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1. Introduction

Inclusive charged-particle distributions have been measured in $pp$ and $p\bar{p}$ collisions at a range of different centre-of-mass energies [1–13]. Many of these measurements have been used to constrain phenomenological models of soft-hadronic interactions and to predict properties at higher centre-of-mass energies. Most of the previous charged-particle multiplicity measurements were obtained by selecting data with a double-arm coincidence trigger, thus removing large fractions of diffractive events. The data were then further corrected to remove the remaining single-diffractive component. This selection is referred to as non-single-diffractive (NSD). In some cases, designated as inelastic non-diffractive, the residual double-diffractive component was also subtracted. The selection of NSD or inelastic non-diffractive charged-particle spectra involves model-dependent corrections for the diffractive components and for effects of the trigger selection on events with no charged particles within the acceptance of the detector. The measurement presented in this Letter implements a different strategy, which uses a single-arm trigger overlapping with the acceptance of the tracking volume. Results are presented as inclusive-inelastic distributions, with minimal model-dependence, by requiring one charged particle within the acceptance of the measurement.

This Letter reports on a measurement of primary charged particles with a momentum component transverse to the beam direction $p_T > 500$ MeV and in the pseudorapidity range $|\eta| < 2.5$. Primary charged particles are defined as charged particles with a mean lifetime $\tau > 0.3 \times 10^{-10}$ s directly produced in $pp$ interactions or from subsequent decays of particles with a shorter lifetime. The distributions of tracks reconstructed in the ATLAS inner detector were corrected to obtain the particle-level distributions:

$$\frac{1}{N_{ev}} \frac{dN_{ch}}{d\eta}, \frac{1}{N_{ev}} \frac{1}{2\pi p_T} \frac{d^2N_{ch}}{dp_T d\eta}, \frac{1}{N_{ev}} \frac{dN_{ev}}{dn_{ch}}$$

and $\langle p_T \rangle$ vs. $n_{ch}$.

where $N_{ev}$ is the number of events with at least one charged particle inside the selected kinematic range, $N_{ch}$ is the total number of charged particles, $n_{ch}$ is the number of charged particles in an event and $\langle p_T \rangle$ is the average $p_T$ for a given number of charged particles.

© CERN, for the benefit of the ATLAS Collaboration.
Comparisons are made to previous measurements of charged-particle multiplicities in $pp$ and $p\bar{p}$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 900$ GeV centre-of-mass energies [1,5] and to Monte Carlo (MC) models.

2. The ATLAS detector

The ATLAS detector [14] at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) [15] covers almost the whole solid angle around the collision point with layers of tracking detectors, calorimeters and muon chambers. It has been designed to study a wide range of physics topics at LHC energies. For the measurements presented in this Letter, the tracking devices and the trigger system were of particular importance.

The ATLAS inner detector has full coverage in $\phi$ and covers the pseudorapidity range $|\eta| < 2.5$. It consists of a silicon pixel detector (Pixel), a silicon microstrip detector (SCT) and a transition radiation tracker (TRT). These detectors cover a sensitive radial distance from the interaction point of 50.5–150 mm, 299–560 mm and 563–1066 mm, respectively, and are immersed in a 2 T axial magnetic field. The inner-detector barrel (end-cap) parts consist of 3 (2 × 3) Pixel layers, 4 (2 × 9) double-layers of single-sided silicon microstrips with a 40 mrad stereo angle, and 73 (2 × 160) layers of TRT straws. These detectors have position resolutions of typically 10, 17 and 130 μm for the $R$–$\phi$ co-ordinate and, in case of the Pixel and SCT, 115 and 580 μm for the second measured co-ordinate. A track from a particle traversing the barrel detector would typically have 11 silicon hits (3 pixel clusters and 8 strip clusters), and more than 30 straw hits.

The ATLAS detector has a three-level trigger system: Level 1 (L1), Level 2 (L2) and Event Filter (EF). For this measurement, the trigger relies on the L1 signals from the Beam Pickup Timing devices (BPTX) and the Minimum Bias Trigger Scintillators (MBTS). The BPTX are composed of beam pick-ups attached to the beam pipe ±175 m from the centre of the ATLAS detector. The MBTS are mounted at each end of the detector in front of the liquid-argon end-cap calorimeter cryostats at $z = ±3.56$ m and are segmented into eight sectors in azimuth and two rings in pseudorapidity ($2.09 < |\eta| < 2.82$ and $2.82 < |\eta| < 3.84$). Data were collected for this analysis using the MBTS trigger, formed from BPTX and MBTS trigger signals. The MBTS trigger was configured to require one hit above threshold from either side of the detector. The efficiency of this trigger was studied with a separate prescaled L1 BPTX trigger, filtered to obtain inelastic interactions by inner detector requirements at L2 and EF.

3. Monte Carlo simulation

Low-$p_T$ scattering processes may be described by lowest-order perturbative Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD) two-to-two parton scatterers, where the divergence of the cross section at $p_T = 0$ is regulated by phenomenological models. These models include multiple-parton scattering, partonic-matter distributions, scattering between the unresolved protons and colour reconnection [16]. The PYTHIA [17] MC event generator implements several of these models. The parameters of these models have been tuned to describe charged-hadron production and the underlying event in $pp$ and $p\bar{p}$ data at centre-of-mass energies between 200 GeV and 1.96 TeV.

Samples of ten million MC events were produced for single-diffractive, double-diffractive and non-diffractive processes using the PYTHIA 6.4.21 generator. A specific set of optimised parameters, the ATLAS MC09 PYTHIA tune [18], which employs the MRST LO* parton density functions [19] and the $p_T$-ordered parton shower, is the reference tune throughout this Letter. These parameters were derived by tuning to underlying event and minimum-bias data from Tevatron at 630 GeV and 1.8 TeV. The MC samples generated with this tune were used to determine detector acceptances and efficiencies and to correct the data.

For the purpose of comparing the present measurement to different phenomenological models describing minimum-bias events, the following additional MC samples were generated: the ATLAS MC09c [18] PYTHIA tune, which is an extension of the ATLAS MC09 tune optimising the strength of the colour reconnection to describe the $(p_T)$ distributions as a function of $n_{ch}$, as measured by CDF in $p\bar{p}$ collisions [3]; the Perugia010 [20] PYTHIA tune, in which the soft-QCD part is tuned using only minimum-bias data from the Tevatron and CERN $p\bar{p}$ colliders; the DW [21] PYTHIA tune, which uses the virtuality-ordered showers and was derived to describe the CDF Run II underlying event and Drell–Yan data. Finally, the PHOJET generator [22] was used as an alternative model. It describes low-$p_T$ physics using the two-component Dual Parton Model [23,24], which includes soft hadronic processes described by Pomeron exchange and semi-hard processes described by perturbative parton scattering. PHOJET relies on PYTHIA for the fragmentation of partons. The versions used for this study were shown to agree with previous measurements [3,5,6,9].

The non-diffractive, single-diffractive and double-diffractive contributions in the generated samples were mixed according to the generator cross sections to fully describe the inelastic scattering. All the events were processed through the ATLAS detector simulation program [25], which is based on Geant4 [26]. They were then reconstructed and analysed by the same program chain used for the

4. Event selection

All data recorded during the stable LHC running periods between December 6 and 15, 2009, in which the inner detector was fully operational and the solenoid magnet was on, were used for this analysis. During this period the beams were colliding head-on in ATLAS. A total of 455,593 events were collected from colliding proton bunches in which the MBTS trigger recorded one or more counters above threshold on either side. In order to perform an inclusive-inelastic measurement, no further requirements beyond the MBTS trigger and inner detector information were applied in this event selection. The integrated luminosity for the final event sample, which is given here for reference only, was estimated using a sample of events with energy deposits in both sides of the forward and end-cap calorimeters. The MC-based efficiency and the PYTHIA default cross section of 52.5 mb were then used to determine the luminosity of the data sample to be approximately $9 \mu b^{-1}$, while the maximum instantaneous luminosity was approximately $5 \times 10^{26} \mathrm{cm}^{-2} \mathrm{s}^{-1}$. The probability of additional interactions in the same bunch crossing was estimated to be less than 0.1%.

2 PHOJET 1.12 with PYTHIA 6.4.21.
Fig. 1. Comparison between data (dots) and minimum-bias ATLAS MC09 simulation (histograms) for the average number of Pixel hits (a) and SCT hits (b) per track as a function of $\eta$, and the transverse (c) and longitudinal (d) impact parameter distributions of the reconstructed tracks. The MC distributions in (c) and (d) are normalised to the number of tracks in the data. The inserts in the lower panels show the distributions in logarithmic scale.

During this data-taking period, more than 96% of the Pixel detector, 99% of the SCT and 98% of the TRT were operational. Tracks were reconstructed offline within the full acceptance range $|\eta| < 2.5$ of the inner detector [27,28]. Track candidates were reconstructed by requiring seven or more silicon hits in total in the Pixel and SCT, and then extrapolated to include measurements in the TRT. Typically, 88% of tracks inside the TRT acceptance ($|\eta| < 2$) include a TRT extension, which significantly improves the momentum resolution.

This Letter reports results for charged particles with $p_T > 500$ MeV, which are less prone than lower-$p_T$ particles to large inefficiencies and their associated systematic uncertainties resulting from interactions with material inside the tracking volume. To reduce the contribution from background events and non-primary tracks, as well as to minimise the systematic uncertainties, the following criteria were required:

- the presence of a primary vertex [29] reconstructed using at least three tracks, each with:
  - $p_T > 150$ MeV,
  - a transverse distance of closest approach with respect to the beam-spot position $|d_{BS}^{0}| < 4$ mm;
- at least one track with:
  - $p_T > 500$ MeV,
  - a minimum of one Pixel and six SCT hits,
  - transverse and longitudinal impact parameters calculated with respect to the event primary vertex $|d_0| < 1.5$ mm and $|z_0| \cdot \sin \theta < 1.5$ mm, respectively.

These latter tracks were used to produce the corrected distributions and will be referred to as selected tracks. The multiplicity of selected tracks within an event is denoted by $n_{Sel}$. In total 326,201 events were kept after this offline selection, which contained 1,863,622 selected tracks. The inner detector performance is illustrated in Fig. 1 using selected tracks and their MC simulation. The shapes from overlapping Pixel and SCT modules in the forward region and the inefficiency from a small number of disabled Pixel modules in the central region are well modelled by the simulation. The simulated impact-parameter distributions describe the data to better than 10%, including their tails as shown in the inserts of Fig. 1(c) and (d). The difference between data and MC observed in the central region of the $d_0$ distribution is due to small residual misalignments not simulated in the MC, which are found to be unimportant for this analysis.

Trigger and vertex-reconstruction efficiencies were parameterized as a function of the number of tracks passing all of the track selection requirements except for the constraints with respect to the primary vertex. Instead, the transverse impact parameter with respect to the beam spot was required to be less than 4 mm, which is the same requirement as that used in the primary vertex reconstruction preselection. The multiplicity of these tracks in an event is denoted by $n_{BS}^{Sel}$. 
5. Background contribution

There are two possible sources of background events that can contaminate the selected sample: cosmic rays and beam-induced background. A limit on the fraction of cosmic-ray events recorded by the L1 MBTS trigger during data taking was determined from cosmic-ray studies, the maximum number of proton bunches, and the central trigger processor clock width of 25 ns, and was found to be smaller than $10^{-6}$. Beam-induced background events can be produced by proton collisions with upstream collimators or with residual particles inside the beam pipe. The L1 MBTS trigger was used to select beam-induced background events from un-paired proton bunch-crossings. By applying the analysis selection criteria to these events, an upper limit of $10^{-4}$ was determined for the fraction of beam-induced background events within the selected sample. The requirement of a reconstructed primary vertex is particularly useful to suppress the beam-induced background.

Primary charged-particle multiplicities are measured from selected-track distributions after correcting for the fraction of secondary particles in the sample. The potential background from fake tracks is found to be less than 0.1% from simulation studies. Non-primary events within the selected sample. The requirement of a reconstructed primary vertex is particularly useful to suppress the beam-induced background. Beam-induced background events can be produced by proton collisions with upstream collimators or with residual particles inside the beam pipe. The L1 MBTS trigger was used to select beam-induced background events from un-paired proton bunch-crossings. By applying the analysis selection criteria to these events, an upper limit of $10^{-4}$ was determined for the fraction of beam-induced background events within the selected sample. The requirement of a reconstructed primary vertex is particularly useful to suppress the beam-induced background.

Primary charged-particle multiplicities are measured from selected-track distributions after correcting for the fraction of secondary particles in the sample. The potential background from fake tracks is found to be less than 0.1% from simulation studies. Non-primary events within the selected sample. The requirement of a reconstructed primary vertex is particularly useful to suppress the beam-induced background. Beam-induced background events can be produced by proton collisions with upstream collimators or with residual particles inside the beam pipe. The L1 MBTS trigger was used to select beam-induced background events from un-paired proton bunch-crossings. By applying the analysis selection criteria to these events, an upper limit of $10^{-4}$ was determined for the fraction of beam-induced background events within the selected sample. The requirement of a reconstructed primary vertex is particularly useful to suppress the beam-induced background.

Primary charged-particle multiplicities are measured from selected-track distributions after correcting for the fraction of secondary particles in the sample. The potential background from fake tracks is found to be less than 0.1% from simulation studies. Non-primary events within the selected sample. The requirement of a reconstructed primary vertex is particularly useful to suppress the beam-induced background. Beam-induced background events can be produced by proton collisions with upstream collimators or with residual particles inside the beam pipe. The L1 MBTS trigger was used to select beam-induced background events from un-paired proton bunch-crossings. By applying the analysis selection criteria to these events, an upper limit of $10^{-4}$ was determined for the fraction of beam-induced background events within the selected sample. The requirement of a reconstructed primary vertex is particularly useful to suppress the beam-induced background.

6. Selection efficiency

The data were corrected to obtain inclusive spectra for charged primary particles satisfying the event-level requirement of at least one primary charged particle with $p_T > 500$ MeV and $|\eta| < 2.5$. These corrections include inefficiencies due to trigger selection, vertex and track reconstruction. They also account for effects due to the momentum scale and resolution, and for the residual background from secondary tracks.

**Trigger efficiency** The trigger efficiency was measured from an independent data sample selected using the control trigger introduced in Section 2. This control trigger required more than 6 Pixel clusters and 6 SCT hits at L2, and one or more reconstructed tracks with $p_T > 200$ MeV at the EF. The vertex requirement for selected tracks was removed for this study, to avoid correlations between the trigger and vertex-reconstruction efficiencies for L1 MBTS triggered events. The trigger efficiency was determined by taking the ratio of events from the control trigger in which the L1 MBTS also accepted the event, over the total number of events in the control sample. The result is shown in Fig. 2(a) as a function of $n_{\text{BS}}^{\text{sel}}$. The trigger efficiency is nearly 100% everywhere and the requirement of this trigger does not affect the $p_T$ and $|\eta|$ track distributions of the selected events.

**Vertex-reconstruction efficiency** The vertex-reconstruction efficiency was determined from the data, by taking the ratio of triggered events with a reconstructed vertex to the total number of triggered events. It is shown in Fig. 2(b) as a function of $n_{\text{BS}}^{\text{sel}}$. The efficiency amounts to approximately 67% for the lowest bin and rapidly rises to 100% with higher multiplicities. The dependence of the vertex-reconstruction efficiency on $|\eta|$ and $p_T$ of the selected tracks was studied. The $|\eta|$ dependence was found to be approximately flat for $n_{\text{BS}}^{\text{Sel}} > 1$ and to decrease at larger $|\eta|$ for events with $n_{\text{BS}}^{\text{Sel}} = 1$. This dependence was corrected for. No dependence on $p_T$ was observed.

**Track-reconstruction efficiency** The track-reconstruction efficiency in each bin of the $p_T$–$|\eta|$ acceptance was determined from MC. The comparison of the MC and data distributions shown in Fig. 1 highlights their agreement. The track-reconstruction efficiency was defined as:

$$\epsilon_{\text{bin}}(p_T, |\eta|) = \frac{N_{\text{rec}}^{\text{matched}}(p_T, |\eta|)}{N_{\text{gen}}(p_T, |\eta|)}.$$ 

where $p_T$ and $|\eta|$ are generated quantities, and $N_{\text{rec}}^{\text{matched}}(p_T, |\eta|)$ and $N_{\text{gen}}(p_T, |\eta|)$ are the number of reconstructed tracks in a given bin matched to a generated charged particle and the number of generated charged particles in that bin, respectively. The matching between a generated particle and a reconstructed track was done using a cone-matching algorithm in the $|\eta|$–$\phi$ plane, associating the particle to the track with the smallest $\Delta R = \sqrt{(\Delta \phi)^2 + (\Delta |\eta|)^2}$ within a cone of radius 0.05. The resulting reconstruction efficiency as a function of $p_T$ integrated over $|\eta|$ is shown in Fig. 2(c). The drop to $\approx 70\%$ for $p_T < 600$ MeV is an artefact of the $p_T$ cut at the pattern-recognition level and is discussed in Section 8. The reduced track-reconstruction efficiency in the region $|\eta| > 1$ (Fig. 2(d)) is mainly due to the presence of more material in this region. These inefficiencies include a 5% loss due to the track selection used in this analysis, approximately half of which is due to the silicon-hit requirements and half to the impact-parameter requirements.

7. Correction procedure

The effect of events lost due to the trigger and vertex requirements can be corrected for using an event-by-event weight:

$$w_{\text{ev}}(n_{\text{BS}}^{\text{Sel}}) = \frac{1}{\epsilon_{\text{trig}}(n_{\text{BS}}^{\text{Sel}}) \cdot \epsilon_{\text{vtx}}(n_{\text{BS}}^{\text{Sel}})}.$$ 

where $\epsilon_{\text{trig}}(n_{\text{BS}}^{\text{Sel}})$ and $\epsilon_{\text{vtx}}(n_{\text{BS}}^{\text{Sel}})$ are the trigger and vertex reconstruction efficiencies discussed in Section 6. The vertex-reconstruction efficiency for events with $n_{\text{BS}}^{\text{Sel}} = 1$ includes an $|\eta|$-dependent correction which was derived from the data.
Fig. 2. Trigger (a) and vertex-reconstruction (b) efficiencies as a function of the variable $n_{BS}^{\text{Sel}}$ defined in Section 4; track-reconstruction efficiency as a function of $p_T$ (c) and of $\eta$ (d). The vertical bars represent the statistical uncertainty, while the shaded areas represent the statistical and systematic uncertainties added in quadrature. The two bottom panels were derived from the PYTHIA ATLAS MC09 sample.

The $p_T$ and $\eta$ distributions of selected tracks were corrected on a track-by-track basis using the weight:

$$w_{\text{trk}}(p_T, \eta) = \frac{1}{\epsilon_{\text{bin}}(p_T, \eta)} \cdot (1 - f_{\text{sec}}(p_T)) \cdot (1 - f_{\text{okr}}(p_T, \eta)),$$

where $\epsilon_{\text{bin}}$ is the track-reconstruction efficiency described in Section 6 and $f_{\text{sec}}(p_T)$ is the fraction of secondaries determined as described in Section 5. The fraction of selected tracks for which the corresponding primary particles are outside the kinematic range, $f_{\text{okr}}(p_T, \eta)$, originates from resolution effects and has been estimated from MC. Bin migrations were found to be due solely to reconstructed track momentum resolution and were corrected by using the resolution function taken from MC.

In the case of the distributions versus $n_{\text{ch}}$, a track-level correction was applied by using Bayesian unfolding [30] to correct back to the number of charged particles. A matrix $M_{\text{ch, Sel}}$, which expresses the probability that a multiplicity of selected tracks $n_{\text{Sel}}$ is due to $n_{\text{ch}}$ particles, was populated using MC and applied to obtain the $n_{\text{ch}}$ distribution from the data. The resulting distribution was then used to re-populate the matrix and the correction was re-applied. This procedure was repeated without a regularisation term and converged after four iterations, when the change in the distribution between iterations was found to be less than 1%. It should be noted that the matrix cannot correct for events which are lost due to track-reconstruction inefficiency. To correct for these missing events, a correction factor $1/(1 - (1 - \epsilon(n_{\text{ch}}))^n_{\text{ch}})$ was applied, where $\epsilon(n_{\text{ch}})$ is the average track-reconstruction efficiency.

In the case of the $(p_T)$ versus $n_{\text{ch}}$ distribution, each event was weighted by $w_{\text{ev}}(n_{\text{BS}}^{\text{Sel}})$. For each $n_{\text{Sel}}$ a MC-based correction was applied to convert the reconstructed average $p_T$ to the average $p_T$ of primary charged particles. Then the matrix $M_{\text{ch, Sel}}$ was applied as described above.

8. Systematic uncertainties

Numerous detailed studies have been performed to understand possible sources of systematic uncertainties. The main contributions are discussed below.
Trigger

The trigger selection dependence on the $p_T$ and $\eta$ distributions of reconstructed tracks was found to be flat within the statistical uncertainties of the data recorded with the control trigger. The statistical uncertainty on this result was taken as a systematic uncertainty of 0.1% on the overall trigger efficiency.

Since there is no vertex requirement in the data sample used to measure the trigger efficiency, it is not possible to make the same impact-parameter cuts as are made on the final selected tracks. Therefore the trigger efficiency was measured using impact-parameter constraints with respect to the primary vertex or the beam spot and compared to that obtained without such a requirement. The difference was taken as a systematic uncertainty of 0.1% for $n_{\text{Sel}}^0 \leq 3$.

The correlation of the MBTS trigger with the control trigger used to select the data sample for the trigger-efficiency determination was studied using the simulation. The resulting systematic uncertainty was found to affect only the case $n_{\text{Sel}}^0 = 1$ and amounts to 0.2%.

Vertex reconstruction

The run-to-run variation of the vertex-reconstruction efficiency was found to be within the statistical uncertainty. The contribution of beam-related backgrounds to the sample selected without a vertex requirement was estimated by using non-colliding bunches. It was found to be 0.3% for $n_{\text{Sel}}^0 = 1$ and smaller than 0.1% for higher multiplicities, and was assigned as a systematic uncertainty. This background contribution is larger than that given in Section 5, since a reconstructed primary vertex was not required for these events.

Track reconstruction and selection

Since the track-reconstruction efficiency is determined from MC, the main systematic uncertainty results from the level of disagreement between data and MC.

Three different techniques to associate generated particles to reconstructed tracks were studied: a cone-matching algorithm, an evaluation of the fraction of simulated hits associated to a reconstructed track and an inclusive technique using a correction for secondary particles. A systematic uncertainty of 0.5% was assigned from the difference between the cone-matching and the hit-association methods.

A detailed comparison of track properties in data and simulation was performed by varying the track-selection criteria. The largest deviations between data and MC were observed by varying the $z_0 \cdot \sin \theta$ selection requirement, and by varying the constraint on the number of SCT hits. These deviations are generally smaller than 1% and rise to 3% at the edges of the $\eta$ range.

The systematic effects of misalignment were studied by smearing simulation samples by the expected residual misalignment and by comparing the performance of two alignment algorithms on tracks reconstructed from the data. Under these conditions the number of reconstructed tracks was measured and the systematic uncertainty on the track reconstruction efficiency due to the residual misalignment was estimated to be less than 1%.

To test the influence of an imperfect description of the detector material in the simulation, two additional MC samples with approximately 10% and 20% increase in radiation lengths of the material in the Pixel and SCT active volume were used. The impact of excess material in the tracking detectors was studied using the tails of the impact-parameter distribution, the length of tracks, and the change in the reconstructed $K_S^0$ mass as a function of the decay radius, the direction and the momentum of the $K_S^0$. The MC with nominal material was found to describe the data best. The data were found to be consistent with a 10% material increase in some regions, whereas the 20% increase was excluded in all cases. The efficiency of matching full tracks to track segments reconstructed in the Pixel detector was also studied. The comparison between data and simulation was found to have good agreement across most of the kinematic range. Some discrepancies found for $|\eta| > 1.6$ were included in the systematic uncertainties. From all these studies a systematic uncertainty on the track reconstruction efficiency of 3.7%, 5.5% and 8% was assigned to the pseudorapidity regions $|\eta| < 1.6$, 1.6 $< |\eta| < 2.3$ and $|\eta| > 2.3$, respectively.

The track-reconstruction efficiency shown in Fig. 2(c) rises sharply in the region $500 < p_T < 600$ MeV. The observed turn-on curve is produced by the initial pattern recognition step of track reconstruction and its associated $p_T$ resolution, which is considerably worse than the final $p_T$ resolution. The consequence is that some particles which are simulated with $p_T > 500$ MeV are reconstructed with momenta below the selection requirement. This effect reduces the number of selected tracks. The shape of the threshold was studied in data and simulation and a systematic uncertainty of 5% was assigned to the first $p_T$ bin.

In conclusion, an overall relative systematic uncertainty of 4.0% was assigned to the track reconstruction efficiency for most of the kinematic range of this measurement, while 8.5% and 6.9% were assigned to the highest $|\eta|$ and to the lowest $p_T$ bins, respectively.

Momentum scale and resolution

To obtain corrected distributions of charged particles, the scale and resolution uncertainties in the reconstructed $p_T$ and $\eta$ of the selected tracks have to be taken into account. Whereas the uncertainties for the $\eta$ measurement were found to be negligible, those for the $p_T$ measurement are in general more important. The inner detector momentum resolution was taken from MC as a function of $p_T$ and $\eta$. It was found to vary between 1.5% and 5% in the range relevant to this analysis. The uncertainty was estimated by comparing with MC samples with a uniform scaling of 10% additional material at low $p_T$ and with large misalignments at higher $p_T$. Studies of the width of the mass peak for reconstructed $K_S^0$ candidates in the data show that these assumptions are conservative. The reconstructed momentum scale was checked by comparing the measured value of the $K_S^0$ mass to the MC. The systematic uncertainties from both the momentum resolution and scale were found to have no significant effect on the final results.

Fraction of secondaries

The fraction of secondaries was determined as discussed in Section 5. The associated systematic uncertainty was estimated by varying the range of the impact parameter distribution that was used to normalise the MC, and by fitting separate distributions for weak decays and material interactions. The systematic uncertainty includes a small contribution due to the $0$ dependence of this measurement, while 0.1% and $n_{\text{ch}}$ increases with the multiplicity.
Summary of systematic uncertainties on the number of events, $N_{ev}$, and on the charged-particle density $(1/N_{ev}) \cdot (dN_{ch}/d\eta)$ at $\eta = 0$. The uncertainty on $N_{ev}$ is anti-correlated with $dN_{ch}/d\eta$. All other sources are assumed to be uncorrelated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systematic uncertainty on the number of events, $N_{ev}$</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trigger efficiency</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertex-reconstruction efficiency</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track-reconstruction efficiency</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different MC tunes</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total uncertainty on $N_{ev}$</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systematic uncertainty on $(1/N_{ev}) \cdot (dN_{ch}/d\eta)$ at $\eta = 0$</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Track-reconstruction efficiency</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trigger and vertex efficiency</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary fraction</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total uncertainty on $N_{ev}$</td>
<td>−1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total uncertainty on $(1/N_{ev}) \cdot (dN_{ch}/d\eta)$ at $\eta = 0$</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Results

The correction for the $\langle p_T \rangle$ was also studied using the different PYTHIA tunes and PHOJET. The change was found to be less than 2% over the whole sample.

As the track-reconstruction efficiency depends on the particle type, the uncertainty in the composition of the charged particles in the minimum-bias MC sample was studied. The relative yields of pions, kaons and protons in the simulation were separately varied by ±10%. These variations, combined with changing the fraction of electrons and muons by a factor of three, resulted in a systematic uncertainty of 0.2%.

The systematic uncertainty on the normalisation and on the number of charged particles were treated separately. In each of these two groups the systematic uncertainties were added in quadrature. These were then combined taking into account their anti-correlation and were propagated to the final distributions. Table 1 summarises the various contributions to the systematic uncertainties on the charged-particle density at $\eta = 0$.
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Fig. 3. Charged-particle multiplicities for events with $n_{ch} \geq 1$ within the kinematic range $p_T > 500$ MeV and $|\eta| < 2.5$. The panels show the charged-particle multiplicity as a function of pseudorapidity (a) and of the transverse momentum (b), the charged-particle multiplicity (c), and the average transverse momentum as a function of the number of charged particles in the event (d). The dots represent the data and the curves the predictions from different MC models. The vertical bars represent the statistical uncertainties, while the shaded areas show statistical and systematic uncertainties added in quadrature. The values of the ratio histograms refer to the bin centroids.

10. Conclusions

Charged-particle multiplicity measurements with the ATLAS detector using the first collisions delivered by the LHC during 2009 are presented. Based on over three hundred thousand proton–proton inelastic interactions, the properties of events with at least one primary charged particle produced within the kinematic range $|\eta| < 2.5$ and $p_T > 500$ MeV were studied. The data were corrected with minimal model dependence to obtain inclusive distributions. The charged-particle multiplicity per event and unit of pseudorapidity at $\eta = 0$ is
measured to be $1.333 \pm 0.003\text{(stat.)} \pm 0.040\text{(syst.)}$, which is 5–15% higher than the Monte Carlo model predictions. The selected kinematic range and the precision of this analysis highlight clear differences between Monte Carlo models and the measured distributions.
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