behavior is observed in photoproduced J/ψ events in $\gamma + p$ interactions by ALICE [8] where the ratio of non-exclusive




Fig. 1. Results from the simultaneous fit to dimuon invariant mass (top) and p_T (bottom) distributions from opposite-sign muon pairs with $p_T < 1.0$ GeV, $1.8 < |y| < 2.3$ and $2.6 < m(\mu^+\mu^-) < 3.5$ GeV for the X_n0_n break-up mode, after all selections are applied. In the left panel the green curve represents the $\gamma + \gamma$ component (second-order polynomial) and the black curve the sum of the $\gamma + \gamma$, incoherent J/ψ , and coherent J/ψ components (see text for details). In the right panel the green, red, and blue curves represent $\gamma + \gamma$, coherent J/ψ , and incoherent J/ψ components, respectively. The black curve represents the sum of the $\gamma + \gamma$, coherent J/ψ , and incoherent J/ψ components. Only statistical uncertainties are shown. The data are not corrected by acceptance and efficiencies, and the MC templates are folded with the detector response simulation. (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

to exclusive J/ψ events is found to be larger at high- x with respect to that at low- x . Due to the small sample size of this analysis, the coherent J/ψ cross section is measured by summing up both configurations.

The combined acceptance (A) and efficiency (ε) correction factor for J/ψ events in the X_n0_n break-up mode, $(A\varepsilon)^{J/\psi}$, is 5.9 ± 0.5 (syst)%. The 8% systematic uncertainty on the corrections are described in Section 5. Two factors contribute to the $(A\varepsilon)^{J/\psi}$: 1) the product of acceptance multiplied by the offline reconstruction efficiency and 2) the trigger efficiency ($\varepsilon_{\text{trig}}$). The first term is measured to be 12.0 ± 0.5 (syst)%. It is obtained from both data and MC simulations. The STARLIGHT generator is used as an input to the full GEANT4 [48] simulation of the CMS detector. This simulation is used to model the efficiency for all of the selections except the HF and the muon quality requirements. Zero bias data are used to compute the efficiency of the HF re-

Table 1
Summary of systematic uncertainties for coherent J/ψ events in the X_n0_n configuration.

Source	Uncertainty
(1) Signal extraction	5%
(2) Neutron tagging	6%
(3) HF energy limit	2%
(4) MC acceptance corrections	1%
(5) ZDC efficiency estimation	3%
(6) Tracking reconstruction	4%
(7) Int. luminosity determination	5%
(8) Branching fraction	0.55%
(9) Two-photon e^+e^- background	2%
Total	11%

quirement, while the UPC data are used to compute the efficiency of the muon quality requirements. The offline selection discussed above is applied, but the trigger requirement is not demanded at this stage of the efficiency calculation. The UPC trigger efficiency $\varepsilon_{\text{trig}}$ for events passing the event selection is 49.5 ± 3.5 (syst)%. This is computed by taking the product of the efficiencies of the individual components: $\varepsilon_{\text{trig}} = \varepsilon_{\text{ZDC}} \varepsilon_{\text{pixel-track}} \varepsilon_{\text{BSC}} \varepsilon_{\text{dimuon}}$. Because these trigger components are uncorrelated to each other they are measured separately. The $\varepsilon_{\text{dimuon}}$ term is measured to be 0.71 ± 0.02 (syst) from the analysis of the UPC data using the “tag-and-probe” method [37] in which coherent J/ψ candidates are reconstructed for a wider kinematic range than in the analysis. Two different methods to compute $\varepsilon_{\text{dimuon}}$ are studied corresponding to two different background parametrizations. Since both methods give consistent results within the statistical uncertainty, the $\varepsilon_{\text{dimuon}}$ systematic uncertainty is found to be at the 2–3% level. The other components of the trigger efficiency do not require the reconstruction of coherent J/ψ candidates and they are measured separately using control triggers: $\varepsilon_{\text{ZDC}} = 0.91 \pm 0.03$ (syst), $\varepsilon_{\text{pixel-track}} = 0.76 \pm 0.03$ (syst), and ε_{BSC} is fully efficient. The systematic uncertainty for the acceptance and efficiency correction is discussed in the following section.

5. Systematic uncertainties and cross-checks

The systematic uncertainties are summarized in Table 1 and can be divided into three groups. The first group corresponds to the systematic uncertainty due to the signal extraction (5%). The second group corresponds to the acceptance times efficiency correction (8% after combining the uncertainties on the neutron detection efficiency, HF energy requirement, MC correction, ZDC trigger efficiency, and J/ψ reconstruction efficiency). The third group corresponds to the uncertainty in the luminosity determination (5%) and in the branching ratio (0.55%). The individual uncertainties are summarized below.

1. The uncertainty in the signal extraction is found to be 5%. To estimate this uncertainty, the fitting functions used to describe the invariant mass distribution of the J/ψ and the continuum are changed to a Gaussian or Landau distribution, respectively. Also the mass region used for the signal extraction is changed to $2.4 < m(\mu^+\mu^-) < 8.0$ GeV. The systematic uncertainty is provided by the maximum variation of the results.
2. The uncertainty in the neutron detection efficiency is found to be 6%. This uncertainty is mainly due to the presence of low-frequency noise in the readout and is estimated by comparing results from two different reconstruction algorithms. For each event the ZDC signal is recorded in 10 time slices of 25 ns each. The standard reconstruction method uses the difference between the signal in the main time slice and the following

one. This differentiation suppresses the low-frequency noise. The alternative method estimates the noise from time slices before the main signal.

3. The uncertainty associated with the HF energy requirement is found to be 2%. To estimate this uncertainty, the HF energy limit is decreased from 3.85 to 2.95 GeV, changing the limit from keeping 99% of the electronic noise events to 95%. Also, the definition of the HF energy requirement is varied by using the signal from groups of calorimeter cells known as towers, instead of the individual cells. The η symmetry of the calorimeters is checked by defining separate limits for HF+ and HF- for both individual cells and towers. The analysis is repeated for each case and the root-mean-square of the final number of signal candidates is used to estimate the systematic uncertainty associated with this requirement.
4. The uncertainty in the MC acceptance corrections is found to be 1%. This is estimated by varying the p_T and rapidity shapes ($\pm 30\%$ away from the mean distribution) used to produce these corrections. As shown in Section 4, STARLIGHT reproduces very well the p_T shape for the various processes. The shape of the p_T distributions reflects the nuclear density distribution, which has little uncertainty.
5. The uncertainty for the ZDC component of the UPC trigger is found to be 3%. This is estimated by using dedicated monitoring triggers.
6. The uncertainty for the J/ψ reconstruction efficiency is found to be 4%. This is computed using the track reconstruction efficiency uncertainty that is found to be 1–2% [49].
7. The uncertainty of the integrated luminosity determination is estimated to be 5%, based on the analysis of data from van der Meer scans [50]. This uncertainty also covers the possible multiple interactions in the same bunch crossing originating from electromagnetic dissociation (EMD) processes which could affect the exclusivity requirement.
8. The uncertainty in the branching fraction for J/ψ decay into muons is 0.55% [51].
9. A contamination from an electromagnetic e^+e^- pair could cause a possible loss of events, where one of the electrons hits the BSC scintillator and thus vetoes the event. Using a control data sample where no veto at the trigger level is applied, an upper limit on such an inefficiency is found by the ALICE collaboration to be smaller than 2% in the coherent J/ψ analysis, at forward rapidity [32]. Since no data sample, with a comparable luminosity to the one used in this analysis, exist without a veto on the BSC, and in order to be conservative, a 2% systematic uncertainty is assigned due to possible contamination from two-photon e^+e^- background.

These individual systematic uncertainties are added in quadrature resulting in a total systematic uncertainty of 11% for the coherent J/ψ cross section in the X_n0_n configuration.

As an additional cross-check of the overall analysis, the $\gamma + \gamma$ process is studied. As discussed in Section 4, the resulting yield of $\gamma + \gamma$ events in the $2.6 < m(\mu^+\mu^-) < 3.5$ GeV mass interval is $N_{X_n0_n}^{\gamma+\gamma} = 75.2 \pm 12.7(\text{stat}) \pm 8.3(\text{syst})$, while the measured cross section is $44.2 \pm 1.8(\text{stat}) \pm 0.40(\text{syst})\mu\text{b}$. This result is consistent with the QED calculation provided by the STARLIGHT MC at the one standard deviation level. The $\gamma + \gamma \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ cross section in the dimuon mass range 4 to 8 GeV (not shown) is also found to be in agreement with the STARLIGHT prediction within one standard deviation, when considering the statistical and systematic uncertainties.

6. Results and comparison to theoretical models on photonuclear interactions

For the X_n0_n break-up mode, the coherent J/ψ cross section in the dimuon decay channel is given by

$$\frac{d\sigma_{X_n0_n}^{\text{coh}}}{dy}(J/\psi) = \frac{N_{X_n0_n}^{\text{coh}}}{\mathcal{B}(J/\psi \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-) \mathcal{L}_{\text{int}} \Delta y (A \varepsilon)^{J/\psi}} \quad (1)$$

where $\mathcal{B}(J/\psi \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-) = 5.96 \pm 0.03(\text{syst})\%$ is the branching fraction of J/ψ to dimuons [51], $N_{X_n0_n}^{\text{coh}}$ is the coherent J/ψ yield of prompt J/ψ candidates for $p_T < 0.15$ GeV, $\mathcal{L}_{\text{int}} = 159 \pm 8(\text{syst})\mu\text{b}^{-1}$ is an integrated luminosity, $\Delta y = 1$ is the rapidity bin width, and $(A \varepsilon)^{J/\psi} = 5.9 \pm 0.5(\text{stat})\%$ is the combined acceptance times efficiency correction factor as discussed in Section 4. The coherent J/ψ yield of prompt J/ψ candidates is given by

$$N_{X_n0_n}^{\text{coh}} = \frac{N_{\text{yield}}}{1 + f_D} \quad (2)$$

where N_{yield} is the coherent J/ψ yield as extracted from the fit shown in Fig. 1, and f_D is the fraction of J/ψ mesons coming from coherent $\psi(2S) \rightarrow J/\psi + \text{anything}$. As mentioned in Section 4, $N_{\text{yield}} = 207 \pm 18(\text{stat})$ for coherent J/ψ candidates with $p_T < 0.15$ GeV in the rapidity interval $1.8 < |y| < 2.3$. There are not enough data to perform a coherent $\psi(2S)$ analysis, so the feed-down correction has to rely on MC simulations. In order to calculate f_D , coherent $\psi(2S)$ events are simulated using STARLIGHT, while PYTHIA is used to simulate the $\psi(2S)$ decay into the J/ψ [32, 33] obtaining $f_D = 0.018 \pm 0.011(\text{theo})$. The theoretical uncertainty of 60% in f_D is obtained from [32,33]. The resulting coherent J/ψ yield for prompt J/ψ candidates is $N_{X_n0_n}^{\text{coh}} = 203 \pm 18(\text{stat})$. Thus, the coherent J/ψ photoproduction cross section for prompt J/ψ mesons in the X_n0_n break-up mode is $d\sigma_{X_n0_n}^{\text{coh}}/dy(J/\psi) = 0.36 \pm 0.04(\text{stat}) \pm 0.04(\text{syst})\text{mb}$.

Although the $d\sigma_{X_n0_n}^{\text{coh}}/dy(J/\psi)$ measurement is interesting in its own right [18,22], it is also relevant to compare our results to the theoretical predictions and recent results from the ALICE collaboration [32,33] that are available for the total coherent J/ψ cross section. As mentioned in Section 3, one of the UPC trigger requirements is the presence of at least one forward neutron. For this reason it is not possible to scale the measured coherent J/ψ cross section in the X_n0_n break-up mode to the total cross section using our own data. However, as mentioned in Section 3, STARLIGHT can simulate coherent vector meson photoproduction in the various break-up modes for one or both Pb nuclei. The STARLIGHT MC generator is found to give a good description of the break-up ratios on coherent ρ^0 photoproduction measured by STAR [29] and ALICE [46]. It is also found to give a good description of the fraction of coherent J/ψ events with no neutron emitted with respect to the total number of coherent J/ψ events, measured by ALICE [33]. Moreover, STARLIGHT gives a good description of the break-up ratios measured in this analysis. We measure the ratios of the coherent J/ψ cross section in two different break-up modes (X_nX_n and 1_n1_n) to that of the X_n0_n mode for J/ψ events with $p_T < 0.15$ GeV and in the rapidity interval $1.8 < |y| < 2.3$. The measured break-up ratios are $0.36 \pm 0.04(\text{stat})$ for X_nX_n/X_n0_n and $0.03 \pm 0.01(\text{stat})$ for $1_n1_n/X_n0_n$, while the STARLIGHT prediction is $0.37 \pm 0.04(\text{theo})$ and $0.020 \pm 0.002(\text{theo})$, respectively. These ratios are also compatible with the extracted J/ψ yield for each break-up configuration, determined with the signal extraction procedure described in Section 4. Only statistical uncertainties in the measured break-up ratios are given since these dominate over the systematic uncertainties. The feed-down correction from $\psi(2S)$ decays is not applied for these ratios since this contribution is expected to cancel out in the ratio. The 10% uncertainty quoted in the




Fig. 2. Differential cross section versus rapidity for coherent J/ψ production in ultra-peripheral PbPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV, measured by ALICE [32,33] and CMS (see text for details). The vertical error bars include the statistical and systematic uncertainties added in quadrature, and the horizontal bars represent the range of the measurements in y . Also the impulse approximation and the leading twist approximation calculations are shown (see text for details).

STARLIGHT prediction for the break-up mode scaling factors is based on recent results on UPC ρ^0 photoproduction from the ALICE collaboration [46]. Note that the neutron break-up theoretical description is independent of whether a J/ψ or a ρ^0 is produced [45,46]. The scaling factor between the $X_n 0_n$ break-up mode and the total cross section is 5.1 ± 0.5 (theo). After applying this scaling factor we obtain the total coherent J/ψ photoproduction cross section $d\sigma^{\text{coh}}/dy(J/\psi) = 1.82 \pm 0.22$ (stat) ± 0.20 (syst) ± 0.19 (theo) mb.

In Fig. 2, the coherent J/ψ photoproduction cross section is compared to recent ALICE measurements [32,33], to calculations by Guzey et al. [19,34] based on the impulse approximation, and to results obtained using the leading twist approximation (see below). The data from ALICE and CMS show a steady decrease with rapidity.

The leading twist approximation prediction is obtained from Ref. [19] and is in good agreement with the data. It is a calculation at the partonic level that uses a diffractive proton PDF as an input, following the leading twist approximation which is based on a generalization of the Gribov–Glauber nuclear shadowing approach [52]. The theoretical uncertainty band for the leading twist approximation result shown in Fig. 2 is 12% and is due to the uncertainty in the strength of the gluon recombination mechanism. This uncertainty is uncorrelated with the photon flux uncertainty. The nuclear gluon distribution uncertainty is largest at mid-rapidity where $x \sim 10^{-3}$ in the nuclear gluon distribution. At forward rapidity, integrating over all possible emitted neutron configurations, there is a two-fold ambiguity about the photon direction. In this region, the measurements are mostly sensitive to $x \sim 10^{-2}$ [32].

The data are also compared to the impulse approximation result that uses data from exclusive J/ψ photoproduction in $\gamma + p$ interactions to estimate the coherent J/ψ cross section in $\gamma + \text{Pb}$ collisions. The impulse approximation calculation neglects all nuclear effects such as the expected modification of the gluon density in the lead nuclei compared to that of the proton. This calculation overpredicts the CMS measurement by more than 3 standard deviations in the rapidity interval $1.8 < |y| < 2.3$, when adding the experimental and theoretical uncertainties in quadrature.

The cross section for vector meson photoproduction in ultra-peripheral PbPb collisions is given by the sum of two cross section terms, since photons can be emitted by either of the colliding Pb nuclei. Each term is the product of three quantities: the photon flux, the integral over squared nuclear form factor $F_A(t)$ and the forward differential cross section $d\sigma/dt(t=0)$ of $\gamma + p \rightarrow J/\psi + p$, where t is the momentum transfer from the target nucleus squared. The $F_A(t)$ is the Fourier transform of the matter density $\rho(t)$, while the elementary cross section $d\sigma/dt$ has been measured by various collaborations [5–9], as described in Section 1. The impulse approximation result shown in Fig. 2 is performed by Guzey et al. using the methods they describe in Ref. [34] with a pQCD motivated parametrization [53] of exclusive J/ψ data in $\gamma + p$ interactions which incorporates very recent LHC results [8,9]. Thus, in the impulse approximation there is an experimental uncertainty associated to fitting the measured elementary cross section data to the parametrization [53] and this uncertainty is at the 4% level for the relevant photon–proton center-of-mass energies discussed in this analysis. In addition, there are two theoretical uncertainties in the impulse approximation calculation. The first theoretical uncertainty is due to the matter density distribution and is estimated to be 5% based on studies of several matter distribution densities [34]. The second theoretical uncertainty is due to the uncertainty in the photon flux and is estimated to be 5%. This is dominated by the treatment of the photon flux factor for the case when the PbPb collisions take place at small impact parameters $\sim 2R_A$. These two uncertainties are correlated and so to be conservative the combined theoretical uncertainty is taken to be 10%.

The data are also consistent with the central value of the EPS09 global fit from 2009 (not shown), which has large uncertainties [26]. Other calculations of the coherent J/ψ cross section are not considered because the theoretical uncertainties are not available.

7. Summary

The coherent J/ψ photoproduction cross section in ultra-peripheral PbPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV, in conjunction with at least one neutron on one side of the interaction point and no neutron activity on the other side, is measured to be $d\sigma_{X_n 0_n}^{\text{coh}}/dy(J/\psi) = 0.36 \pm 0.04$ (stat) ± 0.04 (syst) mb in the rapidity interval $1.8 < |y| < 2.3$. This measurement is extrapolated to the total coherent J/ψ cross section, resulting in $d\sigma^{\text{coh}}/dy(J/\psi) = 1.82 \pm 0.22$ (stat) ± 0.20 (syst) ± 0.19 (theo) mb in the measured rapidity interval. These results complement recent measurements on coherent J/ψ photoproduction in ultra-peripheral PbPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV by the ALICE collaboration. An impulse approximation model prediction is strongly disfavored, indicating that nuclear effects expected to be present at low x and Q^2 values are needed to describe the data. The prediction given by the leading twist approximation, which includes nuclear gluon shadowing, is consistent with the data. In addition, we observe that, in contrast to coherent J/ψ events, the vast majority of incoherent J/ψ candidates are in the configuration when the J/ψ and the emitted neutrons are in the same rapidity hemisphere (high- x component). This is qualitative agreement with the recent photoproduced J/ψ analysis off protons by the ALICE collaboration.

Acknowledgements

We congratulate our colleagues in the CERN accelerator departments for the excellent performance of the LHC and thank the technical and administrative staffs at CERN and at other CMS institutes for their contributions to the success of the CMS effort. In addition, we gratefully acknowledge the computing centers and

personnel of the Worldwide LHC Computing Grid for delivering so effectively the computing infrastructure essential to our analyses. Finally, we acknowledge the enduring support for the construction and operation of the LHC and the CMS detector provided by the following funding agencies: BMFWF and FWF (Austria); FNRS and FWO (Belgium); CNPq, CAPES, FAPERJ, and FAPESP (Brazil); MES (Bulgaria); CERN; CAS, MOST, and NSFC (China); COLCIENCIAS (Colombia); MSES and CSF (Croatia); RPF (Cyprus); MoER, ERC IUT and ERDF (Estonia); Academy of Finland, MEC, and HIP (Finland); CEA and CNRS/IN2P3 (France); BMBF, DFG, and HGF (Germany); GSRT (Greece); OTKA and NIH (Hungary); DAE and DST (India); IPM (Iran); SFI (Ireland); INFN (Italy); MSIP and NRF (Republic of Korea); LAS (Lithuania); MOE and UM (Malaysia); BUAP, CINVESTAV, CONACYT, LNS, SEP, and UASLP-FAI (Mexico); MBIE (New Zealand); PAEC (Pakistan); MSHE and NSC (Poland); FCT (Portugal); JINR (Dubna); MON, RosAtom, RAS and RFBR (Russia); MESTD (Serbia); SEIDI and CPAN (Spain); Swiss Funding Agencies (Switzerland); MST (Taipei); ThEPCenter, IPST, STAR and NSTDA (Thailand); TUBITAK and TAEK (Turkey); NASU and SFFR (Ukraine); STFC (United Kingdom); DOE and NSF (USA).

Individuals have received support from the Marie-Curie program and the European Research Council and EPLANET (European Union); the Leventis Foundation; the A. P. Sloan Foundation; the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation; the Belgian Federal Science Policy Office; the Fonds pour la Formation à la Recherche dans l'Industrie et dans l'Agriculture (FRIA-Belgium); the Agentschap voor Innovatie door Wetenschap en Technologie (IWT-Belgium); the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (MEYS) of the Czech Republic; the Council of Science and Industrial Research, India; the HOMING PLUS program of the Foundation for Polish Science, cofinanced from European Union, Regional Development Fund; the Mobility Plus program of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education (Poland); the OPUS program of the National Science Center (Poland); the Thalís and Aristeia programs cofinanced by EU-ESF and the Greek NSRF; the National Priorities Research Program by Qatar National Research Fund; the Programa Clarín-COFUND del Principado de Asturias; the Rachadapisek Sompot Fund for Postdoctoral Fellowship, Chulalongkorn University (Thailand); the Chulalongkorn Academic into Its 2nd Century Project Advancement Project (Thailand); and the Welch Foundation, contract C-1845.

References

- [1] C.A. Bertulani, S.R. Klein, J. Nystrand, Physics of ultra-peripheral nuclear collisions, *Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* 55 (2005) 271, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.nucl.55.090704.151526>, arXiv:nucl-ex/0502005.
- [2] A.J. Baltz, The physics of ultraperipheral collisions at the LHC, *Phys. Rep.* 458 (2008) 1, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.physrep.2007.12.001>, arXiv:0706.3356.
- [3] J.G. Contreras, J.D. Tapia Takaki, Ultra-peripheral heavy-ion collisions at the LHC, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* 30 (2015) 1542012, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1142/S0217751X15420129>.
- [4] C. Alexa, et al., H1, Elastic and proton-dissociative photoproduction of J/ψ mesons at HERA, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 73 (2013) 2466, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-013-2466-y>, arXiv:1304.5162.
- [5] A. Aktas, et al., H1, Elastic J/ψ production at HERA, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 46 (2006) 585, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s2006-02519-5>, arXiv:hep-ex/0510016.
- [6] S. Chekanov, et al., ZEUS, Exclusive photoproduction of J/ψ mesons at HERA, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 24 (2002) 345, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10052-002-0953-7>, arXiv:hep-ex/0201043.
- [7] T. Aaltonen, et al., CDF, Observation of exclusive charmonium production and $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ in $p\bar{p}$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 1.96$ TeV, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 102 (2009) 242001, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.102.242001>, arXiv:0902.1271.
- [8] ALICE Collaboration, Exclusive J/ψ photoproduction off protons in ultraperipheral p-Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 113 (2014) 232504, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.113.232504>, arXiv:1406.7819.
- [9] LHCb Collaboration, Updated measurements of exclusive J/ψ and $\psi(2S)$ production cross-sections in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV, *J. Phys. G* 41 (2014) 055002, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/0954-3899/41/5/055002>, arXiv:1401.3288.
- [10] M.G. Ryskin, Diffractive J/ψ electroproduction in LLA QCD, *Z. Phys. C* 57 (1993) 89, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01555742>.
- [11] S.J. Brodsky, L. Frankfurt, J.F. Gunion, A.H. Mueller, M. Strikman, Diffractive lepton production of vector mesons in QCD, *Phys. Rev. D* 50 (1994) 3134, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.50.3134>, arXiv:hep-ph/9402283.
- [12] A. Adeluyi, C.A. Bertulani, Constraining gluon shadowing using photoproduction in ultraperipheral pA and AA collisions, *Phys. Rev. C* 85 (2012) 044904, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.85.044904>, arXiv:1201.0146.
- [13] A. Adeluyi, T. Nguyen, Coherent photoproduction of J/ψ and Υ mesons in ultraperipheral pPb and PbPb collisions at the CERN LHC, *Phys. Rev. C* 87 (2013) 027901, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.87.027901>, arXiv:1302.4288.
- [14] A. Cisek, W. Schafer, A. Szczurek, Exclusive coherent production of heavy vector mesons in nucleus-nucleus collisions at LHC, *Phys. Rev. C* 86 (2012) 014905, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.86.014905>, arXiv:1204.5381.
- [15] S. Klein, J. Nystrand, Exclusive vector meson production in relativistic heavy ion collisions, *Phys. Rev. C* 60 (1999) 014903, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.60.014903>, arXiv:hep-ph/9902259.
- [16] T. Lappi, H. Mantysaari, J/ψ production in ultraperipheral Pb+Pb and p+Pb collisions at energies available at the CERN Large Hadron Collider, *Phys. Rev. C* 87 (2013) 032201, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.87.032201>, arXiv:1301.4095.
- [17] V.P. Goncalves, M.V.T. Machado, Vector meson production in coherent hadronic interactions: an update on predictions for RHIC and LHC, *Phys. Rev. C* 84 (2011) 011902, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.84.011902>, arXiv:1106.3036.
- [18] V. Rebyakova, M. Strikman, M. Zhalov, Coherent ρ^0 and J/ψ photoproduction in ultraperipheral processes with electromagnetic dissociation of heavy ions at RHIC and LHC, *Phys. Lett. B* 710 (2012) 647, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2012.03.041>, arXiv:1109.0737.
- [19] V. Guzey, M. Strikman, M. Zhalov, Disentangling coherent and incoherent quasielastic J/ψ photoproduction on nuclei by neutron tagging in ultraperipheral ion collisions at the LHC, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 74 (2014) 2942, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-014-2942-z>, arXiv:1312.6486.
- [20] Yu.P. Ivanov, B.Z. Kopeliovich, I. Schmidt, Vector meson production in ultraperipheral collisions at LHC, in: Workshop on Heavy Ion Collisions at the LHC: Last Call for Predictions, Geneva, Switzerland, May 14-June 8, 2007, 2007, <https://inspirehep.net/record/752847/files/arXiv:0706.1532.pdf>, arXiv:0706.1532.
- [21] B.L. Berman, S.C. Fultz, Measurements of the giant dipole resonance with monoenergetic photons, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 47 (1975) 713, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.47.713>.
- [22] V. Guzey, E. Kryshen, M. Zhalov, Coherent photoproduction of vector mesons in ultraperipheral heavy ion collisions: update for run 2 at the CERN Large Hadron Collider, *Phys. Rev. C* 93 (2016) 055206, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.93.055206>, arXiv:1602.01456.
- [23] A. Accardi, et al., Electron ion collider: the next QCD frontier - understanding the glue that binds us all, arXiv:1212.1701, 2012.
- [24] J.L. Abelleira Fernandez, et al., A Large Hadron Electron Collider at CERN: report on the physics and design concepts for machine and detector, *J. Phys. G* 39 (2012) 075001, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/0954-3899/39/7/075001>, arXiv:1206.2913.
- [25] Y. Akiba, et al., The hot QCD white paper: exploring the phases of QCD at RHIC and the LHC, arXiv:1502.02730, 2015.
- [26] K.J. Eskola, H. Paukkunen, C.A. Salgado, EPS09: a new generation of NLO and LO nuclear parton distribution functions, *J. High Energy Phys.* 04 (2009) 065, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2009/04/065>, arXiv:0902.4154.
- [27] S.P. Jones, A.D. Martin, M.G. Ryskin, T. Teubner, Exclusive J/ψ and Υ photoproduction and the low x gluon, *J. Phys. G* 43 (2016) 035002, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/0954-3899/43/3/035002>, arXiv:1507.06942.
- [28] J. Rojo, et al., The PDF4LHC report on PDFs and LHC data: results from run I and preparation for run II, *J. Phys. G* 42 (2015) 103103, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/0954-3899/42/10/103103>, arXiv:1507.00556.
- [29] B.I. Abelev, et al., STAR, ρ^0 photoproduction in ultraperipheral relativistic heavy ion collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$ GeV, *Phys. Rev. C* 77 (2008) 034910, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.77.034910>, arXiv:0712.3320.
- [30] S. Afanasiev, et al., PHENIX, Photoproduction of J/ψ and of high mass e^+e^- in ultra-peripheral Au+Au collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$ GeV, *Phys. Lett. B* 679 (2009) 321, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2009.07.061>, arXiv:0903.2041.
- [31] G. Agakishiev, et al., STAR, ρ^0 photoproduction in AuAu collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 62.4$ GeV with the STAR detector, *Phys. Rev. C* 85 (2012) 014910, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.85.014910>, arXiv:1107.4630.
- [32] ALICE Collaboration, Coherent J/ψ photoproduction in ultra-peripheral Pb-Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV, *Phys. Lett. B* 718 (2013) 1273, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2012.11.059>, arXiv:1209.3715.
- [33] ALICE Collaboration, Charmonium and e^+e^- pair photoproduction at mid-rapidity in ultra-peripheral Pb-Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 73 (2013) 2617, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-013-2617-1>, arXiv:1305.1467.
- [34] V. Guzey, E. Kryshen, M. Strikman, M. Zhalov, Evidence for nuclear gluon shadowing from the ALICE measurements of PbPb ultraperipheral exclusive J/ψ production, *Phys. Lett. B* 726 (2013) 290, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2013.08.043>, arXiv:1305.1724.
- [35] S.R. Klein, J. Nystrand, J. Seger, Y. Gorbunov, J. Butterworth, STARlight: a Monte Carlo simulation program for ultra-peripheral collisions of relativistic ions,

- Comput. Phys. Commun. 212 (2017) 258, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cpc.2016.10.016>, arXiv:1607.03838.
- [36] K.J. Eskola, H. Paukkunen, C.A. Salgado, An improved global analysis of nuclear parton distribution functions including RHIC data, *J. High Energy Phys.* 07 (2008) 102, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2008/07/102>, arXiv:0802.0139.
- [37] CMS Collaboration, Performance of CMS muon reconstruction in pp collision events at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV, *J. Instrum.* 7 (2012) P10002, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/7/10/P10002>, arXiv:1206.4071.
- [38] CMS Collaboration, The CMS experiment at the CERN LHC, *J. Instrum.* 3 (2008) S08004, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08004>.
- [39] CMS Collaboration, Absolute Calibration of the Luminosity Measurement at CMS: Winter 2012 Update, CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-SMP-12-008, 2012, <http://cdsweb.cern.ch/record/1434360>.
- [40] CMS Collaboration, Status of zero degree calorimeter for CMS experiment, AIP Conf. Proc. 867 (2006) 258, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.2396962>, arXiv:nucl-ex/0608052.
- [41] CMS Collaboration, Measurement of the pseudorapidity and centrality dependence of the transverse energy density in PbPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 109 (2012) 152303, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.152303>, arXiv:1205.2488.
- [42] 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, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/JHEP02\(2014\)088](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/JHEP02(2014)088), arXiv:1312.1845.
- [43] M. Chiu, A. Denisov, E. Garcia, J. Katzy, S.N. White, Measurement of mutual Coulomb dissociation in $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 130$ GeV Au+Au collisions at RHIC, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 89 (2002) 012302, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.89.012302>, arXiv:nucl-ex/0109018.
- [44] STARLIGHT Monte Carlo generator, Online documentation available at <http://starlight.hepforge.org>, 2015.
- [45] A.J. Baltz, Y. Gorunov, S.R. Klein, J. Nystrand, Two-photon interactions with nuclear breakup in relativistic heavy ion collisions, *Phys. Rev. C* 80 (2009) 044902, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.80.044902>, arXiv:0907.1214.
- [46] ALICE Collaboration, Coherent ρ^0 photoproduction in ultra-peripheral Pb-Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV, *J. High Energy Phys.* 09 (2015) 095, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/JHEP09\(2015\)095](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/JHEP09(2015)095), arXiv:1503.09177.
- [47] M.J. Oreglia, A Study of the Reactions $\psi' \rightarrow \gamma\gamma\psi$, Ph.D. thesis, Stanford University, 1980, <http://www.slac.stanford.edu/pubs/slacreports/slac-r-236.html>, SLAC Report SLAC-R-236, see Appendix D.
- [48] S. Agostinelli, et al., GEANT4, GEANT4—a simulation toolkit, *Nucl. Instrum. Methods A* 506 (2003) 250, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9002\(03\)01368-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9002(03)01368-8).
- [49] CMS Collaboration, Measurement of Tracking Efficiency, Technical Report CMS-PAS-TRK-10-002, CERN, Geneva, 2010, <https://cds.cern.ch/record/1279139>, 2010.
- [50] S. van der Meer, Calibration of the Effective Beam Height in the ISR, CERN Technical Report CERN-ISR-PO-68-31, 1968, <http://cds.cern.ch/record/296752>.
- [51] Particle Data Group, K.A. Olive, et al., Review of particle physics, *Chin. Phys. C* 38 (2014) 090001, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1674-1137/38/9/090001>.
- [52] V.N. Gribov, Glauber corrections and the interaction between high-energy hadrons and nuclei, *Sov. Phys. JETP* 29 (1969) 483, *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* 56 (1969) 892.
- [53] V. Guzey, M. Zhalov, Exclusive J/ψ production in ultraperipheral collisions at the LHC: constrains on the gluon distributions in the proton and nuclei, *J. High Energy Phys.* 10 (2013) 207, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/JHEP10\(2013\)207](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/JHEP10(2013)207), arXiv:1307.4526.

The CMS Collaboration

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

Yerevan Physics Institute, Yerevan, Armenia

W. Adam, E. Asilar, T. Bergauer, J. Brandstetter, E. Brondolin, M. Dragicevic, J. Erö, M. Flechl, M. Friedl, R. Frühwirth¹, V.M. Ghete, C. Hartl, N. Hörmann, J. Hrubec, M. Jeitler¹, A. König, M. Krammer¹, I. Krätschmer, D. Liko, T. Matsushita, I. Mikulec, D. Rabady, N. Rad, B. Rahbaran, H. Rohringer, J. Schieck¹, R. Schöfbeck, J. Strauss, W. Treberer-Treberspurg, W. Waltenberger, C.-E. Wulz¹

Institut für Hochenergiephysik der OeAW, Wien, Austria

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

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

S. Alderweireldt, T. Cornelis, E.A. De Wolf, X. Janssen, A. Knutsson, J. Lauwers, S. Luyckx, M. Van De Klundert, H. Van Haevermaet, P. Van Mechelen, N. Van Remortel, A. Van Spilbeek

Universiteit Antwerpen, Antwerpen, Belgium

S. Abu Zeid, F. Blekman, J. D'Hondt, N. Daci, I. De Bruyn, K. Deroover, N. Heracleous, J. Keaveney, S. Lowette, S. Moortgat, L. Moreels, A. Olbrechts, Q. Python, D. Strom, S. Tavernier, W. Van Doninck, P. Van Mulders, G.P. Van Onsem, I. Van Parijs

Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussel, Belgium

H. Brun, C. Caillol, B. Clerbaux, G. De Lentdecker, G. Fasanella, L. Favart, R. Goldouzian, A. Grebenyuk, G. Karapostoli, T. Lenzi, A. Léonard, T. Maerschalk, A. Marinov, L. Perniè, A. Randle-conde, T. Seva, C. Vander Velde, P. Vanlaer, R. Yonamine, F. Zenoni, F. Zhang²

Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium

L. Benucci, A. Cimmino, S. Crucy, D. Dobur, A. Fagot, G. Garcia, M. Gul, J. McCartin, A.A. Ocampo Rios, D. Poyraz, D. Ryckbosch, S. Salva, M. Sigamani, M. Tytgat, W. Van Driessche, E. Yazgan, N. Zaganidis

Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

1 S. Basegmez, C. Beluffi³, O. Bondu, S. Brochet, G. Bruno, A. Caudron, L. Ceard, S. De Visscher, C. Delaere, 66
 2 M. Delcourt, D. Favart, L. Forthomme, A. Giammanco, A. Jafari, P. Jez, M. Komm, V. Lemaître, A. Mertens, 67
 3 M. Musich, C. Nuttens, L. Perrini, K. Piotrkowski, L. Quertenmont, M. Selvaggi, M. Vidal Marono 68
 4 69

5 *Université Catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium* 70
 6 71

7 N. Belyi, G.H. Hammad 72
 8 73

9 *Université de Mons, Mons, Belgium* 74
 10 75

11 W.L. Aldá Júnior, F.L. Alves, G.A. Alves, L. Brito, M. Correa Martins Junior, M. Hamer, C. Hensel, A. Moraes, 76
 12 M.E. Pol, P. Rebello Teles 77
 13 78

14 *Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Físicas, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil* 79
 15 80

16 E. Belchior Batista Das Chagas, W. Carvalho, J. Chinellato⁴, A. Custódio, E.M. Da Costa, 81
 17 D. De Jesus Damiao, C. De Oliveira Martins, S. Fonseca De Souza, L.M. Huertas Guativa, H. Malbouisson, 82
 18 D. Matos Figueiredo, C. Mora Herrera, L. Mundim, H. Nogima, W.L. Prado Da Silva, A. Santoro, 83
 19 A. Sznajder, E.J. Tonelli Manganote⁴, A. Vilela Pereira 84
 20 85

21 *Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil* 86
 22 87

23 S. Ahuja^a, C.A. Bernardes^b, A. De Souza Santos^b, S. Dogra^a, T.R. Fernandez Perez Tomei^a, 88
 24 E.M. Gregores^b, P.G. Mercadante^b, C.S. Moon^{a,5}, S.F. Novaes^a, Sandra S. Padula^a, D. Romero Abad^b, 89
 25 J.C. Ruiz Vargas 90
 26 91

27 ^a *Universidade Estadual Paulista, São Paulo, Brazil* 92
 28 ^b *Universidade Federal do ABC, São Paulo, Brazil* 93
 29 94

30 A. Aleksandrov, R. Hadjiiska, P. Iaydjiev, M. Rodozov, S. Stoykova, G. Sultanov, M. Vutova 95
 31 96

32 *Institute for Nuclear Research and Nuclear Energy, Sofia, Bulgaria* 97
 33 98

34 A. Dimitrov, I. Glushkov, L. Litov, B. Pavlov, P. Petkov 99
 35 100

36 *University of Sofia, Sofia, Bulgaria* 101
 37 102

38 W. Fang⁶ 103
 39 104

40 *Beihang University, Beijing, China* 105
 41 106

42 M. Ahmad, J.G. Bian, G.M. Chen, H.S. Chen, M. Chen, T. Cheng, R. Du, C.H. Jiang, D. Leggat, R. Plestina⁷, 107
 43 F. Romeo, S.M. Shaheen, A. Spiezia, J. Tao, C. Wang, Z. Wang, H. Zhang 108
 44 109

45 *Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing, China* 110
 46 111

47 C. Asawatangtrakuldee, Y. Ban, Q. Li, S. Liu, Y. Mao, S.J. Qian, D. Wang, Z. Xu 112
 48 113

49 *State Key Laboratory of Nuclear Physics and Technology, Peking University, Beijing, China* 114
 50 115

51 C. Avila, A. Cabrera, L.F. Chaparro Sierra, C. Florez, J.P. Gomez, B. Gomez Moreno, J.C. Sanabria 116
 52 117

53 *Universidad de Los Andes, Bogota, Colombia* 118
 54 119

55 N. Godinovic, D. Lelas, I. Puljak, P.M. Ribeiro Cipriano 120
 56 121

57 *University of Split, Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering and Naval Architecture, Split, Croatia* 122
 58 123

59 Z. Antunovic, M. Kovac 124
 60 125

61 *University of Split, Faculty of Science, Split, Croatia* 126
 62 127

63 V. Brigljevic, K. Kadija, J. Luetic, S. Micanovic, L. Sudic 128
 64 129

65 *Institute Rudjer Boskovic, Zagreb, Croatia* 130

1 A. Attikis, G. Mavromanolakis, J. Mousa, C. Nicolaou, F. Ptochos, P.A. Razis, H. Rykaczewski 66

2 *University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus* 67

3 4 M. Finger⁸, M. Finger Jr.⁸ 68

5 6 *Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic* 69

7 8 A. Awad, S. Elgammal⁹, A. Mohamed¹⁰, E. Salama^{9,11} 70

9 10 *Academy of Scientific Research and Technology of the Arab Republic of Egypt, Egyptian Network of High Energy Physics, Cairo, Egypt* 71

11 12 B. Calpas, M. Kadastik, M. Murumaa, M. Raidal, A. Tiko, C. Veelken 72

13 14 *National Institute of Chemical Physics and Biophysics, Tallinn, Estonia* 73

15 16 P. Eerola, J. Pekkanen, M. Voutilainen 74

17 18 *Department of Physics, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland* 75

19 20 J. Härkönen, V. Karimäki, R. Kinnunen, T. Lampén, K. Lassila-Perini, S. Lehti, T. Lindén, P. Luukka, 76

21 T. Peltola, J. Tuominiemi, E. Tuovinen, L. Wendland 77

22 23 *Helsinki Institute of Physics, Helsinki, Finland* 78

24 25 J. Talvitie, T. Tuuva 79

26 27 *Lappeenranta University of Technology, Lappeenranta, Finland* 80

28 29 M. Besancon, F. Couderc, M. Dejardin, D. Denegri, B. Fabbro, J.L. Faure, C. Favaro, F. Ferri, S. Ganjour, 81

30 A. Givernaud, P. Gras, G. Hamel de Monchenault, P. Jarry, E. Locci, M. Mached, J. Malcles, J. Rander, 82

31 A. Rosowsky, M. Titov, A. Zghiche 83

32 33 *DSM/IRFU, CEA/Saclay, Gif-sur-Yvette, France* 84

34 35 A. Abdulsalam, I. Antropov, S. Baffioni, F. Beaudette, P. Busson, L. Cadamuro, E. Chapon, C. Charlot, 85

36 O. Davignon, N. Filipovic, R. Granier de Cassagnac, M. Jo, S. Lisniak, P. Miné, I.N. Naranjo, M. Nguyen, 86

37 C. Ochando, G. Ortona, P. Paganini, P. Pigard, S. Regnard, R. Salerno, Y. Sirois, T. Strebler, Y. Yilmaz, A. Zabi 87

38 39 *Laboratoire Leprince-Ringuet, Ecole Polytechnique, IN2P3-CNRS, Palaiseau, France* 88

40 41 J.-L. Agram¹², J. Andrea, A. Aubin, D. Bloch, J.-M. Brom, M. Buttignol, E.C. Chabert, N. Chanon, C. Collard, 89

42 E. Conte¹², X. Coubez, J.-C. Fontaine¹², D. Gelé, U. Goerlach, C. Goetzmann, A.-C. Le Bihan, J.A. Merlin¹³, 90

43 K. Skovpen, P. Van Hove 91

44 45 *Institut Pluridisciplinaire Hubert Curien, Université de Strasbourg, Université de Haute Alsace Mulhouse, CNRS/IN2P3, Strasbourg, France* 92

46 47 S. Gadrat 93

48 49 *Centre de Calcul de l'Institut National de Physique Nucléaire et de Physique des Particules, CNRS/IN2P3, Villeurbanne, France* 94

50 51 S. Beauceron, C. Bernet, G. Boudoul, E. Bouvier, C.A. Carrillo Montoya, R. Chierici, D. Contardo, 95

52 B. Courbon, P. Depasse, H. El Mamouni, J. Fan, J. Fay, S. Gascon, M. Gouzevitch, B. Ille, F. Lagarde, 96

53 I.B. Laktineh, M. Lethuillier, L. Mirabito, A.L. Pequegnot, S. Perries, A. Popov¹⁴, J.D. Ruiz Alvarez, D. Sabes, 97

54 V. Sordini, M. Vander Donckt, P. Verdier, S. Viret 98

55 56 *Université de Lyon, Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, CNRS-IN2P3, Institut de Physique Nucléaire de Lyon, Villeurbanne, France* 99

57 58 T. Toriashvili¹⁵ 100

59 60 *Georgian Technical University, Tbilisi, Georgia* 101

61 62 I. Bagaturia¹⁶ 102

63 64 *Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia* 103

65 104

1 C. Autermann, S. Beranek, L. Feld, A. Heister, M.K. Kiesel, K. Klein, M. Lipinski, A. Ostapchuk, M. Preuten, 66
 2 F. Raupach, S. Schael, J.F. Schulte, T. Verlage, H. Weber, V. Zhukov¹⁴ 67
 3

4 RWTH Aachen University, I. Physikalisches Institut, Aachen, Germany 68
 5 69

6 M. Ata, M. Brodski, E. Dietz-Laursonn, D. Duchardt, M. Endres, M. Erdmann, S. Erdweg, T. Esch, 70
 7 R. Fischer, A. Güth, T. Hebbeker, C. Heidemann, K. Hoepfner, S. Knutzen, M. Merschmeyer, A. Meyer, 71
 8 P. Millet, S. Mukherjee, M. Olschewski, K. Padeken, P. Papacz, T. Pook, M. Radziej, H. Reithler, M. Rieger, 72
 9 F. Scheuch, L. Sonnenschein, D. Teyssier, S. Thüer 73
 10 74

11 RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut A, Aachen, Germany 75
 12 76

13 V. Cherepanov, Y. Erdogan, G. Flügge, H. Geenen, M. Geisler, F. Hoehle, B. Kargoll, T. Kress, A. Künsken, 78
 14 J. Lingemann, A. Nehr Korn, A. Nowack, I.M. Nugent, C. Pistone, O. Pooth, A. Stahl¹³ 79
 15 80

16 RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut B, Aachen, Germany 81
 17 82

18 M. Aldaya Martin, I. Asin, N. Bartosik, K. Beernaert, O. Behnke, U. Behrens, K. Borras¹⁷, A. Burgmeier, 83
 19 A. Campbell, C. Contreras-Campana, F. Costanza, C. Diez Pardos, G. Dolinska, S. Dooling, G. Eckerlin, 84
 20 D. Eckstein, T. Eichhorn, E. Gallo¹⁸, J. Garay Garcia, A. Geiser, A. Gizhko, P. Gunnellini, J. Hauk, 85
 21 M. Hempel¹⁹, H. Jung, A. Kalogeropoulos, O. Karacheban¹⁹, M. Kasemann, P. Katsas, J. Kieseler, 86
 22 C. Kleinwort, I. Korol, W. Lange, J. Leonard, K. Lipka, A. Lobanov, W. Lohmann¹⁹, R. Mankel, 87
 23 I.-A. Melzer-Pellmann, A.B. Meyer, G. Mittag, J. Mnich, A. Mussgiller, A. Nayak, E. Ntomari, D. Pitzl, 88
 24 R. Placakyte, A. Raspereza, B. Roland, M.Ö. Sahin, P. Saxena, T. Schoerner-Sadenius, C. Seitz, S. Spannagel, 89
 25 N. Stefaniuk, K.D. Trippkewitz, R. Walsh, C. Wissing 90
 26 91
 27 92

28 Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Hamburg, Germany 93
 29 94
 30 95

31 V. Blobel, M. Centis Vignali, A.R. Draeger, T. Dreyer, J. Erfle, E. Garutti, K. Goebel, D. Gonzalez, M. Görner, 96
 32 J. Haller, M. Hoffmann, R.S. Höing, A. Junkes, R. Klanner, R. Kogler, N. Kovalchuk, T. Lapsien, T. Lenz, 97
 33 I. Marchesini, D. Marconi, M. Meyer, M. Niedziela, D. Nowatschin, J. Ott, F. Pantaleo¹³, T. Peiffer, 98
 34 A. Perieanu, N. Pietsch, J. Poehlsen, C. Sander, C. Scharf, P. Schleper, E. Schlieckau, A. Schmidt, 99
 35 S. Schumann, J. Schwandt, V. Sola, H. Stadie, G. Steinbrück, F.M. Stober, H. Tholen, D. Troendle, E. Usai, 100
 36 L. Vanelderden, A. Vanhoefer, B. Vormwald 101
 37 102
 38 103

39 University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany 104
 40 105

41 C. Barth, C. Baus, J. Berger, C. Böser, E. Butz, T. Chwalek, F. Colombo, W. De Boer, A. Descroix, 106
 42 A. Dierlamm, S. Fink, F. Frensch, R. Friese, M. Giffels, A. Gilbert, D. Haitz, F. Hartmann¹³, S.M. Heindl, 107
 43 U. Husemann, I. Katkov¹⁴, A. Kornmayer¹³, P. Lobelle Pardo, B. Maier, H. Mildner, M.U. Mozer, T. Müller, 108
 44 Th. Müller, M. Plagge, G. Quast, K. Rabbertz, S. Röcker, F. Roscher, M. Schröder, G. Sieber, H.J. Simonis, 109
 45 R. Ulrich, J. Wagner-Kuhr, S. Wayand, M. Weber, T. Weiler, S. Williamson, C. Wöhrmann, R. Wolf 110
 46 111
 47 112

48 Institut für Experimentelle Kernphysik, Karlsruhe, Germany 113
 49 114

50 G. Anagnostou, G. Daskalakis, T. Geralis, V.A. Giakoumopoulou, A. Kyriakis, D. Loukas, A. Psallidas, 115
 51 I. Topsis-Giotis 116
 52 117

53 Institute of Nuclear and Particle Physics (INPP), NCSR Demokritos, Aghia Paraskevi, Greece 118
 54 119

55 A. Agapitos, S. Kesisoglou, A. Panagiotou, N. Saoulidou, E. Tziaferi 120
 56 121

57 National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece 122
 58 123

59 I. Evangelou, G. Flouris, C. Foudas, P. Kokkas, N. Loukas, N. Manthos, I. Papadopoulos, E. Paradas, 124
 60 J. Strologas 125
 61 126

62 University of Ioánnina, Ioánnina, Greece 127
 63 128
 64 129
 65 130

1 G. Bencze, C. Hajdu, P. Hidas, D. Horvath²⁰, F. Sikler, V. Veszpremi, G. Vesztergombi²¹, A.J. Zsigmond 66

2 Wigner Research Centre for Physics, Budapest, Hungary 67

3 68
4 N. Beni, S. Czellar, J. Karancsi²², J. Molnar, Z. Szillasi 69

5 70
6 Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary 71

7 72
8 M. Bartók²¹, A. Makovec, P. Raics, Z.L. Trocsanyi, B. Ujvari 73

9 74
10 University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary 75

11 76
12 S. Choudhury²³, P. Mal, K. Mandal, D.K. Sahoo, N. Sahoo, S.K. Swain 77

13 78
14 National Institute of Science Education and Research, Bhubaneswar, India 79

15 80
16 S. Bansal, S.B. Beri, V. Bhatnagar, R. Chawla, R. Gupta, U. Bhawandeep, A.K. Kalsi, A. Kaur, M. Kaur, 81
17 R. Kumar, A. Mehta, M. Mittal, J.B. Singh, G. Walia 82

18 83
19 Panjab University, Chandigarh, India 84

20 85
21 Ashok Kumar, A. Bhardwaj, B.C. Choudhary, R.B. Garg, S. Keshri, A. Kumar, S. Malhotra, M. Naimuddin, 86
22 N. Nishu, K. Ranjan, R. Sharma, V. Sharma 87

23 88
24 University of Delhi, Delhi, India 89

25 90
26 R. Bhattacharya, S. Bhattacharya, K. Chatterjee, S. Dey, S. Dutta, S. Ghosh, N. Majumdar, A. Modak, 91
27 K. Mondal, S. Mukhopadhyay, S. Nandan, A. Purohit, A. Roy, D. Roy, S. Roy Chowdhury, S. Sarkar, 92
28 M. Sharan 93

29 94
30 Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, Kolkata, India 95

31 96
32 R. Chudasama, D. Dutta, V. Jha, V. Kumar, A.K. Mohanty¹³, L.M. Pant, P. Shukla, A. Topkar 97

33 98
34 Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, Mumbai, India 99

35 100
36 T. Aziz, S. Banerjee, S. Bhowmik²⁴, R.M. Chatterjee, R.K. Dewanjee, S. Dugad, S. Ganguly, S. Ghosh, 101
37 M. Guchait, A. Gurtu²⁵, Sa. Jain, G. Kole, S. Kumar, B. Mahakud, M. Maity²⁴, G. Majumder, K. Mazumdar, 102
38 S. Mitra, G.B. Mohanty, B. Parida, T. Sarkar²⁴, N. Sur, B. Sutar, N. Wickramage²⁶ 103
39 104

40 105
41 Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Mumbai, India 106

42 107
43 S. Chauhan, S. Dube, A. Kapoor, K. Kotheekar, A. Rane, S. Sharma 108

44 109
45 Indian Institute of Science Education and Research (IISER), Pune, India 110

46 111
47 H. Bakhshiansohi, H. Behnamian, S.M. Etesami²⁷, A. Fahim²⁸, M. Khakzad, M. Mohammadi Najafabadi, 112
48 M. Naseri, S. Paktinat Mehdiabadi, F. Rezaei Hosseinabadi, B. Safarzadeh²⁹, M. Zeinali 113

49 114
50 Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM), Tehran, Iran 115

51 116
52 M. Felcini, M. Grunewald 117

53 118
54 University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland 119

55 120
56 M. Abbrescia^{a,b}, C. Calabria^{a,b}, C. Caputo^{a,b}, A. Colaleo^a, D. Creanza^{a,c}, L. Cristella^{a,b}, N. De Filippis^{a,c}, 121
57 M. De Palma^{a,b}, L. Fiore^a, G. Iaselli^{a,c}, G. Maggi^{a,c}, M. Maggi^a, G. Miniello^{a,b}, S. My^{a,b}, S. Nuzzo^{a,b}, 122
58 A. Pompili^{a,b}, G. Pugliese^{a,c}, R. Radogna^{a,b}, A. Ranieri^a, G. Selvaggi^{a,b}, L. Silvestris^{a,13}, R. Venditti^{a,b} 123

59 124
60 ^a INFN Sezione di Bari, Bari, Italy 125

61 ^b Università di Bari, Bari, Italy 126

62 ^c Politecnico di Bari, Bari, Italy 127

63 128
64 G. Abbiendi^a, C. Battilana¹³, D. Bonacorsi^{a,b}, S. Braibant-Giacomelli^{a,b}, L. Brigliadori^{a,b}, 129
65 R. Campanini^{a,b}, P. Capiluppi^{a,b}, A. Castro^{a,b}, F.R. Cavallo^a, S.S. Chhibra^{a,b}, G. Codispoti^{a,b}, 130

1 M. Cuffiani^{a,b}, G.M. Dallavalle^a, F. Fabbri^a, A. Fanfani^{a,b}, D. Fasanella^{a,b}, P. Giacomelli^a, C. Grandi^a,
 2 L. Guiducci^{a,b}, S. Marcellini^a, G. Masetti^a, A. Montanari^a, F.L. Navarria^{a,b}, A. Perrotta^a, A.M. Rossi^{a,b},
 3 T. Rovelli^{a,b}, G.P. Siroli^{a,b}, N. Tosi^{a,b,13}

4
 5 ^a INFN Sezione di Bologna, Bologna, Italy

6 ^b Università di Bologna, Bologna, Italy

7
 8 G. Cappello^b, M. Chiorboli^{a,b}, S. Costa^{a,b}, A. Di Mattia^a, F. Giordano^{a,b}, R. Potenza^{a,b}, A. Tricomi^{a,b},
 9 C. Tuve^{a,b}

10
 11 ^a INFN Sezione di Catania, Catania, Italy

12 ^b Università di Catania, Catania, Italy

13
 14 G. Barbagli^a, V. Ciulli^{a,b}, C. Civinini^a, R. D'Alessandro^{a,b}, E. Focardi^{a,b}, V. Gori^{a,b}, P. Lenzi^{a,b},
 15 M. Meschini^a, S. Paoletti^a, G. Sguazzoni^a, L. Viliani^{a,b,13}

16
 17 ^a INFN Sezione di Firenze, Firenze, Italy

18 ^b Università di Firenze, Firenze, Italy

19
 20 L. Benussi, S. Bianco, F. Fabbri, D. Piccolo, F. Primavera¹³

21 INFN Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, Frascati, Italy

22
 23 V. Calvelli^{a,b}, F. Ferro^a, M. Lo Vetere^{a,b}, M.R. Monge^{a,b}, E. Robutti^a, S. Tosi^{a,b}

24
 25 ^a INFN Sezione di Genova, Genova, Italy

26 ^b Università di Genova, Genova, Italy

27
 28 L. Brianza, M.E. Dinardo^{a,b}, S. Fiorendi^{a,b}, S. Gennai^a, R. Gerosa^{a,b}, A. Ghezzi^{a,b}, P. Govoni^{a,b},
 29 S. Malvezzi^a, R.A. Manzoni^{a,b,13}, B. Marzocchi^{a,b}, D. Menasce^a, L. Moroni^a, M. Paganoni^{a,b}, D. Pedrini^a,
 30 S. Pigazzini, S. Ragazzi^{a,b}, N. Redaelli^a, T. Tabarelli de Fatis^{a,b}

31
 32 ^a INFN Sezione di Milano-Bicocca, Milano, Italy

33 ^b Università di Milano-Bicocca, Milano, Italy

34
 35 S. Buontempo^a, N. Cavallo^{a,c}, S. Di Guida^{a,d,13}, M. Esposito^{a,b}, F. Fabozzi^{a,c}, A.O.M. Iorio^{a,b}, G. Lanza^a,
 36 L. Lista^a, S. Meola^{a,d,13}, M. Merola^a, P. Paolucci^{a,13}, C. Sciacca^{a,b}, F. Thyssen

37
 38 ^a INFN Sezione di Napoli, Napoli, Italy

39 ^b Università di Napoli 'Federico II', Napoli, Italy

40 ^c Università della Basilicata, Potenza, Italy

41 ^d Università G. Marconi, Roma, Italy

42
 43 P. Azzi^{a,13}, N. Bacchetta^a, M. Bellato^a, L. Benato^{a,b}, A. Boletti^{a,b}, M. Dall'Osso^{a,b,13}, T. Dorigo^a,
 44 F. Fanzago^a, F. Gasparini^{a,b}, A. Gozzelino^a, M. Gulmini^{a,30}, S. Lacaprara^a, M. Margoni^{a,b},
 45 A.T. Meneguzzo^{a,b}, M. Michelotto^a, M. Passaseo^a, J. Pazzini^{a,b,13}, M. Pegoraro^a, N. Pozzobon^{a,b},
 46 P. Ronchese^{a,b}, M. Sgaravatto^a, F. Simonetto^{a,b}, E. Torassa^a, M. Tosi^{a,b}, S. Vanini^{a,b}, S. Ventura^a,
 47 M. Zanetti, P. Zotto^{a,b}, A. Zucchetta^{a,b,13}

48
 49 ^a INFN Sezione di Padova, Padova, Italy

50 ^b Università di Padova, Padova, Italy

51 ^c Università di Trento, Trento, Italy

52
 53 A. Braghieri^a, A. Magnani^{a,b}, P. Montagna^{a,b}, S.P. Ratti^{a,b}, V. Re^a, C. Riccardi^{a,b}, P. Salvini^a, I. Vai^{a,b},
 54 P. Vitulo^{a,b}

55
 56 ^a INFN Sezione di Pavia, Pavia, Italy

57 ^b Università di Pavia, Pavia, Italy

58
 59 L. Alunni Solestizi^{a,b}, G.M. Bilei^a, D. Ciangottini^{a,b}, L. Fanò^{a,b}, P. Lariccia^{a,b}, R. Leonardi^{a,b},
 60 G. Mantovani^{a,b}, M. Menichelli^a, A. Saha^a, A. Santocchia^{a,b}

61
 62 ^a INFN Sezione di Perugia, Perugia, Italy

63 ^b Università di Perugia, Perugia, Italy

1 K. Androsov^{a,31}, P. Azzurri^{a,13}, G. Bagliesi^a, J. Bernardini^a, T. Boccali^a, R. Castaldi^a, M.A. Ciocci^{a,31}, 66
 2 R. Dell'Orso^a, S. Donato^{a,c}, G. Fedi, L. Foà^{a,c,†}, A. Giassi^a, M.T. Grippo^{a,31}, F. Ligabue^{a,c}, T. Lomtadze^a, 67
 3 L. Martini^{a,b}, A. Messineo^{a,b}, F. Palla^a, A. Rizzi^{a,b}, A. Savoy-Navarro^{a,32}, P. Spagnolo^a, R. Tenchini^a, 68
 4 G. Tonelli^{a,b}, A. Venturi^a, P.G. Verdini^a 69
 5

6 ^a INFN Sezione di Pisa, Pisa, Italy 71

7 ^b Università di Pisa, Pisa, Italy 72

8 ^c Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Pisa, Italy 73

9
 10 L. Barone^{a,b}, F. Cavallari^a, G. D'imperio^{a,b,13}, D. Del Re^{a,b,13}, M. Diemoz^a, S. Gelli^{a,b}, C. Jorda^a, 74
 11 E. Longo^{a,b}, F. Margaroli^{a,b}, P. Meridiani^a, G. Organtini^{a,b}, R. Paramatti^a, F. Preiato^{a,b}, S. Rahatlou^{a,b}, 75
 12 C. Rovelli^a, F. Santanastasio^{a,b} 76
 13

14 ^a INFN Sezione di Roma, Roma, Italy 79

15 ^b Università di Roma, Roma, Italy 80

16
 17 N. Amapane^{a,b}, R. Arcidiacono^{a,c,13}, S. Argiro^{a,b}, M. Arneodo^{a,c}, R. Bellan^{a,b}, C. Biino^a, N. Cartiglia^a, 82
 18 M. Costa^{a,b}, R. Covarelli^{a,b}, A. Degano^{a,b}, N. Demaria^a, L. Finco^{a,b}, B. Kiani^{a,b}, C. Mariotti^a, S. Maselli^a, 83
 19 E. Migliore^{a,b}, V. Monaco^{a,b}, E. Monteil^{a,b}, M.M. Obertino^{a,b}, L. Pacher^{a,b}, N. Pastrone^a, M. Pelliccioni^a, 84
 20 G.L. Pinna Angioni^{a,b}, F. Ravera^{a,b}, A. Romero^{a,b}, M. Ruspa^{a,c}, R. Sacchi^{a,b}, A. Solano^{a,b}, A. Staiano^a 85
 21
 22

23 ^a INFN Sezione di Torino, Torino, Italy 88

24 ^b Università di Torino, Torino, Italy 89

25 ^c Università del Piemonte Orientale, Novara, Italy 90

26 S. Belforte^a, V. Candelise^{a,b}, M. Casarsa^a, F. Cossutti^a, G. Della Ricca^{a,b}, B. Gobbo^a, C. La Licata^{a,b}, 91
 27 A. Schizzi^{a,b}, A. Zanetti^a 92
 28

29 ^a INFN Sezione di Trieste, Trieste, Italy 94

30 ^b Università di Trieste, Trieste, Italy 95

31
 32 S.K. Nam 97

33 Kangwon National University, Chunchon, Republic of Korea 98

34 D.H. Kim, G.N. Kim, M.S. Kim, D.J. Kong, S. Lee, S.W. Lee, Y.D. Oh, A. Sakharov, D.C. Son 99
 35

36 Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Republic of Korea 101

37
 38 J.A. Brochero Cifuentes, H. Kim, T.J. Kim³³ 102
 39

40 Chonbuk National University, Jeonju, Republic of Korea 103
 41

42
 43 S. Song 104
 44

45 Chonnam National University, Institute for Universe and Elementary Particles, Kwangju, Republic of Korea 105
 46

47 S. Cho, S. Choi, Y. Go, D. Gyun, B. Hong, H. Kim, Y. Kim, B. Lee, K. Lee, K.S. Lee, S. Lee, J. Lim, S.K. Park, 106
 48 Y. Roh 107
 49

50 Korea University, Seoul, Republic of Korea 108
 51

52
 53 H.D. Yoo 109
 54

55 Seoul National University, Seoul, Republic of Korea 110
 56

57 M. Choi, H. Kim, J.H. Kim, J.S.H. Lee, I.C. Park, G. Ryu, M.S. Ryu 111
 58

59 University of Seoul, Seoul, Republic of Korea 112
 60

61 Y. Choi, J. Goh, D. Kim, E. Kwon, J. Lee, I. Yu 113
 62

63 Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon, Republic of Korea 114
 64
 65

1 V. Dudenas, A. Juodagalvis, J. Vaitkus

2 *Vilnius University, Vilnius, Lithuania*

3
4 I. Ahmed, Z.A. Ibrahim, J.R. Komaragiri, M.A.B. Md Ali³⁴, F. Mohamad Idris³⁵, W.A.T. Wan Abdullah,
5 M.N. Yusli, Z. Zolkapli

6
7 *National Centre for Particle Physics, Universiti Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia*

8
9 E. Casimiro Linares, H. Castilla-Valdez, E. De La Cruz-Burelo, I. Heredia-De La Cruz³⁶,
10 A. Hernandez-Almada, R. Lopez-Fernandez, J. Mejia Guisao, A. Sanchez-Hernandez

11
12 *Centro de Investigacion y de Estudios Avanzados del IPN, Mexico City, Mexico*

13
14 S. Carrillo Moreno, F. Vazquez Valencia

15
16 *Universidad Iberoamericana, Mexico City, Mexico*

17
18 I. Pedraza, H.A. Salazar Ibarguen

19
20 *Benemerita Universidad Autonoma de Puebla, Puebla, Mexico*

21
22 A. Morelos Pineda

23
24 *Universidad Autónoma de San Luis Potosí, San Luis Potosí, Mexico*

25
26 D. Krofcheck

27
28 *University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand*

29
30 P.H. Butler

31
32 *University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand*

33
34 A. Ahmad, M. Ahmad, Q. Hassan, H.R. Hoorani, W.A. Khan, T. Khurshid, M. Shoaib, M. Waqas

35
36 *National Centre for Physics, Quaid-I-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan*

37
38 H. Bialkowska, M. Bluj, B. Boimska, T. Frueboes, M. Górski, M. Kazana, K. Nawrocki,
39 K. Romanowska-Rybinska, M. Szeleper, P. Traczyk, P. Zalewski

40
41 *National Centre for Nuclear Research, Swierk, Poland*

42
43 G. Brona, K. Bunkowski, A. Byszuk³⁷, K. Doroba, A. Kalinowski, M. Konecki, J. Krolikowski, M. Misiura,
44 M. Olszewski, M. Walczak

45
46 *Institute of Experimental Physics, Faculty of Physics, University of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland*

47
48 P. Bargassa, C. Beirão Da Cruz E Silva, A. Di Francesco, P. Faccioli, P.G. Ferreira Parracho, M. Gallinaro,
49 J. Hollar, N. Leonardo, L. Lloret Iglesias, M.V. Nemallapudi, F. Nguyen, J. Rodrigues Antunes, J. Seixas,
50 O. Toldaiev, D. Vadrucchio, J. Varela, P. Vischia

51
52 *Laboratório de Instrumentação e Física Experimental de Partículas, Lisboa, Portugal*

53
54 S. Afanasiev, P. Bunin, M. Gavrilenko, I. Golutvin, I. Gorbunov, A. Kamenev, V. Karjavin, A. Lanev,
55 A. Malakhov, V. Matveev^{38,39}, P. Moisezenz, V. Palichik, V. Perelygin, S. Shmatov, S. Shulha, N. Skatchkov,
56 V. Smirnov, N. Voytishin, A. Zarubin

57
58 *Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia*

59
60 V. Golovtsov, Y. Ivanov, V. Kim⁴⁰, E. Kuznetsova, P. Levchenko, V. Murzin, V. Oreshkin, I. Smirnov,
61 V. Sulimov, L. Uvarov, S. Vavilov, A. Vorobyev

62
63 *Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, Gatchina (St. Petersburg), Russia*

64
65

1 Yu. Andreev, A. Dermenev, S. Gninenko, N. Golubev, A. Karneyeu, M. Kirsanov, N. Krasnikov,
2 A. Pashenkov, D. Tilsov, A. Toropin

3 *Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia*

4 V. Epshteyn, V. Gavrilov, N. Lychkovskaya, V. Popov, I. Pozdnyakov, G. Safronov, A. Spiridonov, E. Vlasov,
5 A. Zhokin

6 *Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia*

7 M. Chadeeva, R. Chistov, M. Danilov, V. Rusinov, E. Tarkovskii

8 *National Research Nuclear University 'Moscow Engineering Physics Institute' (MEPhI), Moscow, Russia*

9 V. Andreev, M. Azarkin³⁹, I. Dremin³⁹, M. Kirakosyan, A. Leonidov³⁹, G. Mesyats, S.V. Rusakov

10 *P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia*

11 A. Baskakov, A. Belyaev, E. Boos, A. Demiyarov, A. Ershov, A. Gribushin, O. Kodolova, V. Korotkikh,
12 I. Lokhtin, I. Miagkov, S. Obraztsov, S. Petrushanko, V. Savrin, A. Snigirev, I. Vardanyan

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

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

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

17 P. Adzic⁴¹, P. Cirkovic, D. Devetak, J. Milosevic, V. Rekovic

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

19 J. Alcaraz Maestre, E. Calvo, M. Cerrada, M. Chamizo Llatas, N. Colino, B. De La Cruz, A. Delgado Peris,
20 A. Escalante Del Valle, C. Fernandez Bedoya, J.P. Fernández Ramos, J. Flix, M.C. Fouz, P. Garcia-Abia,
21 O. Gonzalez Lopez, S. Goy Lopez, J.M. Hernandez, M.I. Josa, E. Navarro De Martino,
22 A. Pérez-Calero Yzquierdo, J. Puerta Pelayo, A. Quintario Olmeda, I. Redondo, L. Romero, M.S. Soares

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

24 J.F. de Trocóniz, M. Missiroli, D. Moran

25 *Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain*

26 J. Cuevas, J. Fernandez Menendez, S. Folgueras, I. Gonzalez Caballero, E. Palencia Cortezon¹³,
27 J.M. Vizan Garcia

28 *Universidad de Oviedo, Oviedo, Spain*

29 I.J. Cabrillo, A. Calderon, J.R. Castiñeiras De Saa, E. Curras, P. De Castro Manzano, M. Fernandez,
30 J. Garcia-Ferrero, G. Gomez, A. Lopez Virto, J. Marco, R. Marco, C. Martinez Rivero, F. Matorras,
31 J. Piedra Gomez, T. Rodrigo, A.Y. Rodríguez-Marrero, A. Ruiz-Jimeno, L. Scodellaro, N. Trevisani, I. Vila,
32 R. Vilar Cortabitarte

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

34 D. Abbaneo, E. Auffray, G. Auzinger, M. Bachtis, P. Baillon, A.H. Ball, D. Barney, A. Benaglia, L. Benhabib,
35 G.M. Berruti, P. Bloch, A. Bocci, A. Bonato, C. Botta, H. Breuker, T. Camporesi, R. Castello, M. Cepeda,
36 G. Cerminara, M. D'Alfonso, D. d'Enterria, A. Dabrowski, V. Daponte, A. David, M. De Gruttola, F. De Guio,
37 A. De Roeck, E. Di Marco⁴², M. Dobson, M. Dordevic, B. Dorney, T. du Pree, D. Duggan, M. Dünser,
38 N. Dupont, A. Elliott-Peisert, G. Franzoni, J. Fulcher, W. Funk, D. Gigi, K. Gill, M. Girone, F. Glege,
39 R. Guida, S. Gundacker, M. Guthoff, J. Hammer, P. Harris, J. Hegeman, V. Innocente, P. Janot,
40 H. Kirschenmann, V. Knünz, M.J. Kortelainen, K. Kousouris, P. Lecoq, C. Lourenço, M.T. Lucchini,

1 N. Magini, L. Malgeri, M. Mannelli, A. Martelli, L. Masetti, F. Meijers, S. Mersi, E. Meschi, F. Moortgat, 66
2 S. Morovic, M. Mulders, H. Neugebauer, S. Orfanelli⁴³, L. Orsini, L. Pape, E. Perez, M. Peruzzi, A. Petrilli, 67
3 G. Petrucciani, A. Pfeiffer, M. Pierini, D. Piparo, A. Racz, T. Reis, G. Rolandi⁴⁴, M. Rovere, M. Ruan, 68
4 H. Sakulin, J.B. Sauvan, C. Schäfer, C. Schwick, M. Seidel, A. Sharma, P. Silva, M. Simon, P. Sphicas⁴⁵, 69
5 J. Steggemann, M. Stoye, Y. Takahashi, D. Treille, A. Triossi, A. Tsirou, V. Veckalns⁴⁶, G.I. Veres²¹, 70
6 N. Wardle, H.K. Wöhri, A. Zagozdinska³⁷, W.D. Zeuner 71
7

8 CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland 73
9

10 W. Bertl, K. Deiters, W. Erdmann, R. Horisberger, Q. Ingram, H.C. Kaestli, D. Kotlinski, U. Langenegger, 74
11 T. Rohe 75
12

13 Paul Scherrer Institut, Villigen, Switzerland 76
14

15 F. Bachmair, L. Bäni, L. Bianchini, B. Casal, G. Dissertori, M. Dittmar, M. Donegà, P. Eller, C. Grab, 77
16 C. Heidegger, D. Hits, J. Hoss, G. Kasieczka, P. Lecomte[†], W. Lustermann, B. Mangano, M. Marionneau, 78
17 P. Martinez Ruiz del Arbol, M. Masciovecchio, M.T. Meinhard, D. Meister, F. Micheli, P. Musella, 79
18 F. Nessi-Tedaldi, F. Pandolfi, J. Pata, F. Pauss, G. Perrin, L. Perrozzi, M. Quittnat, M. Rossini, 80
19 M. Schönemberger, A. Starodumov⁴⁷, M. Takahashi, V.R. Tavolaro, K. Theofilatos, R. Wallny 81
20

21 Institute for Particle Physics, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland 82
22

23 T.K. Aarrestad, C. AMSler⁴⁸, L. Caminada, M.F. Canelli, V. Chiochia, A. De Cosa, C. Galloni, A. Hinzmann, 83
24 T. Hreus, B. Kilminster, C. Lange, J. Ngadiuba, D. Pinna, G. Rauco, P. Robmann, D. Salerno, Y. Yang 84
25

26 Universität Zürich, Zurich, Switzerland 85
27

28 K.H. Chen, T.H. Doan, Sh. Jain, R. Khurana, M. Konyushikhin, C.M. Kuo, W. Lin, Y.J. Lu, A. Pozdnyakov, 86
29 S.S. Yu 87
30

31 National Central University, Chung-Li, Taiwan 88
32

33 Arun Kumar, P. Chang, Y.H. Chang, Y.W. Chang, Y. Chao, K.F. Chen, P.H. Chen, C. Dietz, F. Fiori, 89
34 U. Grundler, W.-S. Hou, Y. Hsiung, Y.F. Liu, R.-S. Lu, M. Miñano Moya, E. Petrakou, J.f. Tsai, Y.M. Tzeng 90
35

36 National Taiwan University (NTU), Taipei, Taiwan 91
37

38 B. Asavapibhop, K. Kovitanggoon, G. Singh, N. Srimanobhas, N. Suwonjandee 92
39

40 Chulalongkorn University, Faculty of Science, Department of Physics, Bangkok, Thailand 93
41

42 A. Adiguzel, M.N. Bakirci⁴⁹, S. Cerci⁵⁰, S. Damarcekin, Z.S. Demiroglu, C. Dozen, E. Eskut, S. Girgis, 94
43 G. Gokbulut, Y. Guler, E. Gurpinar, I. Hos, E.E. Kangal⁵¹, G. Onengut⁵², K. Ozdemir⁵³, S. Ozturk⁴⁹, 95
44 A. Polatoz, D. Sunar Cerci⁵⁰, C. Zorbilmez 96
45

46 Cukurova University, Adana, Turkey 97
47

48 B. Bilin, S. Bilmis, B. Isildak⁵⁴, G. Karapinar⁵⁵, M. Yalvac, M. Zeyrek 98
49

50 Middle East Technical University, Physics Department, Ankara, Turkey 99
51

52 E. Gülmez, M. Kaya⁵⁶, O. Kaya⁵⁷, E.A. Yetkin⁵⁸, T. Yetkin⁵⁹ 100
53

54 Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey 101
55

56 A. Cakir, K. Cankocak, S. Sen⁶⁰ 102
57

58 Istanbul Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey 103
59

60 B. Grynyov 104
61

62 Institute for Scintillation Materials of National Academy of Science of Ukraine, Kharkov, Ukraine 105
63

64 106
65 107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130

1 L. Levchuk, P. Sorokin

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

3
4 R. Aggleton, F. Ball, L. Beck, J.J. Brooke, D. Burns, E. Clement, D. Cussans, H. Flacher, J. Goldstein,
5 M. Grimes, G.P. Heath, H.F. Heath, J. Jacob, L. Kreczko, C. Lucas, Z. Meng, D.M. Newbold⁶¹,
6 S. Paramesvaran, A. Poll, T. Sakuma, S. Seif El Nasr-storey, S. Senkin, D. Smith, V.J. Smith

7
8
9 *University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom*

10 A. Belyaev⁶², C. Brew, R.M. Brown, L. Calligaris, D. Cieri, D.J.A. Cockerill, J.A. Coughlan, K. Harder,
11 S. Harper, E. Olaiya, D. Petyt, C.H. Shepherd-Themistocleous, A. Thea, I.R. Tomalin, T. Williams, S.D. Worm

12
13
14 *Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom*

15
16 M. Baber, R. Bainbridge, O. Buchmuller, A. Bundock, D. Burton, S. Casasso, M. Citron, D. Colling, L. Corpe,
17 P. Dauncey, G. Davies, A. De Wit, M. Della Negra, P. Dunne, A. Elwood, D. Futyan, G. Hall, G. Iles, R. Lane,
18 R. Lucas⁶¹, L. Lyons, A.-M. Magnan, S. Malik, L. Mastrolorenzo, J. Nash, A. Nikitenko⁴⁷, J. Pela,
19 B. Penning, M. Pesaresi, D.M. Raymond, A. Richards, A. Rose, C. Seez, A. Tapper, K. Uchida,
20 M. Vazquez Acosta⁶³, T. Virdee¹³, S.C. Zenz

21
22
23 *Imperial College, London, United Kingdom*

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

25
26
27 *Brunel University, Uxbridge, United Kingdom*

28 A. Borzou, K. Call, J. Dittmann, K. Hatakeyama, H. Liu, N. Pastika

29
30
31 *Baylor University, Waco, USA*

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

33
34
35 *The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, USA*

36 D. Arcaro, A. Avetisyan, T. Bose, D. Gastler, D. Rankin, C. Richardson, J. Rohlf, L. Sulak, D. Zou

37
38
39 *Boston University, Boston, USA*

40 J. Alimena, G. Benelli, E. Berry, D. Cutts, A. Ferapontov, A. Garabedian, J. Hakala, U. Heintz, O. Jesus,
41 E. Laird, G. Landsberg, Z. Mao, M. Narain, S. Piperov, S. Sagir, R. Syarif

42
43
44 *Brown University, Providence, USA*

45 R. Breedon, G. Breto, M. Calderon De La Barca Sanchez, S. Chauhan, M. Chertok, J. Conway, R. Conway,
46 P.T. Cox, R. Erbacher, G. Funk, M. Gardner, W. Ko, R. Lander, C. Mclean, M. Mulhearn, D. Pellett, J. Pilot,
47 F. Ricci-Tam, S. Shalhout, J. Smith, M. Squires, D. Stolp, M. Tripathi, S. Wilbur, R. Yohay

48
49
50 *University of California, Davis, Davis, USA*

51 R. Cousins, P. Everaerts, A. Florent, J. Hauser, M. Ignatenko, D. Saltzberg, E. Takasugi, V. Valuev, M. Weber

52
53
54 *University of California, Los Angeles, USA*

55 K. Burt, R. Clare, J. Ellison, J.W. Gary, G. Hanson, J. Heilman, M. Ivova Paneva, P. Jandir, E. Kennedy,
56 F. Lacroix, O.R. Long, M. Malberti, M. Olmedo Negrete, A. Shrinivas, H. Wei, S. Wimpenny, B.R. Yates

57
58
59 *University of California, Riverside, Riverside, USA*

60 J.G. Branson, G.B. Cerati, S. Cittolin, R.T. D'Agnolo, M. Derdzinski, A. Holzner, R. Kelley, D. Klein, J. Letts,
61 I. Macneill, D. Olivito, S. Padhi, M. Pieri, M. Sani, V. Sharma, S. Simon, M. Tadel, A. Vartak,
62 S. Wasserbaech⁶⁴, C. Welke, F. Würthwein, A. Yagil, G. Zevi Della Porta

63
64
65 *University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, USA*

1 J. Bradmiller-Feld, C. Campagnari, A. Dishaw, V. Dutta, K. Flowers, M. Franco Sevilla, P. Geffert, C. George, 66
2 F. Golf, L. Gouskos, J. Gran, J. Incandela, N. Mccoll, S.D. Mullin, J. Richman, D. Stuart, I. Suarez, C. West, 67
3 J. Yoo 68
4 69

5 *University of California, Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, USA* 70
6 71

7 D. Anderson, A. Apresyan, J. Bendavid, A. Bornheim, J. Bunn, Y. Chen, J. Duarte, A. Mott, H.B. Newman, 72
8 C. Pena, M. Spiropulu, J.R. Vlimant, S. Xie, R.Y. Zhu 73
9 74

10 *California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA* 75
11 76

12 M.B. Andrews, V. Azzolini, A. Calamba, B. Carlson, T. Ferguson, M. Paulini, J. Russ, M. Sun, H. Vogel, 77
13 I. Vorobiev 78
14 79

15 *Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, USA* 80
16 81

17 J.P. Cumalat, W.T. Ford, A. Gaz, F. Jensen, A. Johnson, M. Krohn, T. Mulholland, U. Nauenberg, K. Stenson, 82
18 S.R. Wagner 83
19 84

20 *University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, USA* 85
21 86

22 J. Alexander, A. Chatterjee, J. Chaves, J. Chu, S. Dittmer, N. Eggert, N. Mirman, G. Nicolas Kaufman, 87
23 J.R. Patterson, A. Rinkevicius, A. Ryd, L. Skinnari, L. Soffi, W. Sun, S.M. Tan, W.D. Teo, J. Thom, 88
24 J. Thompson, J. Tucker, Y. Weng, P. Wittich 89
25 90

26 *Cornell University, Ithaca, USA* 91
27 92

28 S. Abdullin, M. Albrow, G. Apollinari, S. Banerjee, L.A.T. Bauerdick, A. Beretvas, J. Berryhill, P.C. Bhat, 93
29 G. Bolla, K. Burkett, J.N. Butler, H.W.K. Cheung, F. Chlebana, S. Cihangir, V.D. Elvira, I. Fisk, J. Freeman, 94
30 E. Gottschalk, L. Gray, D. Green, S. Grünendahl, O. Gutsche, J. Hanlon, D. Hare, R.M. Harris, S. Hasegawa, 95
31 J. Hirschauer, Z. Hu, B. Jayatilaka, S. Jindariani, M. Johnson, U. Joshi, B. Klima, B. Kreis, S. Lammel, 96
32 J. Lewis, J. Linacre, D. Lincoln, R. Lipton, T. Liu, R. Lopes De Sá, J. Lykken, K. Maeshima, J.M. Marraffino, 97
33 S. Maruyama, D. Mason, P. McBride, P. Merkel, S. Mrenna, S. Nahn, C. Newman-Holmes[†], V. O'Dell, 98
34 K. Pedro, O. Prokofyev, G. Rakness, E. Sexton-Kennedy, A. Soha, W.J. Spalding, L. Spiegel, S. Stoynev, 99
35 N. Strobbe, L. Taylor, S. Tkaczyk, N.V. Tran, L. Uplegger, E.W. Vaandering, C. Vernieri, M. Verzocchi, 100
36 R. Vidal, M. Wang, H.A. Weber, A. Whitbeck 101
37 102
38 103
39 104

40 *Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, USA* 105
41 106

42 D. Acosta, P. Avery, P. Bortignon, D. Bourilkov, A. Brinkerhoff, A. Carnes, M. Carver, D. Curry, S. Das, 107
43 R.D. Field, I.K. Furic, J. Konigsberg, A. Korytov, K. Kotov, P. Ma, K. Matchev, H. Mei, P. Milenovic⁶⁵, 108
44 G. Mitselmakher, D. Rank, R. Rossin, L. Shchutska, M. Snowball, D. Sperka, N. Terentyev, L. Thomas, 109
45 J. Wang, S. Wang, J. Yelton 110
46 111
47 112

48 *University of Florida, Gainesville, USA* 113
49 114

50 S. Linn, P. Markowitz, G. Martinez, J.L. Rodriguez 115
51 116

52 *Florida International University, Miami, USA* 117
53 118

54 A. Ackert, J.R. Adams, T. Adams, A. Askew, S. Bein, J. Bochenek, B. Diamond, J. Haas, S. Hagopian, 119
55 V. Hagopian, K.F. Johnson, A. Khatiwada, H. Prosper, M. Weinberg 120
56 121

57 *Florida State University, Tallahassee, USA* 122
58 123

59 M.M. Baarmand, V. Bhopatkar, S. Colafranceschi⁶⁶, M. Hohlmann, H. Kalakhety, D. Noonan, T. Roy, 124
60 F. Yumiceva 125
61 126

62 *Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, USA* 127
63 128
64 129
65 130

1 M.R. Adams, L. Apanasevich, D. Berry, R.R. Betts, I. Bucinskaite, R. Cavanaugh, O. Evdokimov, L. Gauthier, 66
 2 C.E. Gerber, D.J. Hofman, P. Kurt, C. O'Brien, I.D. Sandoval Gonzalez, P. Turner, N. Varelas, Z. Wu, 67
 3 M. Zakaria, J. Zhang 68
 4

5 *University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC), Chicago, USA* 69
 6 70

7 B. Bilki⁶⁷, W. Clarida, K. Dilsiz, S. Durgut, R.P. Gandrajula, M. Haytmyradov, V. Khristenko, J.-P. Merlo, 72
 8 H. Mermerkaya⁶⁸, A. Mestvirishvili, A. Moeller, J. Nachtman, H. Ogul, Y. Onel, F. Ozok⁶⁹, A. Penzo, 73
 9 C. Snyder, E. Tiras, J. Wetzel, K. Yi 74
 10 75

11 *The University of Iowa, Iowa City, USA* 76
 12 77

13 I. Anderson, B.A. Barnett, B. Blumenfeld, A. Cocoros, N. Eminizer, D. Fehling, L. Feng, A.V. Gritsan, 78
 14 P. Maksimovic, M. Osherson, J. Roskes, U. Sarica, M. Swartz, M. Xiao, Y. Xin, C. You 79
 15 80

16 *Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA* 81
 17 82

18 P. Baringer, A. Bean, C. Bruner, J. Castle, R.P. Kenny III, A. Kropivnitskaya, D. Majumder, M. Malek, 83
 19 W. Mcbrayer, M. Murray, S. Sanders, R. Stringer, J.D. Tapia Takaki, Q. Wang 84
 20 85

21 *The University of Kansas, Lawrence, USA* 86
 22 87

23 A. Ivanov, K. Kaadze, S. Khalil, M. Makouski, Y. Maravin, A. Mohammadi, L.K. Saini, N. Skhirtladze, 88
 24 S. Toda 89
 25 90

26 *Kansas State University, Manhattan, USA* 91
 27 92

28 D. Lange, F. Rebassoo, D. Wright 93
 29 94

30 *Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, USA* 95
 31 96

32 C. Anelli, A. Baden, O. Baron, A. Belloni, B. Calvert, S.C. Eno, C. Ferraioli, J.A. Gomez, N.J. Hadley, S. Jabeen, 97
 33 R.G. Kellogg, T. Kolberg, J. Kunkle, Y. Lu, A.C. Mignerey, Y.H. Shin, A. Skuja, M.B. Tonjes, S.C. Tonwar 98
 34 99

35 *University of Maryland, College Park, USA* 100
 36 101

37 A. Apyan, R. Barbieri, A. Baty, R. Bi, K. Bierwagen, S. Brandt, W. Busza, I.A. Cali, Z. Demiragli, 102
 38 L. Di Matteo, G. Gomez Ceballos, M. Goncharov, D. Gulhan, Y. Iiyama, G.M. Innocenti, M. Klute, 103
 39 D. Kovalskyi, K. Krajczar, Y.S. Lai, Y.-J. Lee, A. Levin, P.D. Luckey, A.C. Marini, C. McGinn, C. Mironov, 104
 40 S. Narayanan, X. Niu, C. Paus, C. Roland, G. Roland, J. Salfeld-Nebgen, G.S.F. Stephans, K. Sumorok, 105
 41 K. Tatar, M. Varma, D. Velicanu, J. Veverka, J. Wang, T.W. Wang, B. Wyslouch, M. Yang, V. Zhukova 106
 42 107
 43 108

44 *Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, USA* 109
 45 110

46 A.C. Benvenuti, B. Dahmes, A. Evans, A. Finkel, A. Gude, P. Hansen, S. Kalafut, S.C. Kao, K. Klapoetke, 111
 47 Y. Kubota, Z. Lesko, J. Mans, S. Nourbakhsh, N. Ruckstuhl, R. Rusack, N. Tambe, J. Turkewitz 112
 48 113

49 *University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, USA* 114
 50 115

51 J.G. Acosta, S. Oliveros 116
 52 117

53 *University of Mississippi, Oxford, USA* 118
 54 119

55 E. Avdeeva, R. Bartek, K. Bloom, S. Bose, D.R. Claes, A. Dominguez, C. Fangmeier, R. Gonzalez Suarez, 120
 56 R. Kamalieddin, D. Knowlton, I. Kravchenko, F. Meier, J. Monroy, F. Ratnikov, J.E. Siado, G.R. Snow, 121
 57 B. Stieger 122
 58 123

59 *University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, USA* 124
 60 125

61 M. Alyari, J. Dolen, J. George, A. Godshalk, C. Harrington, I. Iashvili, J. Kaisen, A. Kharchilava, A. Kumar, 126
 62 A. Parker, S. Rappoccio, B. Roobahani 127
 63 128

64 *State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, USA* 129
 65 130

1 G. Alverson, E. Barberis, D. Baumgartel, M. Chasco, A. Hortiangtham, A. Massironi, D.M. Morse, D. Nash, 66
 2 T. Orimoto, R. Teixeira De Lima, D. Trocino, R.-J. Wang, D. Wood, J. Zhang 67

3 *Northeastern University, Boston, USA* 68
 4 69

5 S. Bhattacharya, K.A. Hahn, A. Kubik, J.F. Low, N. Mucia, N. Odell, B. Pollack, M.H. Schmitt, K. Sung, 70
 6 M. Trovato, M. Velasco 71
 7 72

8 *Northwestern University, Evanston, USA* 73
 9 74
 10 75

11 N. Dev, M. Hildreth, C. Jessop, D.J. Karmgard, N. Kellams, K. Lannon, N. Marinelli, F. Meng, C. Mueller, 76
 12 Y. Musienko³⁸, M. Planer, A. Reinsvold, R. Ruchti, N. Rupprecht, G. Smith, S. Taroni, N. Valls, M. Wayne, 77
 13 M. Wolf, A. Woodard 78
 14 79

15 *University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, USA* 80
 16 81

17 L. Antonelli, J. Brinson, B. Bylsma, L.S. Durkin, S. Flowers, A. Hart, C. Hill, R. Hughes, W. Ji, T.Y. Ling, 82
 18 B. Liu, W. Luo, D. Puigh, M. Rodenburg, B.L. Winer, H.W. Wulsin 83
 19 84

20 *The Ohio State University, Columbus, USA* 85
 21 86

22 O. Driga, P. Elmer, J. Hardenbrook, P. Hebda, S.A. Koay, P. Lujan, D. Marlow, T. Medvedeva, M. Mooney, 87
 23 J. Olsen, C. Palmer, P. Piroué, D. Stickland, C. Tully, A. Zuranski 88
 24 89

25 *Princeton University, Princeton, USA* 90
 26 91

27 S. Malik 92
 28 93

29 *University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez, USA* 94
 30 95

31 A. Barker, V.E. Barnes, D. Benedetti, D. Bortoletto, L. Gutay, M.K. Jha, M. Jones, A.W. Jung, K. Jung, 96
 32 D.H. Miller, N. Neumeister, B.C. Radburn-Smith, X. Shi, I. Shipsey, D. Silvers, J. Sun, A. Svyatkovskiy, 97
 33 F. Wang, W. Xie, L. Xu 98
 34 99

35 *Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA* 100
 36 101

37 N. Parashar, J. Stupak 102
 38 103

39 *Purdue University Calumet, Hammond, USA* 104
 40 105

41 A. Adair, B. Akgun, Z. Chen, K.M. Ecklund, F.J.M. Geurts, M. Guilbaud, W. Li, B. Michlin, M. Northup, 106
 42 B.P. Padley, R. Redjimi, J. Roberts, J. Rorie, Z. Tu, J. Zabel 107
 43 108

44 *Rice University, Houston, USA* 109
 45 110

46 B. Betchart, A. Bodek, P. de Barbaro, R. Demina, Y. Eshaq, T. Ferbel, M. Galanti, A. Garcia-Bellido, J. Han, 111
 47 O. Hindrichs, A. Khukhunaishvili, K.H. Lo, P. Tan, M. Verzetti 112
 48 113

49 *University of Rochester, Rochester, USA* 114
 50 115

51 J.P. Chou, E. Contreras-Campana, D. Ferencek, Y. Gershtein, E. Halkiadakis, M. Heindl, D. Hidas, 116
 52 E. Hughes, S. Kaplan, R. Kunnawalkam Elayavalli, A. Lath, K. Nash, H. Saka, S. Salur, S. Schnetzer, 117
 53 D. Sheffield, S. Somalwar, R. Stone, S. Thomas, P. Thomassen, M. Walker 118
 54 119

55 *Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, Piscataway, USA* 120
 56 121

57 M. Foerster, J. Heideman, G. Riley, K. Rose, S. Spanier, K. Thapa 122
 58 123

59 *University of Tennessee, Knoxville, USA* 124
 60 125

61 O. Bouhali⁷⁰, A. Castaneda Hernandez⁷⁰, A. Celik, M. Dalchenko, M. De Mattia, A. Delgado, S. Dildick, 126
 62 R. Eusebi, J. Gilmore, T. Huang, T. Kamon⁷¹, V. Krutelyov, R. Mueller, I. Osipenkov, Y. Pakhotin, R. Patel, 127
 63 128
 64 129
 65 130

1 A. Perloff, D. Rathjens, A. Rose, A. Safonov, A. Tatarinov, K.A. Ulmer

2 *Texas A&M University, College Station, USA*

3
4 N. Akchurin, C. Cowden, J. Damgov, C. Dragoiu, P.R. Duderov, J. Faulkner, S. Kunori, K. Lamichhane,
5 S.W. Lee, T. Libeiro, S. Undleeb, I. Volobouev, Z. Wang

6
7 *Texas Tech University, Lubbock, USA*

8
9 E. Appelt, A.G. Delannoy, S. Greene, A. Gurrola, R. Janjam, W. Johns, C. Maguire, Y. Mao, A. Melo, H. Ni,
10 P. Sheldon, S. Tuo, J. Velkovska, Q. Xu

11
12 *Vanderbilt University, Nashville, USA*

13
14 M.W. Arenton, P. Barria, B. Cox, B. Francis, J. Goodell, R. Hirosky, A. Ledovskoy, H. Li, C. Neu,
15 T. Sinthuprasith, X. Sun, Y. Wang, E. Wolfe, J. Wood, F. Xia

16
17 *University of Virginia, Charlottesville, USA*

18
19 C. Clarke, R. Harr, P.E. Karchin, C. Kottachchi Kankanamge Don, P. Lamichhane, J. Sturdy

20
21 *Wayne State University, Detroit, USA*

22
23 D.A. Belknap, D. Carlsmith, S. Dasu, L. Dodd, S. Duric, B. Gomber, M. Grothe, M. Herndon, A. Hervé,
24 P. Klabbers, A. Lanaro, A. Levine, K. Long, R. Loveless, A. Mohapatra, I. Ojalvo, T. Perry, G.A. Pierro,
25 G. Polese, T. Ruggles, T. Sarangi, A. Savin, A. Sharma, N. Smith, W.H. Smith, D. Taylor, P. Verwilligen,
26 N. Woods

27
28
29 *University of Wisconsin – Madison, Madison, WI, USA*

30
31 † Deceased.

32 1 Also at Vienna University of Technology, Vienna, Austria.

33 2 Also at State Key Laboratory of Nuclear Physics and Technology, Peking University, Beijing, China.

34 3 Also at Institut Pluridisciplinaire Hubert Curien, Université de Strasbourg, Université de Haute Alsace Mulhouse, CNRS/IN2P3, Strasbourg, France.

35 4 Also at Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, Brazil.

36 5 Also at Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS) – IN2P3, Paris, France.

37 6 Also at Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium.

38 7 Also at Laboratoire Leprince-Ringuet, Ecole Polytechnique, IN2P3-CNRS, Palaiseau, France.

39 8 Also at Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia.

40 9 Now at British University in Egypt, Cairo, Egypt.

41 10 Also at Zewail City of Science and Technology, Zewail, Egypt.

42 11 Now at Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt.

43 12 Also at Université de Haute Alsace, Mulhouse, France.

44 13 Also at CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland.

45 14 Also at Skobeltsyn Institute of Nuclear Physics, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia.

46 15 Also at Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia.

47 16 Also at Ilia State University, Tbilisi, Georgia.

48 17 Also at RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut A, Aachen, Germany.

49 18 Also at University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany.

50 19 Also at Brandenburg University of Technology, Cottbus, Germany.

51 20 Also at Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary.

52 21 Also at MTA-ELTE Lendület CMS Particle and Nuclear Physics Group, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary.

53 22 Also at University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary.

54 23 Also at Indian Institute of Science Education and Research, Bhopal, India.

55 24 Also at University of Visva-Bharati, Santiniketan, India.

56 25 Now at King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia.

57 26 Also at University of Ruhuna, Matara, Sri Lanka.

58 27 Also at Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, Iran.

59 28 Also at University of Tehran, Department of Engineering Science, Tehran, Iran.

60 29 Also at Plasma Physics Research Center, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.

61 30 Also at Laboratori Nazionali di Legnaro dell'INFN, Legnaro, Italy.

62 31 Also at Università degli Studi di Siena, Siena, Italy.

63 32 Also at Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA.

64 33 Now at Hanyang University, Seoul, Korea.

65 34 Also at International Islamic University of Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

35 Also at Malaysian Nuclear Agency, MOSTI, Kajang, Malaysia.

36 Also at Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología, Mexico city, Mexico.

1	37	Also at Warsaw University of Technology, Institute of Electronic Systems, Warsaw, Poland.	66
2	38	Also at Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia.	67
3	39	Now at National Research Nuclear University 'Moscow Engineering Physics Institute' (MEPhI), Moscow, Russia.	68
4	40	Also at St. Petersburg State Polytechnical University, St. Petersburg, Russia.	69
5	41	Also at Faculty of Physics, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia.	70
6	42	Also at INFN Sezione di Roma; Università di Roma, Roma, Italy.	71
7	43	Also at National Technical University of Athens, Athens, Greece.	72
8	44	Also at Scuola Normale e Sezione dell'INFN, Pisa, Italy.	73
9	45	Also at National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece.	74
10	46	Also at Riga Technical University, Riga, Latvia.	75
11	47	Also at Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia.	76
12	48	Also at Albert Einstein Center for Fundamental Physics, Bern, Switzerland.	77
13	49	Also at Gaziosmanpasa University, Tokat, Turkey.	78
14	50	Also at Adiyaman University, Adiyaman, Turkey.	79
15	51	Also at Mersin University, Mersin, Turkey.	80
16	52	Also at Cag University, Mersin, Turkey.	81
17	53	Also at Piri Reis University, Istanbul, Turkey.	82
18	54	Also at Ozyegin University, Istanbul, Turkey.	83
19	55	Also at Izmir Institute of Technology, Izmir, Turkey.	84
20	56	Also at Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey.	85
21	57	Also at Kafkas University, Kars, Turkey.	86
22	58	Also at Istanbul Bilgi University, Istanbul, Turkey.	87
23	59	Also at Yildiz Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey.	88
24	60	Also at Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.	89
25	61	Also at Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom.	90
26	62	Also at School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southampton, Southampton, United Kingdom.	91
27	63	Also at Instituto de Astrofísica de Canarias, La Laguna, Spain.	92
28	64	Also at Utah Valley University, Orem, USA.	93
29	65	Also at University of Belgrade, Faculty of Physics and Vinca Institute of Nuclear Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia.	94
30	66	Also at Facoltà Ingegneria, Università di Roma, Roma, Italy.	95
31	67	Also at Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, USA.	96
32	68	Also at Erzincan University, Erzincan, Turkey.	97
33	69	Also at Mimar Sinan University, Istanbul, Istanbul, Turkey.	98
34	70	Also at Texas A&M University at Qatar, Doha, Qatar.	99
35	71	Also at Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea.	100
36			101
37			102
38			103
39			104
40			105
41			106
42			107
43			108
44			109
45			110
46			111
47			112
48			113
49			114
50			115
51			116
52			117
53			118
54			119
55			120
56			121
57			122
58			123
59			124
60			125
61			126
62			127
63			128
64			129
65			130