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The ATLAS detector at the Large Hadron Collider has been used to measure jet substructure modification and suppression in Pb+Pb collisions at a nucleon–nucleon center-of-mass energy \( \sqrt{s_{\text{NN}}} = 5.02 \text{ TeV} \) in comparison with proton–proton (pp) collisions at \( \sqrt{s} = 5.02 \text{ TeV} \). The Pb+Pb data, collected in 2018, have an integrated luminosity of 1.72 nb\(^{-1}\), while the pp data, collected in 2017, have an integrated luminosity of 260 pb\(^{-1}\). Jets used in this analysis are clustered using the anti-\( k_T \) algorithm with a radius parameter \( R = 0.4 \). The jet constituents, defined by both tracking and calorimeter information, are used to determine the angular scale \( r_g \) of the first hard splitting inside the jet by reclustering them using the Cambridge–Aachen algorithm and employing the soft-drop grooming technique. The nuclear modification factor, \( R_{\text{AA}} \), used to characterize jet suppression in Pb+Pb collisions, is presented differentially in \( r_g \), jet transverse momentum, and in intervals of collision centrality. The \( R_{\text{AA}} \) value is observed to depend significantly on jet \( r_g \). Jets produced with the largest measured \( r_g \) are found to be twice as suppressed as those with the smallest \( r_g \) in central Pb+Pb collisions. The \( R_{\text{AA}} \) values do not exhibit a strong variation with jet \( p_T \) in any of the \( r_g \) intervals. The \( r_g \) and \( p_T \) dependence of jet \( R_{\text{AA}} \) is qualitatively consistent with a picture of jet quenching arising from coherence and provides the most direct evidence in support of this approach.
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I. INTRODUCTION

In ultrarelativistic heavy-ion collisions a hot and dense state of matter known as a quark-gluon plasma (QGP) is produced. The temperatures attained in the fireball are such that quarks and gluons are no longer confined within their parent hadrons [1,2]. Producing a QGP in the laboratory provides unique opportunities to study quantum chromodynamics (QCD). Experimental results from the Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider (RHIC) and the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) comparing proton–proton (pp) and heavy-ion collisions have led to the conclusion that the QGP expands hydrodynamically. The remarkably small viscosity needed to describe the data suggests that this matter exhibits strong-coupling behavior at large distance scales [3]. In contrast, at short distance scales the interactions among quarks and gluons are expected to become weaker because QCD exhibits asymptotic freedom. It is not fully understood how such hydrodynamic behavior arises from the interactions among elementary quarks and gluons [4]. To address this challenge, the dynamics of the QGP must be characterized over a range of length scales.

Jets are highly collimated sprays of particles resulting from the point-like, hard scattering of quarks and gluons, collectively referred to as partons. Jets are produced at the earliest stages of a high-energy heavy-ion collision and become attenuated while passing through the plasma, a phenomenon known as jet quenching [5,6]. The energy loss suffered by a jet and the modification of its radiation pattern provide information about the plasma’s microscopic structure. Scattered partons in the vacuum, studied using pp collisions, experience a cascade of radiative processes and thus the modification of the jet evolution process in the QGP is inherently a multiscale problem.

Techniques that enable the identification of the hardest splitting in the parton shower of a jet, and more generally the substructure of the jet and its overall radiation pattern, have been developed [7,8]. In theoretical calculations the soft-drop grooming procedure [9], a generalization of the modified mass-drop tagger [8], shows less sensitivity to the effects of initial-state radiation, multiparton interactions, and non-perturbative contributions to substructure observables. Since these effects typically contribute large uncertainties, their mitigation allows more rigorous comparisons with experimental data [10,11]. The potential of such techniques to characterize jet substructure in heavy-ion collisions has also been recognized [12–14], and a first series of measurements have been performed indicating a mild modification of jet-substructure variables in Pb+Pb collisions relative to pp results [15–19]. However these initial studies have not yet elucidated the relationship between the observed modifications and the energy loss of the jet.

Measurements of jet quenching in heavy-ion collisions performed at RHIC and the LHC [20,21] typically fall into one of two categories: quantifying the total energy loss or studying the modification of the jet’s radiation pattern. The
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rate of jets produced in central heavy-ion collisions at a given jet transverse momentum, $p_T^{\text{jet}}$, is observed to be approximately a factor of two lower than in $pp$ collisions [22–26]. Additionally, back-to-back dijet and photon/Z-jet pairs are observed to have poorer $p_T$ balance in Pb+Pb collisions than in $pp$ collisions [27–30]. These measurements provide information about the total jet energy loss and its parametric dependence on the in-medium path length and flavor of the initiating parton. They also constrain how energy loss may fluctuate on a jet-by-jet basis. Another class of measurements which studies the fragmentation properties of quenched jets, typically through the particle-momentum distributions within jets [31–35], is less sensitive to the energy loss but can directly assess how the radiation pattern is modified. This class includes the current heavy-ion jet-substructure measurements [15–18,36] because the distributions of substructure quantities are normalized per jet. Currently missing from the experimental program are analyses that correlate a jet’s energy loss with its radiation pattern.

A common theoretical framework for describing jet quenching is the coherence picture in which interference effects, crucial for determining the structure of the vacuum parton shower [37], become disrupted by the medium, resulting in energy loss in the form of additional radiation [38]. Recent studies have also shown the emergence of a critical angle in the first hard splitting of a jet, above which the jet loses energy incoherently, i.e. as multiple color entities [39–43]. This approach leads to the expectation that a wide jet with two prongs, each of which may act as a separate emitter of radiation, will lose more energy than a narrow jet which acts as a single source of radiation. More generally, jets with different substructure are expected to experience different amounts of energy loss according to the degree to which the medium resolves the jet and induces decoherence of its radiation pattern [12].

This paper describes a measurement of jet suppression, a measure of the energy loss, as a function of the observed substructure of the jet. The measurements are based on $1.72\, \text{nb}^{-1}$ of Pb+Pb collision data collected in 2018 and $260\, \text{pb}^{-1}$ of $pp$ collision data collected in 2017, both at $\sqrt{s_{\text{NN}}} = 5.02$ TeV. The jets are reconstructed from energy deposits in the ATLAS calorimeters with the anti-$k_t$ algorithm with a radius parameter of $R = 0.4$ [44] and by applying a subtraction procedure that removes the underlying event contribution to the jet kinematics on an event-by-event basis [22]. The soft-drop grooming procedure is applied with parameters $\beta = 0$ and $z_{\text{cut}} = 0.2$ to jet constituents formed from charged-particle tracks and calorimeter energy deposits. The substructure is quantified through $r_g$, the angle subtended by the subjets chosen using the soft-drop procedure to tag the first hard splitting of a jet. Jets which fail the soft-drop requirement are considered as single-prong jets and assigned $r_g = 0$. The per-event jet yields as a function of $p_T^{\text{jet}}$ and $r_g$ are measured in four centrality intervals, which characterize the overlap of the colliding nuclei in Pb+Pb collisions. The analogous differential cross-sections are measured in $pp$ collisions, and the suppression is quantified through the nuclear modification factor, $R_{AA}$. The cross-sections, yields, and $R_{AA}$ are reported for jets with $p_T^{\text{jet}} > 158\, \text{GeV}$ and $0 \leq r_g < 0.4$. The measured cross-sections and yields are unfolded to a particle-level phase space.

## II. ATLAS DETECTOR

The ATLAS detector [45] at the LHC is a multipurpose particle detector with a forward–backward symmetric cylindrical geometry and a near-$4\pi$ coverage in solid angle.1 It consists of an inner tracking detector surrounded by a thin superconducting solenoid, electromagnetic and hadron calorimeters, and a muon spectrometer. The inner-detector system is immersed in a 2 T axial magnetic field and provides charged-particle tracking within $|\eta| < 2.5$. The high-granularity silicon pixel detector covers the vertex region and typically provides four measurements per track, with the first hit typically being in the insertable B-layer installed before Run 2 [46,47]. It is followed by the silicon microstrip tracker (SCT) which usually provides eight measurements per track. These silicon detectors are complemented by the transition radiation tracker, a drift-tube-based detector, which surrounds the SCT and has coverage up to $|\eta| = 2.0$.

The calorimeter system covers the pseudorapidity range $|\eta| < 4.9$. Within the region $|\eta| < 3.2$, electromagnetic calorimetry is provided by barrel and endcap high-granularity lead/liquid-argon (LAr) calorimeters, with an additional thin LAr presampler covering $|\eta| < 1.8$ to correct for energy loss in material upstream of the calorimeters. Hadronic calorimetry is provided by the steel/scintillator-tile calorimeter, segmented into three barrel structures within $|\eta| < 1.7$, and two copper/LAr hadronic endcap calorimeters. The solid angle coverage is completed with copper/LAr and tungsten/LAr calorimeter modules (FCal), covering the forward regions of $3.1 < |\eta| < 4.9$. The zero-degree calorimeters (ZDC) consist of layers of alternating quartz rods and tungsten plates and are located symmetrically at $\zeta = \pm140\, \text{m}$ and cover $|\eta| \geq 8.3$. In Pb+Pb collisions, the ZDCs primarily measure “spectator” neutrons: neutrons that do not interact hadronically when the incident nuclei collide.

Events of interest are selected for recording and offline analysis by the first-level (L1) trigger system implemented in custom hardware, followed by selections made by algorithms implemented in software in the high-level trigger [48].

An extensive software suite [49] is used in data simulation, in reconstruction and analysis of real and simulated events, in detector operations, and in the trigger and data acquisition systems of the experiment. The events used in this analysis

---

1 ATLAS uses a right-handed coordinate system with its origin at the nominal interaction point (IP) in the center of the detector and the $z$ axis along the beam pipe. The $x$-axis points from the IP to the center of the LHC ring, and the $y$-axis points upward. Cylindrical coordinates ($r, \phi$) are used in the transverse plane, $\phi$ being the azimuthal angle around the $z$-axis. The pseudorapidity is defined in terms of the polar angle $\theta$ as $\eta = -\ln \tan(\theta/2)$. The rapidity is defined as $y = 0.5 \ln ((E + p_T) / (E - p_T))$ where $E$ and $p_T$ are the energy and $z$ component of the momentum along the beam direction, respectively. Angular distance is measured in units of $\Delta R = \sqrt{(\Delta \eta)^2 + (\Delta \phi)^2}$. 

---

054909-2
were selected by a jet trigger [48]. The L1 trigger identified jet candidates by applying a sliding-window algorithm and selecting events passing a p_T threshold of 30 GeV. These events were then passed to the high-level jet trigger, which uses a jet reconstruction and background subtraction procedure similar to that used in the offline analysis and requires a minimum p_T of 100 GeV for anti-κ, R = 0.4 jets. The jet trigger was fully efficient for the p_T range considered in this measurement.

### III. DATA SAMPLES AND EVENT SELECTION

The data used in this analysis are taken from the 2018 Pb+Pb and 2017 pp runs, both at \( \sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02 \) TeV. The average number of collisions per bunch-crossing (pileup) was 0.003 in the Pb+Pb data and ranges from 1.4 to 4.4 in the pp data depending on the data-taking run. Events from both the Pb+Pb and pp collisions were collected using the jet triggers with the same p_T threshold as described above. The events are required to have been collected during stable beam conditions, and to satisfy detector and data-quality requirements [50]. Both the pp and Pb+Pb events are required to have at least one reconstructed primary vertex, and the Pb+Pb events are also required to satisfy nominal offline minimum-bias Pb+Pb collision criteria, identical to those used in Ref. [51]. This additional requirement, based on a combination of the total transverse energy \( E_T \) measured in the FCal, denoted by \( \Sigma E_T^{FCal} \), and the total energy deposited in the ZDC identifies and rejects 0.2% of the selected events as pile-up events.

The degree of geometric overlap of the colliding Pb nuclei is characterized by “event centrality,” and each collision event is assigned to a centrality interval. The procedure used to experimentally define centrality intervals in this paper follows that used in other measurements of Pb+Pb collisions performed by the ATLAS Collaboration [28]. The distribution of the total transverse energy deposited in the FCal is divided into successive quantiles of the total inelastic cross-section for Pb+Pb collisions, with the highest \( \Sigma E_T^{FCal} \) events corresponding, on average, to the events with the largest geometric overlap between the colliding nuclei. The centrality intervals used are: 0–10% (highest \( \Sigma E_T^{FCal} \)), 10–30%, 30–50%, and 50–80%. A Glauber model analysis of the \( \Sigma E_T^{FCal} \) distribution is used to evaluate the mean nuclear thickness function, \( (T_{AA})_x \), for different centrality intervals [52,53]. The \( (T_{AA})_x \) values and uncertainties, which are discussed in Ref. [54], are listed in Table I for each centrality selection considered in this measurement.

The Monte Carlo (MC) simulations used in this analysis are multijet events modeled with the PYTHIA 8 [55] MC generator with leading-order matrix elements for dijet production which were matched to the parton shower. The A14 set of tuned parameters [56] and the NNPDF23LO parton distribution functions [57] were used. The events generated by PYTHIA 8 were passed through a GEANT4-based simulation [58,59] of the ATLAS detector and its response. By reproducing the detector conditions in the data-taking run, this allows the simulations to account for underlying-event (UE) effects in the jet reconstruction. For Pb+Pb collisions, the simulated dijet events were overlaid with minimum-bias Pb+Pb data, and this “overlay” sample was reweighted on an event-by-event basis to obtain the same centrality distribution as in the jet-triggered Pb+Pb data sample. The simulated events are digitized and reconstructed in the same way as data events.

### IV. ANALYSIS PROCEDURE

#### A. Jet reconstruction

The jet reconstruction procedures follow those used by the ATLAS Collaboration for previous jet measurements in Pb+Pb collisions [24,60]. Jets are reconstructed using the anti-κ algorithm [44] implemented in the FastJet software package [61]. In both pp and Pb+Pb collisions, jets with \( R = 0.4 \) are formed by clustering calorimeter towers with \( \Delta \eta \times \Delta \phi = 0.1 \times \pi / 32 \) in the pseudorapidity range |\( \eta \)| < 4.9 over the full azimuthal range. The energies in the towers are obtained by summing the energies of calorimeter cells at the electromagnetic energy scale [62] within the tower boundaries. The UE contribution to each tower is subtracted on an event-by-event basis by estimating the average local energy density, \( \rho(\eta, \phi) \). This estimate is obtained by measuring the average energy in calorimeter towers as a function of \( \eta \) and including the azimuthal modulation due to harmonic flow characterized by the second-, third-, and fourth-order flow coefficients [63]. The \( \rho \)-dependent background subtraction is performed only for jet reconstruction in Pb+Pb events, as the event activity is observed to be azimuthally symmetric in minimum-bias pp data [64]. An iterative procedure is applied to prevent the jets from biasing the determination of \( \rho \) [60]. Following the UE subtraction, new estimates of \( \rho \) are obtained by excluding the contributions coming from towers within jets from the average energy density and flow parametrization. Additionally, the UE is also corrected for \( \eta \) and \( \phi \)-dependent nonuniformities in the detector response to soft particles by applying correction factors derived in minimum-bias Pb+Pb data. In pp collisions, the same background subtraction procedure is used, but without the nonuniformity correction and no harmonic modulation of the UE.

Following the UE subtraction, \( \eta \)- and \( p_T \)-dependent multiplicative calibration factors derived in MC simulations are applied to the jet four-momentum vector to account for the noncompensating hadronic response of the calorimeter [65]. An additional correction based on in situ studies of jets recoiling against photons, Z bosons, and jets in other regions of the calorimeter is applied to account for known differences between data and the MC sample used to derive the calibration [28]. This calibration is followed by a cross-calibration which relates the jet energy scale (JES) of jets reconstructed using
the procedure outlined in this section to the JES in 13 TeV
$p p$ collisions [65]. The performance of the jet reconstruction in
$p p$ and $P b + P b$ collisions has been studied in detail as de-
scribed in Ref. [24]. The jet transverse momentum, denoted by
$p_{T}^{jet}$, is defined as the calibrated $p_{T}$ of $R = 0.4$ jets formed from
calorimeter towers. Calibrations are applied to the $p_{T}$ of the
jet and not individually to the constituent calorimeter towers
in this procedure. Fully calibrated jets having $p_{T}^{jet} > 158 \text{ GeV}$
and $|y| < 2.1$ are used in this measurement. The $p_{T}^{jet}$
binning was designed to match previous jet measurements by ATLAS
[22–24] and have uniformly spaced bins on the logarithmic
scale. MC-truth jets are defined in simulated events at particle
level by applying the anti-$k_{t}$ algorithm with $R = 0.4$ to stable
particles with a proper lifetime greater than 30 ps in the gener-
or’s event record, but excluding muons and neutrinos, which
do not leave significant energy deposits in the calorimeter.

B. Jet constituents

The granularity of the ATLAS calorimeter towers, which are used as constituents in the initial jet reconstruction, is
too coarse to resolve collimated prongs within a jet that have
small opening angles comparable to the expected resolving
power of the QGP [41,42]. In order to improve the angular and
ergy resolution of the jet constituents, new constituents are
defined by combining the superior angular resolution of the
tracker with calorimeter information. These objects, referred
to as track-calo-clusters (TCCs), are built using the energies of
topological cell clusters (topoclusters) [66] and the spatial
coordinates of charged-particle tracks [67]. TCCs were used
in previous ATLAS studies to improve the resolution of jet-
substructure variables used in previous ATLAS studies to improve the resolution of jet-
substructure measurements in
algorithm [66] and have been used extensively in jet-
are built from calorimeter cells using a noise-suppression

tation (Sec.IV A), is applied to the calorimeter cells before
the TCC reconstruction are required to have
$|y| < 2.1$ have an average of 6–7 associated
TCCs above the 4 GeV threshold in
$p p$ and $P b + P b$ collisions. TCCs built by matching tracks to topoclusters account for
$\approx 77\%$ of the total number of TCCs within a jet in
$p p$ collisions. Due to the lower tracking efficiency in
$P b + P b$ compared to $p p$ collisions, the fraction of TCCs within a jet
built by matching tracks to topoclusters drops to
$\approx 59\%$ in central $P b + P b$ collisions. The remaining TCCs are mostly
cases where topoclusters are not matched to any tracks.

C. Jet grooming and $r_{g}$

Jet grooming algorithms are used to isolate the prongs of
a jet that correspond to a hard splitting in the evolution of the
parton shower by systematically removing the contributions of
soft wide-angle radiation. The soft-drop grooming proce-
dure [9], a generalization of the modified mass-drop tagger [8]
is employed in this measurement to distinguish perturbative
radiation from soft, mostly nonperturbative, components of
the jet [15–17,36]. The angular distance $r_{g}$ between the subjets
that tag the first hard splitting of a jet is measured in this
analysis.

The procedure starts with reclustering the constituents of a jet using the Cambridge–Aachen (C/A) algorithm [73,74]
to form a clustering tree with a purely angle-ordered struc-
ture. In this measurement, jets are initially reconstructed from
calorimeter towers with the anti-$k_{t}$ algorithm as described
in Sec. IV A, and the calorimeter’s response is well-defined
[60]. Calorimeter-tower jets satisfying the kinematic thresh-
holds listed in Sec. IV A are selected to be reclustered using the
TCCs associated with the jet. TCCs having $p_T$ above 4 GeV and within $\Delta R < 0.4$ of a reconstructed jet’s axis are utilized in the jet reclustering process of the soft-drop procedure. The 4 GeV $p_T$ threshold for the TCCs, applied only at the detector level, is used to further reduce the influence of the UE on the measurement of $r_g$. When reclustering MC-truth particle-level jets, all stable charged and neutral particles within the jets are used in the soft-drop reclustering procedure. The C/A algorithm clusters the nearest constituents first, working outward toward the wider-angle constituents, independent of their $p_T$. The C/A reclustered jet is then recursively declustered into two “subjets” and it is determined whether the subjets $s_{j1}$ and $s_{j2}$ with transverse momenta $p_T^{j1}$ and $p_T^{j2}$ satisfy the soft-drop condition:

$$\frac{\min(p_T^{j1}, p_T^{j2})}{p_T^{j1} + p_T^{j2}} > z_{cut} \left( \frac{\Delta R_{12}}{R} \right)^\beta,$$

(1)

where $z_{cut}$ and $\beta$ are algorithm parameters, $R$ is the radius parameter value used to cluster the jets ($R = 0.4$), and $\Delta R_{12} = \sqrt{(\Delta y_{12})^2 + (\Delta \phi_{12})^2}$ is the distance in $y$-$\phi$ between the subjets, where $y$ is the rapidity. If the soft-drop condition in Eq. (1) is not satisfied, then the subjett with the smaller $p_T$ is dropped and the procedure is iterated on the remaining subjets. If the soft-drop condition is satisfied at any point, then the algorithm terminates and $r_g$ is set to the $\Delta R_{12}$ value between the subjets $s_{j1}$ and $s_{j2}$.

If the condition described in Eq. (1) cannot be satisfied, then $r_g = 0$ is assigned to the jet to indicate that the soft-drop procedure cannot find two subjets that satisfy Eq. (1). Jets with $r_g = 0$ are primarily those with a single TCC object or MC-truth particle carrying a significant fraction of the jet energy. For all $z_{cut} > 0$ and $\beta > 0$, the procedure is infrared- and collinear-safe, while it is infrared-safe when $\beta = 0$ [9]. The soft-drop parameter values $z_{cut} = 0.2$ and $\beta = 0$, corresponding to an angle-independent grooming setting, are used for the results shown. These values are chosen to maximize the efficiency of selecting the two hardest prongs of the jet against the competing effect of jets failing the soft-drop grooming with a high $z_{cut}$ value [75]. At the particle level, less than 4% of the jets fail the soft-drop condition when using $z_{cut} = 0.2$ and $\beta = 0$, thereby minimizing a possible bias from looking at different populations of jets in $pp$ and Pb+Pb collisions. The $r_g$ value of a jet measured using $z_{cut} = 0.2$ and $\beta = 0$ is also observed to be insensitive to lowering the 4 GeV threshold for the TCCs.

Distributions of $r_g$ measured using detector-level TCCs from $pp$ and Pb+Pb data are shown in Fig. 1, and are compared with the detector-level distributions from the PYTHIA 8 MC events. The detector-level $r_g$ distributions measured using TCCs show good agreement between data and MC events in $pp$ and peripheral Pb+Pb collisions. The $r_g$ distribution differences between data and simulation for central Pb+Pb collisions can plausibly be attributed to effects from jet quenching, not modeled in simulation, and are discussed in detail in Sec. VI. No systematic uncertainties are shown in Fig. 1 because it is only intended to demonstrate the performance of TCCs in measuring $r_g$.

D. Unfolding

The jet yields are unfolded in both jet $p_T$ and $r_g$ to the particle level in order to account for nonuniformities in detector performance and bin migration due to the finite resolution in jet energy, TCC energy, and TCC position, including migration in and out of the measurement phase space. The measurement phase space in this analysis corresponds to $p_T > 158$ GeV, $|y| < 2.1$, and $0 < r_g < 0.4$ for the jets.
At the particle level, the soft-drop procedure is applied to MC-truth jets using all stable charged and neutral particles within the jet as constituents. Utilizing the RooUnfold package [76], the yields of groomed jets are unfolded using a two-dimensional iterative Bayesian unfolding algorithm [77] simultaneously in $p_T^{\text{jet}}$ and $r_g$, while the inclusive jet yields are unfolded using a one-dimensional unfolding in $p_T$. The migration matrices are reweighted simultaneously in MC-truth $p_T^{\text{jet}}$ and $r_g$ by the ratios of the corresponding distributions in data to those in the reconstructed MC sample, separately for $pp$ collisions and each centrality interval in Pb+Pb collisions. The reweighting factors are smoothed as a function of $r_g$ and $p_T^{\text{jet}}$, and their effect on bin values of the migration matrices is typically less than 25%. The uncertainty from the reweighting procedure is estimated by unfolding with and without the reweighting factors and is detailed in Sec. V. The effects of inefficiencies and misidentified jets in the measurement are accounted for in the analysis by applying an efficiency correction and subtraction procedure, respectively, through the unfolding procedure. In the iterative Bayesian unfolding method implemented in RooUnfold, the inefficiencies are handled by applying a multiplicative factor to each MC-truth bin of the migration matrix. The inefficiencies in this measurement arise mainly from jets migrating out of the measurement phase space at the detector level because of energy resolution effects and from jets that fail the soft-drop grooming procedure. MC-truth jets having significantly lower $p_T$ than 158 GeV (the $p_T$ threshold that migrate into the measurement phase space at the detector level are treated as misidentified jets. The rate of such misidentified jets is observed to be negligible in this measurement, and are accounted for by treating them as an additive background. The effect of jets reconstructed entirely from overlapping UE particles in this measurement is insignificant.

The migration matrices used in the unfolding procedure are binned uniformly on a logarithmic scale and have 13 bins along $r_g$ from 0 to 0.4 and 16 bins along $p_T^{\text{jet}}$ from 158 GeV to 1 TeV. Additionally, in the MC-truth phase space, $p_T^{\text{jet}}$ has one overflow bin and six underflow bins down to 80 GeV for a smooth inefficiency correction, and $r_g$ has one overflow and one underflow bin in the migration matrix. There is no significant migration between centrality intervals in this measurement. A separate migration matrix is generated for each centrality interval in Pb+Pb collisions, using the PYTHIA 8.2 sample overlaid with minimum-bias Pb+Pb data and for $pp$ collisions, using the PYTHIA 8 sample. The number of iterations in the unfolding procedure is optimized independently for different centrality intervals to balance minimizing any bias from the unfolding against fluctuations in MC samples. The optimal number of iterations ranges from four to six depending on the centrality interval. The remnant unfolding bias evaluated in MC samples is better than 1%.

The differential jet cross-section in $pp$ collisions is defined as

$$
\frac{d^2\sigma_{\text{jet}}}{dp_T^{\text{jet}} dr_g} = \frac{1}{L_{\text{int}}} \frac{N_{\text{jets}}}{\Delta p_T \Delta r_g},
$$

where $N_{\text{jets}}$ is the unfolded jet yield, $\Delta p_T^{\text{jet}}$ and $\Delta r_g$ are the widths of the $p_T^{\text{jet}}$ and $r_g$ bins, respectively, and $L_{\text{int}}$ is the integrated luminosity.

The jet yield per minimum-bias event jet yield in Pb+Pb collisions, referred to as the per-event yield for simplicity, is defined as

$$
\frac{1}{N_{\text{evt}}} \frac{d^2N_{\text{cent}}^{\text{jet}}}{dp_T^{\text{jet}} dr_g} = \frac{1}{N_{\text{evt}}} \frac{N_{\text{cent}}^{\text{jet}}}{\Delta p_T^{\text{jet}} \Delta r_g},
$$

where $N_{\text{cent}}^{\text{jet}}$ is the unfolded jet yield in Pb+Pb collisions within intervals of $p_T^{\text{jet}}$ and $r_g$ for a given centrality (denoted by the superscript “cent”), and $N_{\text{evt}}$ is the number of minimum-bias events in the centrality interval.

Modification of the jet yield in Pb+Pb collisions in a given centrality interval relative to the jet yield in $pp$ collisions is quantified using the nuclear modification factor, $R_{AA}$, defined as

$$
R_{AA}(p_T^{\text{jet}}, r_g) = \frac{1}{N_{\text{evt}}} \frac{1}{(T_{AA})} \frac{d^2N_{\text{cent}}^{\text{jet}}}{dp_T^{\text{jet}} dr_g} \int \frac{d^2\sigma_{\text{jet}}}{dp_T^{\text{jet}} dr_g}, \tag{2}
$$

where $(T_{AA})$ is the mean nuclear thickness function, presented in Table I. At a given $p_T^{\text{jet}}$, $r_g$, and centrality interval, $R_{AA} < 1$ indicates a suppression of jet production in Pb+Pb collisions relative to that in $pp$ collisions.

V. SYSTEMATIC UNCERTAINTIES

Several sources of systematic uncertainty are considered for this analysis. The systematic uncertainties in the jet cross-sections in $pp$ collisions and per-event yields in Pb+Pb collisions arise from the jet energy scale and resolution, the constituent TCC energy scale and resolution, the unfolding procedure, integrated $pp$ luminosity, and $(T_{AA})$ (Pb+Pb only). The jet- and TCC-related uncertainties are evaluated in the analysis by modifying the migration matrix for each uncertainty contribution. The deviations from the nominal unfolded result for each variation are then combined in quadrature to calculate the total contribution.

The systematic uncertainty in the JES has three parts. The first (labeled “JES baseline” in Figs. 2–5) is a centrality-independent component that is determined from in situ studies of the calorimeter response to jets reconstructed with the procedure used in 13 TeV $pp$ collisions [62,78], with an additional component which accounts for the relative energy-scale difference between the jet reconstruction procedures used in 13 TeV $pp$ collisions and in this measurement [65]. The potential mismodeling of relative abundances of jets initiated by quarks and gluons in the MC events, and of the calorimetric response to quark and gluon jets, are accounted for by the second component (labeled “JES flavor” in Figs. 2–5). The third, centrality-dependent component (applicable in Pb+Pb collisions only and labeled “JES quenching” in Figs. 2–5) accounts for modifications of the parton shower due to quenching [31,35] resulting in a different detector response to jets in Pb+Pb collisions that is not modeled by the MC simulation. It is evaluated by the method used for data collected by ATLAS in 2011 and 2015 [65], which compares the jet $p_T$ measured in the calorimeter with the sum of the $p_T$ of charged particles.
FIG. 2. The relative systematic uncertainties in inclusive $p_{T}^{\text{jet}}$ cross-sections in $pp$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 5.02$ TeV (left) and in per-event jet yields in Pb+Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV for different event centralities (middle and right panels). The legend applies to all of the panels.

The uncertainty due to the jet energy resolution (JER) is evaluated by applying a Gaussian smearing factor to the reconstructed $p_{T}^{\text{jet}}$ in the MC sample. The smearing factor is evaluated using an in situ technique in 13 TeV $pp$ data that involves studies of dijet $p_{T}$ balance [78,79]. Further, an uncertainty is included to account for differences between the tower-based jet reconstruction and the jet reconstruction used in 13 TeV $pp$ data analyses, as well as differences between calibration procedures [65]. The jet energy scale and resolution are the dominant sources of uncertainty in measuring the jet cross-sections and $R_{AA}$ in this analysis and contribute a maximum relative uncertainty of about 14% and 9%, respectively.

Although the TCC energies are not utilized in measuring $p_{T}^{\text{jet}}$, they are used in the measurement of $r_{g}$ via the soft-drop procedure. The TCC energy response is primarily determined by the topocluster energy response. The uncertainties in the topocluster energy scale and resolution, measured using 13 TeV $pp$ data [11], are applied directly to $pp$ data. The cluster uncertainties from 13 TeV $pp$ data [11] are scaled conservatively by a factor of two for Pb+Pb data to cover the uncertainty in the topocluster energy response in the dense Pb+Pb collision environment. The inefficiency of matching between tracks and topoclusters is driven by the angular resolution of the topoclusters, which is used to match these objects.

FIG. 3. The relative systematic uncertainties in inclusive $r_{g}$ cross-sections in $pp$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 5.02$ TeV (left) and in per-event jet yields in Pb+Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV for different event centralities (middle and right panels) shown for soft-drop parameters $z_{\text{cut}} = 0.2$ and $\beta = 0$. The legend applies to all of the panels.
FIG. 4. The relative systematic uncertainties in the $R_{AA}$ measurements as a function of $p_T^{jet}$ in different centrality intervals of Pb+Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV. The legend applies to all of the panels.

FIG. 5. The relative systematic uncertainties in the $R_{AA}$ measurements as a function of $r_g$ in different centrality intervals of Pb+Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV shown for soft-drop parameters $z_{cut} = 0.2$ and $\beta = 0$. The legend applies to all of the panels.
FIG. 6. Differential cross-section of jets passing the soft-drop grooming condition in different $r_g$ intervals in $pp$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 5.02$ TeV as a function of $p_T^{\text{jet}}$. Distributions for inclusive jets (no grooming) and for those jets that fail the soft-drop requirement ($r_g = 0$) are also shown. For visual clarity, the distributions are scaled by factors specified in the legend. The statistical uncertainties are smaller than the symbols, while shaded bars represent systematic uncertainties. Note that the highest $p_T^{\text{jet}}$ bin does not contain the overflow and that the 1.6% luminosity uncertainty is not shown. The $pp$ jet cross-sections are compared with predictions from three MC generators, PYTHIA 8 (top), HERWIG (bottom left), and SHERPA (bottom right). The ratios of jet cross-section predictions from different MC generators to the unfolded data are shown in the lower panels. The statistical uncertainties on the ratios are smaller than the line widths, while shaded bars in the lower panels represent systematic uncertainties in inclusive cross-section ratios.

The unfolding uncertainty is observed to have a smaller effect than other sources, contributing a relative uncertainty of $<5\%$ to the cross-section, yield, and $R_{AA}$ results. The statistical uncertainties in the unfolding due to the statistical uncertainties associated with the size of the accumulated dataset are evaluated using the pseudoexperiment technique with 500 separate stochastic variations of the input spectrum as described in Ref. [83]. The contributions from statistical fluctuations in the response matrix are similarly evaluated using the same number of stochastic variations. The
FIG. 7. Differential cross-section of jets passing the soft-drop grooming condition in $pp$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 5.02$ TeV as a function of $r_g$ is shown for different $p_T^{jet}$ intervals and also for $p_T^{jet} > 158$ GeV. The error bars represent statistical uncertainties, and are smaller than the marker size here, while the shaded bars represent systematic uncertainties. The 1.6% uncertainty in the $pp$ luminosity is not shown. The last bin does not contain the overflow. The ratios of jet cross-section predictions from different MC generators to the unfolded data are shown in the lower panels. The shaded bars in the lower panels represent systematic uncertainties in cross-section ratios.
FIG. 8. The per-event inclusive jet yields in Pb+Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV normalized by $\langle T_{AA} \rangle$ as a function of $p_T^{\text{jet}}$ in four centrality intervals. Distributions for inclusive jets (no grooming) and for those jets that fail the soft-drop requirement (denoted by $r_g = 0$) are also shown. For visual clarity, the distributions are scaled by factors specified in the legend. The last bin does not contain the overflow. The statistical uncertainties are indicated by the error bars while the systematic uncertainties are indicated by the shaded bars. The normalization uncertainties of $\langle T_{AA} \rangle$ for each centrality interval are not shown, but are listed in Table I.

A summary of the relative uncertainties in the unfolded inclusive jet cross-sections, yields, and nuclear modification factor are shown in Figs. 2–5. Figures 2 and 3 present a summary of the total and individual relative uncertainties in the jet cross-sections and per-event yields as a function of $p_T^{\text{jet}}$ and $r_g$, respectively. The individual uncertainties are summed in quadrature to obtain the total uncertainty. The jet energy scale is the dominant source of uncertainty in the cross-sections and per-event jet yields except at large $r_g$ in central Pb+Pb collisions, where the TCC energy-scale uncertainties have a comparable effect. A summary of the total and individual relative uncertainties in the $R_{AA}$ is shown in Figs. 4 and 5 as a function of $p_T^{\text{jet}}$ and $r_g$, respectively. The uncertainties which are common to $pp$ and Pb+Pb collisions,
FIG. 9. The per-event jet yields in Pb+Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV normalized by $\langle T_{AA} \rangle$ as a function of soft-drop $r_g$ in four centrality intervals and three $p_T^{\text{jet}}$ intervals as well for $p_T^{\text{jet}} > 158$ GeV. The last bin does not contain the overflow. The statistical uncertainties are indicated by the error bars while the systematic uncertainties are indicated by the shaded bars. The normalization uncertainties of $\langle T_{AA} \rangle$ for each centrality interval are not shown, but are listed in Table I.

such as the centrality-independent JES and JER uncertainties, are treated as correlated when determining the uncertainty in $R_{AA}$. However, as the centrality-dependent component of the JES uncertainty (only for Pb+Pb collisions) does not cancel out in the cross-section ratios, it becomes the dominant source of uncertainty in the $R_{AA}$ results.

VI. RESULTS

The unfolded differential jet cross-sections obtained from pp collision data are shown in Fig. 6 as a function of $p_T^{\text{jet}}$ and $r_g$. The differential cross-sections are reported for four intervals in $r_g$, each scaled up by successive powers of 10. The cross-sections are also reported for jets that fail the soft-drop grooming condition. These are assigned a value of $r_g = 0$ in this analysis and they make up about 3.5% of the inclusive pp jet cross-section, and are also shown in Fig. 6.

Figure 7 shows the unfolded inclusive differential cross-section in pp collision data as a function of $r_g$. The differential cross-sections in $r_g$ are also reported for four bins in $p_T^{\text{jet}}$. The distributions are observed to peak at lower values of $r_g$ with increasing $p_T^{\text{jet}}$. Tighter collimation of jets with increasing $p_T^{\text{jet}}$ is expected from the larger boost of the fragmenting parton and an increased quark-initiated jet fraction [67].

The jet differential cross-sections measured in pp data are compared with particle-level predictions from the PYTHIA 8, HERWIG, and SHERPA generators in Figs. 6 and 7. The HERWIG predictions are obtained from multijet events generated at next-to-leading order by HERWIG 7.1.3 [86] with the NNPDF3.0 PDF set [87] for the matrix element calculation.
The SHERPA predictions are from multijet events generated using SHERPA 2.2.5 [88]. The matrix element calculation was included for the $2 \to 2$ process at leading order, and the default SHERPA parton shower [89] based on Catani–Seymour dipole factorization was used for the showering with $p_T$ ordering, using the CT14NNLO PDF set [90]. The PYTHIA 8 predictions overestimate the $pp$ data jet cross-sections but describe the shape of the $p_T^{jet}$ and $r_g$ distributions well, both inclusively and differentially in $p_T^{jet}$ and $r_g$. The HERWIG and SHERPA predictions underestimate the cross-sections but describe the shape of both the inclusive jet differential cross-section as a function of $p_T^{jet}$ and the differential cross-section in different $r_g$ bins. The HERWIG generator predicts a slightly wider $r_g$ distribution than seen in $pp$ data across all $p_T^{jet}$ regions studied here. The SHERPA generator predicts a significantly narrower $r_g$ distribution than seen in $pp$ data at low $p_T^{jet}$ and underestimates the jet cross-sections at high $p_T^{jet}$. The trend of tighter collimation of jets with increasing $p_T^{jet}$ observed in $pp$ data is reproduced by all three MC generators with varying levels of accuracy.

Figures 8 and 9 show the Pb+Pb per-event yields normalized by $\langle T_{AA} \rangle$ for four centrality intervals as a function of $p_T^{jet}$ and $r_g$, respectively. The PYTHIA 8 predictions overestimate the Pb+Pb data jet cross-sections but describe the shape of the $p_T^{jet}$ and $r_g$ distributions well, both inclusively and differentially in $p_T^{jet}$ and $r_g$. The HERWIG and SHERPA predictions underestimate the jet cross-sections at high $p_T^{jet}$. The trend of tighter collimation of jets with increasing $p_T^{jet}$ observed in $pp$ data is reproduced by all three MC generators with varying levels of accuracy.
FIG. 11. Nuclear modification factor, $R_{AA}$, as a function of $r_g$ for soft-drop groomed jets with $|y| < 2.1$ in four centrality intervals and three intervals of $p_T$, in comparison with the $p_T$-inclusive results. The error bars represent statistical uncertainties while the shaded bars represent bin-wise correlated systematic uncertainties. The uncertainties in the $pp$ luminosity (1.6%) and $\langle T_{AA} \rangle$ are not included, but are listed in Table I.

$p_T$ spectra are observed to have similar slopes in the different $r_g$ regions for both $pp$ and Pb+Pb collisions.

The nuclear modification factor $R_{AA}$, which quantifies the jet suppression in Pb+Pb collisions relative to $pp$ collisions, is shown as a function of $p_T$ in Fig. 10 and as a function of $r_g$ in Fig. 11 for four centrality intervals. The $R_{AA}$ value for inclusive jets is observed to vary from $\approx 0.95$ for jets in the 50–80% centrality interval to $\approx 0.55$ for the most central collisions. The $R_{AA}$ values for inclusive jets are also observed to have an upward slope with increasing $p_T$ and are consistent with the results measured for jets using 2015 Pb+Pb data with a lower integrated luminosity of $0.49 \text{ nb}^{-1}$ [24].

The values of $R_{AA}$ are observed to depend significantly on $r_g$, with a clear ordering with respect to the splitting. Jets that fail the soft-drop grooming procedure or have $r_g < 0.02$ are observed to be the least suppressed with an $R_{AA}$ value of $\approx 0.75$ in central Pb+Pb collisions. In contrast, jets with the widest splitting angle between their hardest subjets are observed to be suppressed with an $R_{AA}$ value of $\approx 0.3$. Notably, the difference in the $R_{AA}$ values is largest between jets having $r_g$ values below or above 0.02, supporting a coherence picture of jet quenching [41,42]. The $R_{AA}$ values for jets in different $r_g$ regions are observed to have a weaker dependence on $p_T$ in comparison with the $R_{AA}$ behavior for the inclusive jets, especially in more central collisions. The increase in $R_{AA}$ for inclusive jets as a function of $p_T$ may be explained as arising from tighter jet collimation with increasing $p_T$. Jets with lower $r_g$ values in Pb+Pb collisions are significantly less suppressed than jets with large $r_g$ values and they also constitute a larger fraction of the inclusive jets with increasing $p_T$, resulting in a rising trend for $R_{AA}$ as a function of $p_T$. As a function of $r_g$, $R_{AA}$ decreases smoothly with increasing $r_g$. 
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FIG. 12. Comparison of $R_{AA}$ as a function of (left) $p_{T}^{\text{jet}}$ for inclusive jets and for four intervals of $r_g$, (right) $r_g$ for inclusive jets and for three intervals of $p_{T}^{\text{jet}}$, and in three centrality intervals of Pb+Pb events with predictions from the JETSCAPE framework [43,91]. The error bars and the open boxes around the data points represent the statistical and systematic uncertainties, respectively. The uncertainties in the $pp$ luminosity (1.6%) and $\langle T_{AA} \rangle$ are not included, but are listed in Table I. The widths of the bands representing the JETSCAPE predictions indicate their statistical uncertainties.
FIG. 13. Comparison of $R_{AA}$ as a function of (left) $p_T^{jet}$ for inclusive jets and for four intervals of $r_g$ and (right) as a function of $r_g$ for inclusive jets in 0–10% centrality Pb+Pb events with theoretical predictions from the pQCD framework of Caucalet al., described in Refs. [41,42,92]. The error bars and the open boxes around the data points represent the statistical and systematic uncertainties, respectively. The uncertainties in the $pp$ luminosity (1.6%) and $\langle T_{AA} \rangle$ are not included, but are listed in Table I. The shaded areas around the theoretical predictions represent the uncertainties arising from the variation of the transport coefficient ($\hat{q}$) and shower cutoff parameters.

The jet suppression measurements are compared with predictions from various theoretical models and frameworks including those from the JETSCAPE MC framework [43,91], Caucalet al. [41,42,92] and Ringer et al. [93]. JETSCAPE provides a multistage model of jet evolution by combining several jet-quenching formalisms applied in its range of validity in shower energy and virtuality. The JETSCAPE predictions combine jet energy-loss calculations from the MATTER [94] and LBT [95,96] models at high and low virtualities of the parton shower in the QGP medium, respectively. The parameters used in generating the predictions, including the transport coefficient ($\hat{q}$) and the virtuality at which to switch parton energy loss from MATTER to LBT ($Q_{sw}$), can be found in Ref. [43]. JETSCAPE also includes a virtuality-dependent onset of coherence effects in order to model the inability of the medium to resolve narrow splittings of highly virtual partons at earlier timescales. The model from Caucalet al. presents a perturbative QCD (pQCD) picture of jet quenching dictated by the factorization of medium-induced

FIG. 14. Comparison of $R_{AA}$ as a function of $r_g$ for three intervals of $p_T^{jet}$ in 0–10% centrality Pb+Pb events with theoretical predictions from Ringer et al. [93]. The error bars and the open boxes around the data points represent the statistical and systematic uncertainties, respectively. The uncertainties in the $pp$ luminosity (1.6%) and $\langle T_{AA} \rangle$ are not included, but are listed in Table I. The green curve (med q/g) represents the quark and gluon differential energy loss setting. The red curve (med q/g + $p_T$ broadening) adds transverse momentum broadening effects for all subjets in the medium.
parton branchings and vacuum-like emissions in a longitudinally expanding medium. An important aspect of this model is the onset of incoherent jet energy loss beyond a critical angle between the branches of the hardest jet splitting. It should be noted that the calculations from Caucalet al. are purely at the parton level and hadronization effects are not included. The analytic calculations for jet $R_{AA}$ by Ringer et al. are based on medium-modified quark and gluon jet functions using a MC sampling approach. In conjunction with the quark and gluon differential jet energy loss, transverse momentum broadening is applied to all the subjets in this model, based on the transport coefficient parameter.

The jet $R_{AA}$ results are compared with predictions from the above frameworks and models as a function of $p_T^g$ and $r_g$ in Figs. 12–14. Predictions from JETSCAPE (MATTER + LBT), shown in Fig. 12, are able to capture the trend of $r_g$-dependent jet suppression in three centrality intervals of Pb+Pb collisions. However, JETSCAPE overestimates the $R_{AA}$ values for jets in the low $r_g$ ($<0.01$) region, especially at higher $p_T^g$. The $R_{AA}$ predictions from the pQCD picture modeled by Caucalet al., shown in Fig. 13, qualitatively describe the $r_g$-dependent suppression trend observed in the most central collisions. Compared to the data in Fig. 13, the parton-level pQCD model calculations predict a sharper drop in $R_{AA}$ around the critical angle beyond which incoherent jet energy loss sets in. The quark versus gluon differential quenching effects modeled by Ringer et al., labeled “med $q$/g” in Fig. 14, are able to describe the $r_g$-dependent jet suppression in three intervals of $p_T^g$. Transverse momentum broadening effects are included in the model calculations by adding $p_T$ kicks perpendicular to the direction of each subjet by sampling from a simple Gaussian distribution, whose width is determined using the transport coefficient parameter.

The combined model calculations with quark and gluon differential jet energy loss and transverse momentum broadening effects are labeled as “med $q$/g + $p_T$ broadening” in Fig. 14. Adding $p_T$-broadening effects to the model results in a significant suppression of jets at lower $r_g$ values and a peak in $R_{AA}$ at mid-$r_g$ values, neither of which are observed in data.

VII. CONCLUSION

Jet production in Pb+Pb and $pp$ collisions, both at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV, is measured with the ATLAS detector at the LHC, using integrated luminosities of 1.72 nb$^{-1}$ and 260 pb$^{-1}$, respectively. The jets are reconstructed using the anti-$k_T$ algorithm with $R = 0.4$ and groomed using the soft-drop procedure with parameters $z_{cut} = 0.2$ and $\beta = 0$. The jet differential cross-sections and yields presented are as a function of $p_T^g$ and $r_g$, the opening angle of the hardest splitting, and in intervals of collision centrality. Results unfolded to the particle level are presented for jets with $p_T^g > 158$ GeV, $|y| < 2.1$, and $0 \leq r_g < 0.4$.

The $r_g$ distributions obtained in $pp$ collisions are observed to peak at lower values of $r_g$ with increasing $p_T^g$, indicating that higher-momentum jets are more collimated. The differential cross-sections as a function of $p_T^g$ and $r_g$ are compared with results from MC event generators (PYTHIA 8, HERWIG, and SHERPA), with the PYTHIA 8 predictions best describing the shape of the $p_T^g$ and $r_g$ spectra seen in $pp$ collisions.

The jet energy loss and the resulting suppression in Pb+Pb collisions is quantified by the nuclear modification factor, $R_{AA}$. The $R_{AA}$ values are observed to depend primarily on the jet $r_g$ value and the event centrality. In the most central collisions, the $R_{AA}$ value ranges between $R_{AA} \approx 0.75$ for the most collimated jets ($r_g < 0.02$) and $R_{AA} \approx 0.3$ for the widest jets ($0.26 < r_g < 0.4$). The $R_{AA}$ values are observed to decrease monotonically with increasing $r_g$, and do not depend strongly on $p_T^g$ for a selected $r_g$ range. Although the energy loss is not measured directly and must be inferred from the $R_{AA}$ values and slope of the differential cross-sections as a function of $p_T^g$, the $p_T^g$-dependence is observed to be similar for different $r_g$ ranges. These features together with the dependence of $R_{AA}$ on $r_g$ indicate that jets with larger opening angles lose more energy. Predictions from theoretical models of jet quenching are compared with the $R_{AA}$ measurements presented here and are observed to describe the $r_g$-dependent jet suppression features with varying accuracy. The results presented here are qualitatively consistent with a picture of jet quenching dictated by coherence and provide the most direct evidence supporting this approach so far.
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