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The yield of charged particles opposite to a Z boson with large transverse momentum ($p_T$) is measured in 260 $\text{pb}^{-1}$ of $pp$ and 1.7 $\text{nb}^{-1}$ of Pb + Pb collision data at 5.02 TeV per nucleon pair recorded with the ATLAS detector at the Large Hadron Collider. The Z boson tag is used to select hard-scattered partons with specific kinematics, and to observe how their showers are modified as they propagate through the quark-gluon plasma created in Pb + Pb collisions. Compared with $pp$ collisions, charged-particle yields in Pb + Pb collisions show significant modifications as a function of charged-particle $p_T$ in a way that depends on event centrality and Z boson $p_T$. The data are compared with a variety of theoretical calculations and provide new information about the medium-induced energy loss of partons in a $p_T$ regime difficult to measure through other channels.
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Collisions of heavy nuclei at ultrarelativistic energies at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) and the Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider (RHIC) are understood to produce an extended region of hot and dense matter where partons exist in a deconfined state known as the quark-gluon plasma (QGP). The high density of unscreened color charges in the QGP causes the showers of hard-scattered partons with large transverse momentum ($p_T$) to be modified as they traverse the medium [1]. These modifications are observed in measurements of dijet and photon-jet momentum imbalance [2–5], and in jet fragmentation functions [6,7].

The large integrated luminosity of Pb + Pb collisions delivered during LHC Run 2 has enabled measurements of jets produced in association with a high-$p_T$ Z boson. At leading order, the Z boson and the jet are produced back to back in the azimuthal plane, with equal $p_T$. Since Z bosons and their decay leptons, or similarly, photons, do not participate in the strong interaction and are not modified by the QGP [8,9], they provide an estimate of the $p_T$ and azimuthal direction of the partner hard-scattered parton before the developing shower is modified through interactions with the QGP [10,11]. Measurements of photon-tagged fragmentation functions at the LHC [12,13] and photon-hadron correlations at RHIC [14,15] used this feature to perform detailed studies of jet quenching. At fixed $p_T$, jets balancing Z bosons and photons arise from processes with different $Q^2$, and can test the sensitivity of the energy loss process to parton virtuality. Additionally, the use of isolated photons at low photon $p_T$ ($\lesssim$60 GeV) is difficult due to the large hadron-decay background, motivating the use of Z bosons. A measurement of Z + jet production with $p_T^Z > 60$ GeV by CMS demonstrates that the total $p_T$ carried inside the jet cone is decreased in Pb + Pb events compared with that in $pp$ events [16]. However, the modification of the jet’s constituent particle $p_T$ distributions, or any lower $p_T$ selections, have not yet been studied.

This Letter presents a measurement of the yield of charged particles produced opposite in azimuth to a Z boson with $p_T^Z > 15$ GeV in Pb + Pb and $pp$ collisions at a nucleon-nucleon center-of-mass energy $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV with the ATLAS detector at the LHC. The Pb + Pb and $pp$ data were recorded in 2018 and 2017, respectively, and correspond to integrated luminosities of up to 1.7 $\text{nb}^{-1}$ and 260 $\text{pb}^{-1}$. The charged particles are required to have $p_T^{ch} > 1$ GeV and be approximately back to back with the Z boson in the transverse plane, with azimuthal separation $\Delta \phi$ larger than $3\pi/4$ [17]. In simulations of $pp$ collisions, particles meeting these criteria reside primarily in the leading jet azimuthally opposite to the Z boson. The per-Z yields of charged particles, $N_{ch}$, are reported as a function of $p_T^{ch}$, $(1/\mathcal{N}_Z)(d^2N_{ch}/dp_T^{ch}d\Delta \phi)$, in $pp$ and Pb + Pb collisions. To quantify the modification resulting from the partons’ propagation through the QGP, the ratio of particle yields between Pb + Pb and $pp$ collisions, $I_{AA}$, is reported and compared with the expectations from theoretical calculations. This measurement explores phenomena similar to those in measurements of the photon-tagged jet fragmentation function [12]. However, requiring a
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reconstructed jet may result in a bias towards events with less energy loss than average [18–20]. Since there is no such requirement in this measurement, it provides additional insight into energy loss in an unbiased way, at low \( p_T^{Z/\ell} \) values which have not yet been measured at the LHC and where theoretical models have not been tested.

The ATLAS experiment [21] is a multipurpose particle detector with a forward-backward symmetric cylindrical geometry and a near 4\( \pi \) coverage in solid angle. It consists of an inner tracking detector surrounded by a superconducting solenoid providing a 2 T axial magnetic field, electromagnetic and hadron calorimeters, and a muon spectrometer. The inner tracking detector covers the pseudorapidity range \( |\eta| < 2.5 \). It consists of silicon pixel, silicon microstrip, and transition radiation tracking detectors [22,23]. Lead/liquid-argon (LAr) sampling detectors are optimized separately for Pb data taking, the muon system is operational for only \( 1\% \) of the total integrated luminosity. Thus the dimuon channel is analyzed only in this subset of data.

Events with a high-\( p_T \) electron or muon are initially selected for analysis by the single-lepton triggers described in Refs. [24,25]. The centrality of Pb + Pb events is defined using the total transverse energy measured in the FCal [4,26], \( \Sigma E_T^{\text{FCal}} \). Pb + Pb events are divided into three categories which correspond to the 0%–10%, 10%–30%, and 30%–80% centrality intervals in minimum-bias (MB) events, the smaller values indicating larger nuclear overlap regions and thus larger, hotter QGP regions. The orientation of the underlying event (UE) elliptic flow is determined from the azimuthal distribution of the FCal energy [27,28].

In \( pp \) events, the average number of interactions per bunch crossing ranged from 2 to 4, and thus all charged-particle tracks are required to originate from the primary reconstructed vertex [29]. Monte Carlo simulations of \( \sqrt{s} = 5.02 \) TeV \( pp \) collisions with \( Z \) bosons decaying in the dielectron and dimuon channels, as well as data-driven studies, are used to correct the data for bin migration and reconstruction inefficiencies. Generated events were passed through a GEANT4 simulation [30,31] of the ATLAS detector under the same conditions present during data taking and were digitized and reconstructed in the same way as the data. The \( Z \) boson events were generated at next-to-leading order (NLO) with the POWHEG-BOX \( v2 \) program [32–35] interfaced to the PYTHIA 8.186 parton shower model [36]. The NLO CT10 parton distribution function (PDF) set [37] was used in the matrix element, while the CTEQ6L1 PDF set [38] and the AZNLO tuned set of parameters [39] were used to model the parton shower.

Four million events were generated to serve as the simulation sample for \( pp \) collisions. To model Pb + Pb events, fifteen million simulated \( pp \) events were overlaid at the detector-hit level with MB Pb + Pb events in data. This data-overlay sample was reweighted on an event-by-event basis to match the \( \Sigma E_T^{\text{FCal}} \) distribution for Pb + Pb events containing \( Z \) bosons.

The \( Z \) bosons in \( pp \) and Pb + Pb events are reconstructed in opposite-sign dielectron and dimuon decay channels using procedures similar to those described in Refs. [9,40]. Reconstructed electrons are required to have a transverse momentum \( p_T^e > 20 \) GeV, to lie within the fiducial acceptance of the EM barrel (\( |\eta^e| < 1.37 \)) or end cap (\( 1.52 < |\eta^e| < 2.47 \)) detectors, and to pass the “medium” likelihood-based identification criteria, which have been optimized separately for \( pp \) and Pb + Pb events [41]. Reconstructed muons are required to have a transverse momentum \( p_T^\mu > 20 \) GeV, to lie within the fiducial acceptance of the muon spectrometer (\( |\eta^\mu| < 2.5 \)), and to pass the \( Z \to \ell\ell \) candidates are required to be within the mass range \( 76 < m_{\ell\ell} < 106 \) GeV and have \( p_T^Z > 15 \) GeV. This selection ensures that the contribution from multijet and other backgrounds is smaller than 1.5% (0.1%) for the dielectron (dimuon) channel, and is considered negligible. In total, these criteria select approximately 21000 (28000) \( Z \to \ell\ell (Z \to \mu\mu) \) events in \( pp \) data, and 3400 (4100) events in Pb + Pb data.

Each \( Z \) data event is assigned a series of weights, derived from simulation and data, to account for the trigger, reconstruction and selection efficiencies of its decay leptons. Individual lepton trigger efficiencies are determined directly in \( pp \) and Pb + Pb data using tag-and-probe techniques [24,25], and are 0.70–0.80 for each muon and 0.75–0.95 for each electron. Reconstruction and selection efficiencies are determined using simulation and are 0.65–0.80 for muons and 0.65–0.95 for electrons. Although the efficiencies may vary substantially with the individual lepton \( p_T, \eta, \) and \( \phi \), the resulting dependence on \( p_T^Z \) is weak due to the large \( Z \) mass and weak correlation between bosons and their decay leptons.

Charged-particle tracks are reconstructed from hits in the inner detector using an algorithm [43] which, in Pb + Pb collisions, is optimized for the high-occupancy conditions [44]. They are required to meet several criteria intended to select primary charged particles [6]. All reconstructed tracks with \( p_T > 1 \) GeV, \( |\eta| < 2.5 \) and \( \Delta\phi > 3\pi/4 \) are considered. The charged-particle yield is corrected for reconstruction and selection inefficiency on a per-track basis using a simulation-derived efficiency which varies...
from 0.6 to 0.8 depending on both detector occupancy and track kinematics. A small correction, typically 1%–2%, accounts for the contribution of reconstructed tracks not associated with primary particles. The \( p_T^{ch} \) resolution is found to have a negligible effect (\( \lesssim 0.3\% \)) on the results and is not corrected for.

The contribution to the yield from UE particles in \( \text{Pb} + \text{Pb} \) collisions is estimated using MB events and is statistically subtracted from the measured yields. For each \( Z \) event in data, 40–160 unique MB events are used for this estimation. These MB events are centrality matched to within 1% in peripheral events, decreasing to within 0.1% in central events. Furthermore, to match the azimuthal modulation of the UE, the elliptic flow angles [28] in the \( Z \) data event and in the matching MB event must match within \( \pi/16 \). The signal-to-background ratio varies strongly with \( p_T^{ch} \), \( p_T^Z \), and \( \text{Pb} + \text{Pb} \) centrality, with a minimum of \( 5 \times 10^{-3} \) at the lowest \( p_T^{ch} \) and \( p_T^Z \) values in the most central events. In \( pp \) events, the UE is known to have larger activity in a \( Z \) event than in an ordinary MB \( pp \) collision [45,46], necessitating a different procedure. Here, the UE is determined in events with \( 1 < p_T^Z < 12 \text{ GeV} \) in the azimuthal region perpendicular to the \( Z \) boson to avoid the contribution from jet particles.

The data are further corrected for bin migration resulting from the finite resolution in the \( p_T^Z \) measurement. This is evaluated by comparing the per-\( Z \) charged-particle yields, where the \( Z \) selection is made at the generator level, with those after reconstruction, and is typically a 2%–3% correction.

The primary sources of systematic uncertainty in the yield measurement are those affecting the \( Z \) boson reconstruction, those affecting the charged-particle selection, and those affecting the UE background estimation and subtraction. The uncertainties associated with the electron and muon energy scales are evaluated using a common set of uncertainties [42,47], and are typically negligible (\( \lesssim 1\% \)) except at high \( p_T^{ch} \). Those associated with lepton trigger and selection efficiency determination are smaller than the ones related to the energy scale. Several sources of tracking-related uncertainty are considered, which are described in previous measurements of charged-particle fragmentation functions, and of which the largest is the sensitivity to the track selection criteria, which is 2%–3% [6,48].

The uncertainty in the determination of the UE background yield is evaluated by propagating the statistical uncertainty of the UE estimation in MB events. The sensitivity of the UE estimation to the matching criteria for the elliptic flow [27] angles between signal and MB events, or the additional requirement to match the triangular flow angles, are investigated. However, since these variations give statistically compatible results, they are not included. As a check of the background subtraction procedure, the full analysis is performed on simulated \( Z \) events overlaid with HIJING [49] \( \text{Pb} + \text{Pb} \) background, and compared with the generator-level distributions. An absolute uncertainty in the background estimation of 0.3% is derived using this study.

Finally, an internal consistency check is performed by comparing the per-\( Z \) yields between the electron and muon decay channels. A difference was observed in the \( 15 < p_T^Z < 30 \text{ GeV} \) selections and was included as an uncertainty of at most 4% in \( pp \) and 14% in central \( \text{Pb} + \text{Pb} \) events.

For the yields at low \( p_T^{ch} \) and in central events, the uncertainty from the UE determination is dominant and can be as large as 30%. For yields at high \( p_T^{ch} \) and in lower-multiplicity events, the uncertainties associated with the track selection and the lepton energy scale are typically dominant, and as large as 5%. Uncertainty sources common to \( \text{Pb} + \text{Pb} \) and \( pp \) are canceled in the \( I_{AA} \) ratio when possible, such that the resulting measurement is dominated by uncertainties specific to \( \text{Pb} + \text{Pb} \) events. In all cases, the statistical uncertainty in the \( I_{AA} \) is larger than the total systematic uncertainty.

Figure 1 presents the charged-particle yield per \( Z \) boson, in \( \text{Pb} + \text{Pb} \) and \( pp \) events, as a function of \( p_T^{ch} \), for the selection \( \Delta \phi > 3\pi/4 \). The yields in \( \text{Pb} + \text{Pb} \) collisions are observed to be modified relative to those in \( pp \) collisions.

![FIG. 1. Charged-particle yield per \( Z \) boson as a function of \( p_T^{ch} \), for the selection \( \Delta \phi > 3\pi/4 \), reported for \( 15 < p_T^Z < 30 \text{ GeV} \), \( 30 < p_T^Z < 60 \text{ GeV} \), and \( p_T^Z > 60 \text{ GeV} \). Results are shown for \( pp \) events and the three centralities of \( \text{Pb} + \text{Pb} \) events. These are offset horizontally around the bin centers, which are located between the 0%–10% and 10%–30% points, for visibility. The vertical bars and boxes correspond to the statistical and systematic uncertainties of the data.](image-url)
To better reveal the modification, Fig. 2 presents $I_{AA}$ values, the ratios of yields in Pb + Pb events to those in $pp$ events. The $I_{AA}$ values are suppressed below unity at large $p_T^{ch}$, with a systematically larger suppression in more central events and for lower $p_T^{ch}$ selections. For $p_T^{ch} > 60$ GeV, the $I_{AA}$ values at low $p_T^{ch}$, less than 2–3 GeV, are significantly different than those at high $p_T^{ch}$, and typically greater than unity. Lower $p_T^{ch}$ selections are compatible with a similar increase at low $p_T^{ch}$, although the uncertainties limit the significance of this enhancement. The suppression over a wide range of $p_T^{ch}$ values, and the general enhancement of the $I_{AA}$ above unity at lower $p_T^{ch}$, are qualitatively similar to those observed in the ratios of jet fragmentation functions in photon-tagged events [12].

Figure 3 compares the $I_{AA}$ in 0%–10% Pb + Pb events with the following theoretical calculations, where available, which use the same kinematic selections as the data: (1) a perturbative calculation within the framework of soft-collinear effective field theory with Glauber gluons (SCET$_G$) in the soft-gluon-emission (energy-loss) limit, with jet-medium coupling $g = 2.0 \pm 0.2$ [50,51]; (2) the Hybrid Strong/Weak Coupling model [52], which combines initial production using PYTHIA 8 with a parameterization of energy loss derived from holographic methods, including backreaction effects; (3) JEWEL, an MC event generator which simulates QCD jet evolution in heavy-ion collisions, including radiative and elastic energy loss processes, and configured to include medium recoils [53]; and (4) a coupled linearized Boltzmann transport (COLBT) and hydrodynamics model [54,55], which includes jet-induced medium excitations. All models qualitatively reproduce the degree of suppression at large $p_T^{ch}$, greater than 10 GeV. The Hybrid model, JEWEL, and COLBT qualitatively capture the increase at low $p_T^{ch}$. For these three models, removing the backreaction, medium recoils, and jet-induced medium excitations, respectively, results in a significant underprediction of the data in this region. Several of these models also capture the relative difference in the $I_{AA}$ between the three $p_T^{ch}$ selections. A full evaluation of theoretical uncertainties is needed to further discriminate between the mechanisms of energy loss and medium response in the data.
In conclusion, this Letter presents a measurement of charged-particle yields produced in the azimuthal direction opposite to a Z boson with $p_T > 15$ GeV. The measurement is performed using 260 pb$^{-1}$ of $pp$ and up to 1.7 nb$^{-1}$ of Pb + Pb collision data at 5.02 TeV with the ATLAS detector at the Large Hadron Collider. The per-Z yields are systematically modified in Pb + Pb collisions compared with $pp$ collisions due to the interactions between the parton shower and the hot and dense QGP medium. The charged-particle $p_T$ distribution in Pb + Pb collisions is softer than that in $pp$ collisions, with a suppression at high $p_T^\text{ch}$ and an enhancement at low $p_T^\text{ch}$. The degree of modification varies with Pb + Pb event centrality, consistent with a larger and hotter QGP being created in more central events. At high $p_T$, the modification pattern is qualitatively similar to that observed in measurements of photon-tagged jet fragmentation functions. In addition to the particular theoretical comparisons presented here, the data will allow systematic tests of models across centrality and $p_T$ selections. The data can also test energy loss models for low-$p_T$ partons that are otherwise difficult to access experimentally at the LHC, but which are valuable for direct comparison to future measurements at RHIC.
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[17] 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. Cylindrical coordinates $(r, \phi)$ are used in the transverse plane, $\phi$ being the azimuthal angle around the $z$ axis. The pseudo-rapidity is defined in terms of the polar angle $\theta$ as $\eta = -\ln \tan(\theta/2)$.


1Department of Physics, University of Adelaide, Adelaide, Australia
2Physics Department, SUNY Albany, Albany, New York, USA
3Department of Physics, University of Alberta, Edmonton AB, Canada
4aDepartment of Physics, Ankara University, Ankara, Turkey
4bIstanbul Aydin University, Application and Research Center for Advanced Studies, Istanbul, Turkey
4cDivision of Physics, TOBB University of Economics and Technology, Ankara, Turkey
5LAPP, Université Grenoble Alpes, Université Savoie Mont Blanc, CNRS/IN2P3, Annecy, France
6High Energy Physics Division, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Illinois, USA
7Department of Physics, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona, USA
8Physics Department, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece
9Physics Department, National Technical University of Athens, Zographou, Greece
10Department of Physics, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas, USA
11Department of Physics, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece
12aBahceşehir University, Faculty of Engineering and Natural Sciences, Istanbul, Turkey
12bIstanbul Bilgi University, Faculty of Engineering and Natural Sciences, Istanbul, Turkey
13Department of Physics, Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey
13Department of Physics Engineering, Gaziantep University, Gaziantep, Turkey
14Institute of Physics, Azerbaijan Academy of Sciences, Baku, Azerbaijan
15Institut de Física d’Altes Energies (IFAE), Barcelona Institute of Science and Technology, Barcelona, Spain
15aInstitute of High Energy Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China
15bPhysics Department, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China
15cDepartment of Physics, Nanjing University, Nanjing, China
15dUniversity of Chinese Academy of Science (UCAS), Beijing, China
16Institute of Physics, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia
17Department for Physics and Technology, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway
18Physics Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory and University of California, Berkeley, California, USA


1Department of Physics, University of Adelaide, Adelaide, Australia
2Physics Department, SUNY Albany, Albany, New York, USA
3Department of Physics, University of Alberta, Edmonton AB, Canada
4aDepartment of Physics, Ankara University, Ankara, Turkey
4bIstanbul Aydin University, Application and Research Center for Advanced Studies, Istanbul, Turkey
4cDivision of Physics, TOBB University of Economics and Technology, Ankara, Turkey
5LAPP, Université Grenoble Alpes, Université Savoie Mont Blanc, CNRS/IN2P3, Annecy, France
6High Energy Physics Division, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Illinois, USA
7Department of Physics, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona, USA
8Physics Department, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece
9Physics Department, National Technical University of Athens, Zographou, Greece
10Department of Physics, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas, USA
11Department of Physics, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece
12aBahceşehir University, Faculty of Engineering and Natural Sciences, Istanbul, Turkey
12bIstanbul Bilgi University, Faculty of Engineering and Natural Sciences, Istanbul, Turkey
13Department of Physics, Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey
13Department of Physics Engineering, Gaziantep University, Gaziantep, Turkey
14Institute of Physics, Azerbaijan Academy of Sciences, Baku, Azerbaijan
15Institut de Física d’Altes Energies (IFAE), Barcelona Institute of Science and Technology, Barcelona, Spain
15aInstitute of High Energy Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China
15bPhysics Department, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China
15cDepartment of Physics, Nanjing University, Nanjing, China
15dUniversity of Chinese Academy of Science (UCAS), Beijing, China
16Institute of Physics, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia
17Department for Physics and Technology, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway
18Physics Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory and University of California, Berkeley, California, USA

(ATOM Collaboration)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School of Physics and Astronomy, Queen Mary University of London</td>
<td>London, United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Physics, Royal Holloway University of London, Egham</td>
<td>London, United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Physics and Astronomy, University College London</td>
<td>London, United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana Tech University, Ruston, Louisiana, USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics named by A.I. Alikhanov of National Research Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre de Calcul de l’Institut National de Physique Nucléaire et de Physique des Particules (IN2P3), Villeurbanne, France</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departamento de Física Teórica C-15 and CIAFF, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institut für Physik, Universität Mainz, Mainz, Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Manchester, Manchester</td>
<td>Manchester, United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPPM, Aix-Marseille Université, CNRS/IN2P3, Marseille, France</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Physics, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts, USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Physics, McGill University, Montreal QC, Canada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Physics, University of Melbourne, Victoria, Australia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Physics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Physics and Astronomy, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.I. Stepanov Institute of Physics, National Academy of Sciences of Belarus, Minsk, Belarus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Institute for Nuclear Problems of Byelorussian State University, Minsk, Belarus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of Particle Physics, University of Montreal, Montreal QC, Canada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Research Nuclear University MEPhI, Moscow, Russia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.V. Skobeltsyn Institute of Nuclear Physics, M.V. Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fakultät für Physik, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, München, Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max-Planck-Institut für Physik (Werner-Heisenberg-Institut), München, Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagasaki Institute of Applied Science, Nagasaki, Japan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School of Science and Kobayashi-Maskawa Institute, Nagoya University, Nagoya, Japan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico, USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Mathematics, Astrophysics and Particle Physics, Raboud University Nijmegen/Nikhef, Nijmegen, Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikhef National Institute for Subatomic Physics and University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Physics, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, Illinois, USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics and NSU, SB RAS, Novosibirsk, Russia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novosibirsk State University Novosibirsk, Russia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for High Energy Physics of the National Research Centre Kurchatov Institute, Protvino, Russia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics named by A.I. Alikhanov of National Research Centre “Kurchatov Institute”, Moscow, Russia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Physics, New York University, New York, New York, USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ochanomizu University, Otsuka, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo, Japan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer L. Dodge Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma, USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Physics, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palacký University, RCPTM, Joint Laboratory of Optics, Olomouc, Czech Republic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Fundamental Science, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon, USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School of Science, Osaka University, Osaka, Japan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Physics, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Physics, Oxford University, Oxford, United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPNHE, Sorbonne Université, Université de Paris, CNRS/IN2P3, Paris, France</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Physics, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konstantinov Nuclear Physics Institute of National Research Centre “Kurchatov Institute”, PNPI, St. Petersburg, Russia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratório de Instrumentação e Física Experimental de Partículas—LIP, Lisboa, Portugal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departamento de Física, Faculdade de Ciências, Universidade de Lisboa, Lisboa, Portugal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departamento de Física, Faculdade de Ciências, Universidade de Lisboa, Lisboa, Portugal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centro de Física Nuclear da Universidade de Lisboa, Lisboa, Portugal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departamento de Física, Universidade do Minho, Braga, Portugal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departamento de Física Teórica y del Cosmos, Universidad de Granada, Granada (Spain), Spain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dep Física and CEFITECT of Faculdade de Ciências e Tecnologia, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Caparica, Portugal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instituto Superior Técnico, Universidade de Lisboa, Lisboa, Portugal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instituto de Fisica de la Universidad de Granada, Granada, Spain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Physics of the Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague, Czech Republic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Technical University in Prague, Prague, Czech Republic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles University, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Prague, Czech Republic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particle Physics Department, Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IRFU, CEA, Université Paris-Saclay, Gif-sur-Yvette, France
Santa Cruz Institute for Particle Physics, University of California Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz, California, USA
Departamento de Física, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago, Chile
Universidad Andres Bello, Department of Physics, Santiago, Chile
Instituto de Alta Investigación, Universidad de Tarapacá, Chile
Departamento de Física, Universidad Técnica Federico Santa María, Valparaíso, Chile
Universidade Federal de São João del Rei (UFSJ), São João del Rei, Brazil
Department of Physics, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, USA
Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, United Kingdom
Department of Physics, Shinshu University, Nagano, Japan
Department Physik, Universität Siegen, Siegen, Germany
Department of Physics, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby BC, Canada
SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory, Stanford, California, USA
Physics Department, Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden
Departments of Physics and Astronomy, Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, New York, USA
Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Sussex, Brighton, United Kingdom
School of Physics, University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia
Institute of Physics, Academia Sinica, Taipei, Taiwan
E. Andronikashvili Institute of Physics, Iv. Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia
High Energy Physics Institute, Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia
Department of Physics, Technion, Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa, Israel
Raymond and Beverly Sackler School of Physics and Astronomy, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel
Department of Physics, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki, Greece
International Center for Elementary Particle Physics and Department of Physics, University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan
Graduate School of Science and Technology, Tokyo Metropolitan University, Tokyo, Japan
Department of Physics, Tokyo Institute of Technology, Tokyo, Japan
Tomsk State University, Tomsk, Russia
Department of Physics, University of Toronto, Toronto ON, Canada
TRIUMF, Vancouver BC, Canada
Division of Physics and Tonomaga Center for the History of the Universe, Faculty of Pure and Applied Sciences, University of Tsukuba, Tsukuba, Japan
Department of Physics and Astronomy, Tufs University, Medford, Massachusetts, USA
Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of California Irvine, Irvine, California, USA
Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Uppsala, Uppsala, Sweden
Department of Physics, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, USA
Instituto de Física Corpuscular (IFIC), Centro Mixto Universidad de Valencia—CSIC, Valencia, Spain
Department of Physics, University of British Columbia, Vancouver BC, Canada
Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Victoria, Victoria BC, Canada
Fakultät für Physik und Astronomie, Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg, Würzburg, Germany
Department of Physics, University of Warwick, Coventry, United Kingdom
Waseda University, Tokyo, Japan
Department of Particle Physics and Astrophysics, Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot, Israel
Department of Physics, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin, USA
Fakultät für Mathematik und Naturwissenschaften, Fachgruppe Physik, Bergische Universität Wuppertal, Wuppertal, Germany
Department of Physics, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut, USA

\*Deceased.
\a Also at Department of Physics, King’s College London, London, United Kingdom.
\b Also at Instituto de Física Teórica, IFT-UAM/CSIC, Madrid, Spain.
\c Also at TRIUMF, Vancouver BC, Canada.
\d Also at Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky, USA.
\e Also at Physics Department, An-Najah National University, Nablus, Palestine.
\f Also at Department of Physics, University of Fribourg, Fribourg, Switzerland.
\g Also at Departament de Física de la Universitat Autonoma de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain.
\h Also at Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology State University, Dolgoprudy, Russia.
\i Also at Department of Physics, Ben Gurion University of the Negev, Beer Sheva, Israel.
\j Also at Universita di Napoli Parthenope, Napoli, Italy.
\k Also at Institute of Particle Physics (IPP), Canada.
\l Also at Department of Physics, St. Petersburg State Polytechnical University, St. Petersburg, Russia.