CERN-PH-EP/1020-048
2010/11/29

CMS-QCD-10-004

Charged particle multiplicities in pp interactions at $\sqrt{s} = 0.9, 2.36, \text{ and } 7 \text{ TeV}$

The CMS Collaboration*

Abstract

Measurements of primary charged hadron multiplicity distributions are presented for non-single-diffractive events in proton-proton collisions at centre-of-mass energies of $\sqrt{s} = 0.9, 2.36, \text{ and } 7 \text{ TeV}$, in five pseudorapidity ranges from $|\eta| < 0.5$ to $|\eta| < 2.4$. The data were collected with the minimum-bias trigger of the CMS experiment during the LHC commissioning runs in 2009 and the 7 TeV run in 2010. The multiplicity distribution at $\sqrt{s} = 0.9 \text{ TeV}$ is in agreement with previous measurements. At higher energies the increase of the mean multiplicity with $\sqrt{s}$ is underestimated by most event generators. The average transverse momentum as a function of the multiplicity is also presented. The measurement of higher-order moments of the multiplicity distribution confirms the violation of Koba-Nielsen-Olesen scaling that has been observed at lower energies.

Submitted to the Journal of High Energy Physics (JHEP)

*See Appendix A for the list of collaboration members

1 Introduction

The charged hadron multiplicity, or number of primary charged hadrons, n , is a basic global observable characterising final states in high-energy-collision processes. The multiplicity distribution, P_n , is the probability to produce n charged hadrons in an event, either in full phase space or in restricted phase space domains. In this paper we report measurements of P_n in non-single-diffractive [1] proton-proton collisions, at centre-of-mass energies $\sqrt{s} = 0.9, 2.36$, and 7 TeV at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) [2]. The measurements are based on events recorded by the Compact Muon Solenoid (CMS) [3] experiment, using a minimum-bias trigger.

Energy-momentum and charge conservation significantly influence the multiplicity distribution for the full phase space. The distribution in restricted phase space, which is less affected by such constraints, is expected to be a more sensitive probe of the underlying dynamics and can be used to better constrain phenomenological models. Comprehensive reviews on the subject can be found in [1, 4, 5]. The measurements described in this paper are performed for intervals of increasing extent in pseudorapidity from $|\eta| < 0.5$ up to $|\eta| < 2.4$, where η is defined as $-\ln[\tan(\theta/2)]$, and θ is the polar angle of the particle with respect to the counterclockwise beam direction. In these measurements primary charged hadrons are defined as all charged hadrons produced in the interaction, including the products of strong and electromagnetic decays, but excluding products of weak decays and hadrons originating from secondary interactions.

Independent emission of single particles yields a Poissonian P_n . Deviations from this shape, therefore, reveal correlations. These correlations are predominantly short range in rapidity, attributed to cluster decays, and reflect local conservation of quantum numbers in the hadronisation process. In hadron-hadron interactions, additional large long-range rapidity correlations are observed, whose magnitude increases with $\sqrt{s}$ [6]. In contrast, in e^+e^- annihilations such long-range correlations are much weaker and practically absent in two- and three-jet event samples [7].

The mean of the multiplicity distribution, $\langle n \rangle$, is equal to the integral of the inclusive single-particle density in the considered phase-space domain. Higher-order moments of P_n measure event-to-event multiplicity fluctuations. They are related to the two-particle and higher-order inclusive density correlations and provide more detailed dynamical information than that contained in single-particle inclusive spectra [8–12]. The average transverse momentum of the charged particles, $\langle p_T \rangle$, exhibits a positive correlation with the event multiplicity in hadron-hadron collisions ([13–19] and references therein).

Traditionally, the s dependence of P_n and its moments has been much discussed [1, 4, 5] in relation to Koba-Nielsen-Olesen (KNO) scaling [20, 21]. In this framework, one studies the KNO function $\Psi(z) = \langle n \rangle P_n$, where $z = n / \langle n \rangle$. If KNO scaling holds, $\Psi(z)$ and the normalised moments $C_q = \langle n^q \rangle / \langle n \rangle^q$ are independent of s .

Throughout this paper, we compare the data with existing measurements at similar or lower centre-of-mass energies and with predictions of the multiplicity distribution and its mean value from analytical and event generator Monte Carlo (MC) models. The models are based on the assumption that hadrons are produced via the fragmentation of colour strings. This comparison should allow for a better tuning of the existing MC models to accurately simulate minimum-bias events and underlying-event effects.

The next section gives a short description of the CMS detector. Section 3 describes the MC models used in the analysis, while Section 4 presents the data samples. The track reconstruction and acceptance are explained in Section 5. Section 6 describes the corrections applied to the data. Section 7 lists all relevant systematic uncertainties. The results are discussed in Section 8.

2 The CMS detector

A complete description of the CMS detector can be found in [3]. The CMS experiment uses a right-handed coordinate system, with the origin at the nominal interaction point (IP), the x axis pointing to the centre of the LHC ring, the y axis pointing up, and the z axis along the counterclockwise beam direction.

The central feature of the CMS detector is a superconducting solenoid of 6 m internal diameter, providing an axial magnetic field with nominal strength of 3.8 T. Immersed in the magnetic field are the pixel tracker, the silicon-strip tracker (SST), the lead tungstate electromagnetic calorimeter, the brass/scintillator hadron calorimeter and the muon detection system. In addition to the barrel and endcap calorimeters, the steel/quartz-fibre forward calorimeter (HF) covers the region $2.9 < |\eta| < 5.2$.

Two of the CMS subdetectors acting as LHC beam monitors, the Beam Scintillation Counters (BSC) and the Beam Pick-up Timing for the eXperiments (BPTX) devices, were used to trigger the detector readout. The BSCs are located along the beam line on each side of the IP at a distance of 10.86 m and are sensitive in the range $3.23 < |\eta| < 4.65$. The two BPTX devices, which are located inside the beam pipe at distances of 175 m from the IP, are designed to provide precise information on the bunch structure and timing of the incoming beams, with a time resolution better than 0.2 ns.

The tracking detector consists of 1440 silicon-pixel and 15148 silicon-strip detector modules. The barrel part consists of 3 (10) layers of pixel (SST) modules around the IP at distances ranging from 4.4 cm to 1.1 m. Five out of the 10 strip layers are double sided and provide additional z coordinate measurements. The two endcaps consist of 2 (12) disks of pixel (SST) modules that extend the pseudorapidity acceptance to $|\eta| < 2.5$. The tracker provides an impact parameter resolution of about $100 \mu\text{m}$ and a p_T resolution of about 0.7% for 1 GeV/ c charged particles at normal incidence [22, 23].

3 Models

The PYTHIA 6 [24] generator and its fragmentation model tuned to CDF data [25, 26], hereafter called PYTHIA D6T, is used as a baseline model to simulate inelastic pp collisions. However, at 7 TeV a dedicated PYTHIA tune [27] describing better the high multiplicities is used for correcting the data. Alternative tunings that differ mainly in the modelling of multiple parton interactions have also been considered [26, 28, 29]. PHOJET [30, 31] is used as an alternative event generator that differs mainly in the underlying dynamical model for particle production. While PYTHIA contains at least one hard scatter per event, particle production in PHOJET, which is based on the dual-parton model [32], is predominantly soft and contains in general multiple-string configurations derived from the dual-parton model with multi-Pomeron exchanges [32]. Each Pomeron exchange gives rise to two strings stretched between either valence or sea partons. At low energies the dominant process is single-Pomeron exchange, which leads to two strings stretched between valence quarks and diquarks. With increasing energy, additional Pomeron exchanges occur, forming strings stretched between sea partons. Because the sea partons carry on average only a small fraction of the momentum of the incident hadrons, these strings are concentrated in the central rapidity region. These extra strings [33, 34] are needed to explain the KNO scaling violations observed at high energies [35, 36], the increase of the central particle density with increasing energy [35–37], the $\langle p_T \rangle$ versus n dependence [38, 39], and long-range rapidity correlations [40]. The distribution of the number of exchanged Pomerons can be obtained from perturbative Reggeon calculus and unitarity, by means of fits to the mea-

sured total, elastic, and diffractive cross sections as described in [41–43]. Other alternatives based on the Colour Glass Condensate (CGC) picture with saturated gluons [44] also make predictions for the multiplicity dependence of $\langle p_T \rangle$ and for the long-range rapidity correlations.

We also compare our measurements with a new fragmentation model implemented in PYTHIA 8 [45]. In addition to having p_T -ordered parton showers, rather than an ordering by virtuality, it differs from its predecessor in the modelling of multiple-parton interactions and the treatment of beam remnants and diffraction. The detailed MC simulation of the CMS detector response is based on GEANT4 [46]. Simulated events were processed and reconstructed in the same manner as collision data.

4 Data sample

Near the end of 2009, the CMS experiment collected two datasets of proton-proton collisions at centre-of-mass energies of 0.9 and 2.36 TeV. In March 2010 a new running period at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV started, of which data collected in the first days have been analysed for this paper. The corresponding inelastic proton-proton interaction rates were about 11, 3, and 50 Hz, respectively, for these datasets. At these rates, the fraction of bunch crossings in which two or more minimum-bias collisions occurred is negligible [47, 48].

Diffraction is commonly characterised by one (single-diffraction) or two (double-diffraction) colourless exchanges resulting in the observation of a large rapidity interval devoid of any hadron activity (rapidity gap). All results presented in this paper refer to inelastic non-single-diffractive (NSD) interactions and are based on an event selection that retains a large fraction of the non-diffractive (ND) and double-diffractive (DD) events, while disfavouring single-diffractive (SD) events.

The trigger and offline event selection are nearly identical to those used in [47, 48]; about three times more events were used in this analysis at $\sqrt{s} = 0.9$ and 7 TeV. The trigger required a signal in any of the BSC scintillator counters, in coincidence with either of the two BPTX devices indicating the presence of at least one proton bunch crossing the IP. Beam halo backgrounds are reduced by using the timing information from the BSC counters at opposite ends of the CMS detector. Additional beam-induced backgrounds are removed by requiring the cluster sizes in the pixel detector to be consistent with a single primary vertex, as described in [47]. NSD events are selected by requiring at least one HF calorimeter tower with more than 3 GeV of total energy in each of the positive- z and negative- z HF calorimeters. Finally, a reconstructed primary vertex is required with the z coordinate within ± 15 cm of the centre of the beam collision region.

For the final analysis, totals of about 132, 12, and 442 thousand events were retained at $\sqrt{s} = 0.9, 2.36$, and 7 TeV, respectively. Event yields at various stages of the selection are shown in Table 1.

5 Track reconstruction and acceptance definition

The barrel and endcap pixel and SST detectors are used in the reconstruction of tracks within an acceptance of $|\eta| < 2.5$. Due to a large drop in reconstruction efficiency near the limits of this range, we restrict the computation of the multiplicity spectra to the region $|\eta| < 2.4$.

In proton-proton collisions at the LHC, the events selected by minimum-bias triggers involve predominantly soft interactions and contain mostly particles with small transverse momenta.

Table 1: Event yields in each data sample after sequential trigger and event selection.

Selection	$\sqrt{s}$ (TeV)		
	0.9	2.36	7
beam background rejection + L1 trigger	254666	18739	610549
all preceding + forward calorimeters	146658	12019	500077
all preceding + primary vertex	132294	11674	441924

These are reconstructed by extending the standard tracking algorithms of the CMS experiment, which are based on a combinatorial track finder [22] that performs multiple iterations. Hits that can be assigned unambiguously to tracks in one iteration are removed from the collection of tracker hits to create a smaller collection that can be used in the subsequent iteration. This iterative procedure was further optimised for primary track reconstruction with $p_T \geq 100$ MeV/c in minimum-bias events [47]. The reconstruction efficiency, estimated by means of the detector simulation, exceeds 90% for tracks with $p_T > 500$ MeV/c and drops below 70% for tracks with $p_T < 100$ MeV/c. Contamination from mis-reconstructed tracks is below 5% for $p_T < 500$ MeV/c.

After three iterations of the combinatorial track finder, the position of the primary vertex is recomputed and then used as an additional constraint in a refit of all previously reconstructed tracks, thus improving the overall resolution in η and p_T . An agglomerative clustering algorithm followed by a Gaussian mixture model [49] were applied in order to optimise the vertex-finding efficiency.

The contamination due to decays of long-lived particles (denoted as V^0 decays) is dominated by charged pions and protons originating from K_S^0 and Λ decays. The K_S^0 production rate is roughly 5% of that for all charged particles [50], and the resulting charged secondaries amount to 7% of all $\pi^\pm$. The Λ production is measured to be 43% of K_S^0 [51, 52] in this kinematic domain, yielding another 3% of charged secondaries consisting of protons and pions. In order to reduce the contamination of these V^0 decay products and secondaries produced in interactions of charged particles with the material of the detector, we require all reconstructed tracks to be associated with the primary vertex. This is done by selecting tracks with a small impact parameter with respect to the primary vertex position both in the transverse plane and along the z axis [47]. Only 1.5% of K_S^0 and Λ decay products pass these selections, resulting in a final contamination of 0.2%.

The $K^\pm/\pi^\pm$ ratio is known to be fairly constant over a wide range of centre-of-mass energies and is between 8 and 12% [50]. The $K^\pm$ have a lower reconstruction efficiency at low p_T than pions and mismodeling of the $K^\pm/\pi^\pm$ ratio could result in a change in the multiplicity distribution. However a doubling of the $K^\pm/\pi^\pm$ ratio yields a negligible shift of 0.25% in the multiplicity average. This is expected because the $\langle p_T \rangle$ of $K^\pm$ is substantially higher than $\pi^\pm$, and $K^\pm$ therefore contribute very little in the p_T range where the reconstruction efficiencies differ. Finally, only tracks with a relative uncertainty on their measured transverse momentum smaller than 10% are selected; this requirement rejects mainly low-quality and badly reconstructed tracks.

Table 2: The percentage of single-diffractive events (SD/inelastic) at each centre-of-mass energy as predicted by PYTHIA D6T and PHOJET.

Generator	$\sqrt{s}$ (TeV)		
	0.9	2.36	7
PYTHIA D6T	22.5	21.0	19.2
PHOJET	18.9	16.2	13.8

6 Corrections

Due to the requirement of significant activity in both ends of the HF, the event selection acceptance for SD events is small: 5% at 0.9 TeV and 7% at 7 TeV. This contribution is therefore subtracted based on simulated PYTHIA events. The PYTHIA and PHOJET predictions of the initial fractions of SD events differ substantially, as seen from Table 2. The difference of the two predictions is taken as the systematic uncertainty related to the SD subtraction.

It is customary to normalise the charged hadron multiplicity distribution $P_n = \sigma_n / \sigma$, where σ_n denotes the cross section for a fixed multiplicity n , to either the total inelastic cross section or the NSD cross section. For the results presented in this paper the normalisation factor σ corresponds to the latter.

The minimum-bias trigger and NSD selection unavoidably introduce a bias in the measured charged hadron multiplicity. Furthermore, a fraction of the events are removed by the requirement of a good quality primary vertex. These effects result in an accepted multiplicity given by

$$T_n = \epsilon_n \cdot P_n, \quad (1)$$

where ϵ_n is the trigger and event reconstruction efficiency for multiplicity n . This efficiency is close to 100% for multiplicities larger than $n = 20$ and drops gradually to 40% for $n = 1$.

Due to inefficiencies in track reconstruction and acceptance, the creation of secondary particles by the interaction of primaries with the beam pipe and the detector material, and the presence of decay products of long-lived hadrons, one will in general not measure the true multiplicity n but a statistically related quantity m . The statistical distribution O_m of this observed multiplicity is related to the true accepted multiplicity distribution by the linear relation

$$O_m = \sum_n R_{m,n} \cdot T_n. \quad (2)$$

The problem of inverting the response matrix $R_{m,n}$, here taken from MC, is well known and extensive literature on the topic exists [53, 54]. When dealing with limited event samples, an algebraic inversion of $R_{m,n}$ turns out to be impossible and leads to unstable results. We therefore use a Bayesian unfolding method, as described in [55]. The unfolding procedure introduces large statistical correlations between adjacent bins of the multiplicity spectrum. The full covariance matrix of the unfolded multiplicity spectrum was calculated using a resampling technique [54].

The average transverse momentum $\langle p_T \rangle$ as a function of n was measured as well. For each bin in raw multiplicity, a Monte Carlo based correction factor $\langle p_T^{\text{gen}} \rangle / \langle p_T^{\text{rec}} \rangle$ was applied to convert the measured $\langle p_T \rangle$ to the corresponding value for primary charged hadrons. Subsequently, the response matrix $R_{m,n}$, weighted by the corrected data, was applied to correct the multiplicities.

The correctness of the unfolding procedure was verified using MC events generated with our

baseline PYTHIA D6T tune where we compared the multiplicity distribution of generated primary hadrons with that of reconstructed tracks after unfolding. At all energies considered, an excellent agreement with the generated hadrons is achieved, proving the stability of the procedure.

The track reconstruction efficiency of the minimum-bias tracking drops drastically for $p_T < 100 \text{ MeV}/c$, while the mis-reconstructed track rate increases. Rather than correcting for these effects using MC simulations, we reconstruct the p_T spectrum in data themselves and calculate the fraction of charged hadrons with $p_T < 100 \text{ MeV}/c$ by extrapolating the measured spectrum in data, using a parametrisation based on an exponential of a third-degree polynomial in p_T . The fraction of charged hadrons added by this correction ranges between 5% and 7% depending on the centre-of-mass energy and the pseudorapidity interval under study. The functional form used to extrapolate to the lowest transverse momenta introduces an uncertainty of 1% on this fraction and is taken into account in the systematic uncertainties. The effect of all the correction procedures on the measured raw multiplicity distribution is illustrated in Fig. 1 for a centre-of-mass energy of 7 TeV.




Figure 1: A comparison of the uncorrected and fully corrected multiplicity distribution at $\sqrt{s} = 7 \text{ TeV}$ for $|\eta| < 2.4$. The uncertainties before corrections are statistical only, while after corrections the statistical and systematic uncertainties are added in quadrature.

7 Systematic uncertainties

Four main sources of systematic uncertainty contribute to the total uncertainty on the multiplicity distribution P_n and $\langle p_T \rangle$ versus n : the uncertainty on the trigger and event selection efficiency, the uncertainty on the tracking efficiency and acceptance, the model dependence of the response matrix, and the model dependent SD subtraction. All four are discussed below. The effects of misalignment of the tracking detector, dead sensors, and the uncertainty on the vertex position are much smaller and are contained within the overall tracking systematic uncertainty. For $\langle p_T \rangle$ versus n , the effect of the event selection and SD subtraction was observed to be negligible.

Table 3: Summary of systematic uncertainties on the track reconstruction.

Source	tracking uncertainty (%)
Tracking efficiency	2.0
Acceptance	1.0
Pixel hit efficiency	0.3
Pixel cluster splitting	0.2
Correction for secondaries	1.0
Misalignment	0.1
Beam halo	0.1
Multiple track counting	0.1
Mis-reconstructed tracks	0.5
Total	2.5

Trigger and event selection efficiency. The corrections for the trigger and event selection efficiency are based entirely on MC simulation. The largest impact on the overall efficiency is that of the HF coincidence requirement. A cross-check of the multiplicity dependent efficiency with zero-bias events, which are by definition not biased at all (random trigger on collisions), shows good agreement within statistical errors between data and MC. A relative shift of the efficiency correction factors by $^{+5\%}_{-7\%}$ for low multiplicities, decreasing to $\pm 1\%$ for $n \sim 20$, covers the trigger efficiency measured in zero-bias data. This leads to a maximum 5% systematic uncertainty.

Tracking efficiency and acceptance. A correct description of the tracking efficiency in the MC simulation of the detector is essential for obtaining a correct response matrix. At low transverse momenta, the efficiency drops due to a loss of hits on the tracks that are stopped within the tracking volume. As in [47], we assign a 2% uncertainty on this efficiency. The remaining contamination is mostly due to secondary tracks originating from interactions with the material of the LHC beam pipe around the interaction point. This is estimated in [47] to be no more than 1%, and is confirmed based on [56]. These uncertainties, together with smaller contributions from misalignment of the tracking detector, beam-halo background, multiple counting of tracks, and mis-reconstructed tracks are added in quadrature to produce a total tracking uncertainty of 2.5%. All correction factors related to track reconstruction are summarised in Table 3. As was discussed in Section 5, the contamination from V^0 decays after associating tracks with the primary vertex is small (0.2%) and already included in the systematic uncertainty for secondary tracks. The difference in reconstruction efficiency for charged kaons and pions also has a negligible impact on the measured multiplicity distribution. Finally, the extrapolation uncertainty from $p_T = 100 \text{ MeV}/c$ to zero is 1% (Section 6). For $\langle p_T \rangle$ versus n , this was taken into account by changing the mean transverse momentum by the average p_T of tracks lost during the event reconstruction folded with the tracking efficiency uncertainty. The overall effect of this systematic uncertainty is less than 10% for small multiplicities, but can reach up to 30% for the high multiplicities, where it is the main source of systematic uncertainty.

Model dependence. The baseline MC model that is used to unfold the multiplicity distribution underestimates the single-particle densities at zero rapidity by 10% relatively to $|\eta| \sim 1.5$ at $\sqrt{s} = 0.9$ and 2.36 TeV, but correctly describes the 7 TeV data shapes. This discrepancy affects the response matrix used in the unfolding procedure. The effect on the multiplicity distribution is estimated to be at most 3% by means of an alternative MC tune. The robustness of the unfolding procedure was verified by unfolding pseudo-data generated with PHOJET using a response matrix constructed with PYTHIA. The induced variation on P_n is below 3% and is

therefore considered to be covered already by the systematic uncertainty related to modelling of the single-particle densities.

SD subtraction. Finally, the modelling of SD events was found to be different in PYTHIA and PHOJET, both in the predicted relative fraction and in the predicted multiplicity distribution. The largest variation is obtained by subtracting the PHOJET multiplicity distribution for SD events, using the event fraction predicted by PYTHIA and vice versa. The impact can be as large as 20% in some low-multiplicity bins. At high multiplicities this uncertainty is below 5%.

All systematic uncertainties are calculated in each multiplicity bin for upward and downward effects on the multiplicity distribution and added in quadrature to yield a total systematic uncertainty. The total uncertainty on P_n is below 10% for a large part of the multiplicity distribution, but increases to 40% at the lowest and highest multiplicities.

8 Results

8.1 Charged hadron multiplicity distributions

The NSD charged hadron multiplicity distributions are measured in increasing ranges of pseudorapidity from $|\eta| < 0.5$ to $|\eta| < 2.4$. The fully corrected results at $\sqrt{s} = 0.9, 2.36$, and 7 TeV are compared in Fig. 2 with earlier measurements in the same pseudorapidity ranges performed by the UA5 [35, 36] and ALICE [57, 58] collaborations. Our measurements were also compared with results obtained with a CMS cross-check analysis (not shown) on data at $\sqrt{s} = 0.9$ and 7 TeV, using a tracklet-based tracking algorithm as in Ref. [47]. With a reconstruction efficiency exceeding 90% for $p_T > 50$ MeV/c, the latter provided a cross-check of the extrapolation for tracks below $p_T < 100$ MeV/c, including the use of data without magnetic field at 7 TeV. All measurements agree well within their total uncertainties.

In the largest pseudorapidity interval of $|\eta| < 2.4$, there is a change of slope in P_n for $n > 20$, indicating a multicomponent structure as was discussed in [59] and [60] in terms of multiple-soft-Pomeron exchanges. This feature becomes more pronounced with increasing centre-of-mass energies, notably at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV.

An extensive range of tunes [26–29] based on the PYTHIA 6 fragmentation model have been developed. They differ mainly in their parametrisation of the multiple-parton-interaction model. Some reproduce the charged hadron multiplicities better than others, but none is able to give a good description simultaneously at all the centre-of-mass energies and in all pseudorapidity ranges. For clarity, only the baseline tune D6T is shown in comparison with other models having a different physical description of soft-particle production such as PHOJET [30, 31] and the new fragmentation model of PYTHIA 8 [45].

A comparison of our measurements with these three classes of models is shown in Fig. 3 for all charged hadrons and for those with $p_T > 500$ MeV/c. PYTHIA D6T underestimates drastically the multiplicity at all measured energies but improves when $p_T > 500$ MeV/c is required. PYTHIA 8 is the only model that gives a reasonable description of the multiplicity distribution at all energies, but tends to overestimate the multiplicity at 7 TeV when $p_T > 500$ MeV/c is required. PHOJET produces too few charged hadrons overall but gives a good description of the average transverse momentum $\langle p_T \rangle$ at fixed multiplicity n , as illustrated in Fig. 4. Among the three classes of models, PYTHIA 8 gives the best overall description of the multiplicity distribution and the dependence of the average transverse momentum on n . Inspired by [61] we fit a first-degree polynomial in $\sqrt{n}$ to the multiplicity dependence of $\langle p_T \rangle(n)$ for $n > 15$ at each energy, yielding a good description which is valid at all three energies (Fig. 4). The ratios of




Figure 2: The fully corrected charged hadron multiplicity spectrum for $|\eta| < 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, 2.0$, and 2.4 , (a) at $\sqrt{s} = 0.9$ TeV, (b) 2.36 TeV, and (c) 7 TeV, compared with other measurements in the same η interval and at the same centre-of-mass energy [35, 36, 57, 58]. For clarity, results in different pseudorapidity intervals are scaled by powers of 10 as given in the plots. The error bars are the statistical and systematic uncertainties added in quadrature.

the data obtained at 7 and 2.36 TeV with respect to the data at 0.9 TeV show that the rise of the average transverse momentum with the multiplicity is roughly energy-independent.

All previous observations seem to indicate that the Monte Carlo models produce too few particles with low transverse momenta, especially at 7 TeV. The PYTHIA models tend to compensate for this by producing too many particles with high transverse momentum, which is related to the modelling of semi-hard multiple-parton interactions.




Figure 3: The charged hadron multiplicity distributions with $|\eta| < 2.4$ for (a) $p_T > 0$ and (b) $p_T > 500 \text{ MeV}/c$ at $\sqrt{s} = 0.9, 2.36$, and 7 TeV , compared to two different PYTHIA models and the PHOJET model. For clarity, results for different centre-of-mass energies are scaled by powers of 10 as given in the plots.




Figure 4: (a) A comparison of $\langle p_T \rangle$ versus n for $|\eta| < 2.4$ with two different PYTHIA models and the PHOJET model at $\sqrt{s} = 0.9, 2.36$, and 7 TeV . For clarity, results for different energies are shifted by the values of a shown in the plots. Fits to the high-multiplicity part ($n > 15$) with a linear form in $\sqrt{n}$ are superimposed. (b) The ratios of the higher-energy data to the fit at 0.9 TeV indicate the approximate energy independence of $\langle p_T \rangle$ at fixed n .

8.2 Violation of KNO scaling

The multiplicity distributions are shown in KNO form in Fig. 5 for a large pseudorapidity interval of $|\eta| < 2.4$, where we observe a strong violation of KNO scaling between $\sqrt{s} = 0.9$ TeV and 7 TeV, and for a small pseudorapidity interval of $|\eta| < 0.5$, where KNO scaling holds. Scaling is a characteristic property of the multiplicity distribution in cascade processes of a single jet with self-similar branchings and fixed coupling constant [62–69].




Figure 5: The charged hadron multiplicity distributions in KNO form at $\sqrt{s} = 0.9$ and 7 TeV in two pseudorapidity intervals, (a) $|\eta| < 2.4$ and (b) $|\eta| < 0.5$.

The validity of KNO scaling is shown more quantitatively in Fig. 6 by the normalised order- q moments C_q of the multiplicity distribution, complemented with measurements at lower energies [70–72]. For $|\eta| < 2.4$ the values of C_q increase linearly with $\log s$, while for $|\eta| < 0.5$ they remain constant up to $q = 4$ over the full centre-of-mass energy range, as illustrated by the fits in Fig. 6.

Multiplicity distributions for e^+e^- annihilations up to the highest LEP energies show clear evidence for multiplicity scaling, both in small ranges ($\Delta\eta < 0.5$), in single hemispheres, and in full phase-space. However, at LEP energies, scaling is broken for intermediate-size ranges where, besides two-jet events, multi-jet events contribute most prominently [73–77].

For hadron-hadron collisions, approximate KNO scaling holds up to ISR energies [78, 79], but clear scaling violations become manifest above $\sqrt{s} \approx 200$ GeV both for the multiplicity distributions in full phase space and in central pseudorapidity ranges [59, 70, 80, 81]. In $p\bar{p}$ collisions, and for large rapidity ranges, the UA5 experiment was the first to observe a larger than expected high-multiplicity tail and a change of slope [59, 72], which was interpreted as evidence for a multi-component structure of the final states [34, 60, 82]. Our observation of strong KNO scaling violations at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV, as well as a change of slope in P_n , confirm these earlier measurements.

All these observations, together with the sizable growth with energy of the non-diffractive inelastic cross section, point to the increasing importance of multiple hard, semi-hard, and soft partonic subprocesses in high energy hadron-hadron inelastic collisions [6, 32, 34, 59, 83, 84].




Figure 6: Fits of the $\log s$ dependence of the normalised moments C_q of the multiplicity distribution for (a) $|\eta| < 2.4$ (assuming linear dependence) and (b) $|\eta| < 0.5$ (assuming no dependence), including data from lower energy experiments [70–72]. For $\sqrt{s} = 0.9$ TeV, data from experiments other than CMS were drawn shifted to lower $\sqrt{s}$ for clarity.

8.3 Energy dependence of the mean multiplicity

The mean multiplicity $\langle n \rangle$ is the first moment of the multiplicity distribution and is equal to the integral of the corresponding single-particle inclusive density in the η interval considered. The mean multiplicity $\langle n \rangle$ is observed to rise with increasing centre-of-mass energy in hadron-hadron collisions [35–37, 70, 78, 79, 85, 86]. The same behaviour is also observed in e^+e^- collisions, in deep-inelastic scattering [87], and in heavy ion collisions [1].

Our measured mean multiplicity is compared with experimental data obtained at lower energies in Fig. 7. Recent Regge-inspired models [41–43] predict a power-like behaviour among which only Ref. [42] describes the highest energy data very well. Parton saturation models (such as [44]) predict a strong rise of the central rapidity plateau as well. Table 4 gives an overview of $\langle n \rangle$ for the data and for the PYTHIA D6T, PYTHIA 8, and PHOJET event generators. As in Section 8.1, PYTHIA D6T produces on average too few particles per event at all three energies. PHOJET is consistent with the data within uncertainties for $\sqrt{s} = 0.9$ TeV, but is not able to predict properly the mean multiplicity at higher energies. PYTHIA 8 describes best the 7 TeV data, but underestimates $\langle n \rangle$ systematically at all energies.

Table 4: Mean multiplicity for data, PYTHIA D6T, PYTHIA 8, and PHOJET for $|\eta| < 2.4$ at each centre-of-mass energy. For data, the quoted uncertainties are first statistical, then upward and downward systematic.

$\sqrt{s}$ (TeV)	$\langle n \rangle$			
	Data	PYTHIA D6T	PYTHIA 8	PHOJET
0.9	$17.9 \pm 0.1^{+1.1}_{-1.1}$	14.7	14.9	17.1
2.36	$22.9 \pm 0.5^{+1.6}_{-1.5}$	16.7	17.8	18.7
7	$30.4 \pm 0.2^{+2.2}_{-2.0}$	21.2	25.8	23.2




Figure 7: The evolution of the mean charge multiplicity with the centre-of-mass energy for $|\eta| < 2.4$, including data from lower-energy experiments for $|\eta| < 2.5$ [37, 70–72]. The data are compared with predictions from three analytical Regge-inspired models [41–43] and from a saturation model [44].

9 Conclusions

The charged hadron multiplicity distributions of non-single-diffractive events were measured from an analysis of the minimum-bias datasets collected by CMS at three centre-of-mass energies: $\sqrt{s} = 0.9, 2.36$, and 7 TeV. The excellent tracking capabilities of the silicon pixel and strip detectors of CMS, combined with an optimised tracking and vertexing algorithm, allow the reconstruction of charged tracks down to $p_T = 100$ MeV/ c with high efficiency and low background contamination. A full correction for detector resolution and acceptance effects and an extrapolation to zero transverse momentum yield measurements of the charged hadron multiplicity distribution for increasing central pseudorapidity ranges from $|\eta| < 0.5$ to $|\eta| < 2.4$, which can be compared with models of soft-particle production and with experimental data at lower energies.

Although some event generators provide an adequate description of Tevatron and LEP data,

none is able to describe simultaneously the multiplicity distributions and the p_T spectrum at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV. In general, models predict too few low-momentum particles, indicating that by increasing the amount of multiple-parton interactions one effectively introduces too many hard scatters in the event.

The change of slope in P_n in the widest central pseudorapidity intervals observed at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV, combined with the strong linear increase of the C_q moments, indicates a clear violation of KNO scaling with respect to lower energies. This observation merits further studies.

Acknowledgements

We wish to congratulate our colleagues in the CERN accelerator departments for the excellent performance of the LHC machine. We thank the technical and administrative staff at CERN and other CMS institutes. This work was supported by the Austrian Federal Ministry of Science and Research; the Belgium Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique, and Fonds voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek; the Brazilian Funding Agencies (CNPq, CAPES, FAPERJ, and FAPESP); the Bulgarian Ministry of Education and Science; CERN; the Chinese Academy of Sciences, Ministry of Science and Technology, and National Natural Science Foundation of China; the Colombian Funding Agency (COLCIENCIAS); the Croatian Ministry of Science, Education and Sport; the Research Promotion Foundation, Cyprus; the Estonian Academy of Sciences and NICPB; the Academy of Finland, Finnish Ministry of Education, and Helsinki Institute of Physics; the Institut National de Physique Nucléaire et de Physique des Particules / CNRS, and Commissariat à l'Énergie Atomique, France; the Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, and Helmholtz-Gemeinschaft Deutscher Forschungszentren, Germany; the General Secretariat for Research and Technology, Greece; the National Scientific Research Foundation, and National Office for Research and Technology, Hungary; the Department of Atomic Energy, and Department of Science and Technology, India; the Institute for Studies in Theoretical Physics and Mathematics, Iran; the Science Foundation, Ireland; the Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Italy; the Korean Ministry of Education, Science and Technology and the World Class University program of NRF, Korea; the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences; the Mexican Funding Agencies (CINVESTAV, CONACYT, SEP, and UASLP-FAI); the Pakistan Atomic Energy Commission; the State Commission for Scientific Research, Poland; the Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, Portugal; JINR (Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, Ukraine, Uzbekistan); the Ministry of Science and Technologies of the Russian Federation, and Russian Ministry of Atomic Energy; the Ministry of Science and Technological Development of Serbia; the Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación, and Programa Consolider-Ingenio 2010, Spain; the Swiss Funding Agencies (ETH Board, ETH Zurich, PSI, SNF, UniZH, Canton Zurich, and SER); the National Science Council, Taipei; the Scientific and Technical Research Council of Turkey, and Turkish Atomic Energy Authority; the Science and Technology Facilities Council, UK; the US Department of Energy, and the US National Science Foundation.

Individuals have received support from the Marie-Curie programme and the European Research Council (European Union); the Leventis Foundation; the A. P. Sloan Foundation; the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation; the Associazione per lo Sviluppo Scientifico e Tecnologico del Piemonte (Italy); the Belgian Federal Science Policy Office; the Fonds pour la Formation à la Recherche dans l'industrie et dans l'Agriculture (FRIA-Belgium); and the Agentschap voor Innovatie door Wetenschap en Technologie (IWT-Belgium).

References

- [1] W. Kittel and E. A. De Wolf, “Soft multihadron dynamics”. Hackensack, USA: World Scientific, 2005.
- [2] L. Evans and P. Bryant, (eds.), “LHC Machine”, *JINST* **3** (2008) S08001.
doi:10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08001.
- [3] CMS Collaboration, “The CMS experiment at the CERN LHC”, *JINST* **3** (2008) S08004.
doi:10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08004.
- [4] E. A. De Wolf, I. M. Dremin, and W. Kittel, “Scaling laws for density correlations and fluctuations in multiparticle dynamics”, *Phys. Rept.* **270** (1996) 1,
arXiv:hep-ph/9508325. doi:10.1016/0370-1573(95)00069-0.
- [5] J. F. Grosse-Oetringhaus and K. Reygers, “Charged-particle multiplicity in proton-proton collisions”, *J. Phys.* **G37** (2010) 083001, arXiv:0912.0023.
doi:10.1088/0954-3899/37/8/083001.
- [6] A. Capella and A. Krzywicki, “Unitarity corrections to short range order: long range rapidity correlations”, *Phys. Rev.* **D18** (1978) 4120.
doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.18.4120.
- [7] OPAL Collaboration, “Multiplicity and transverse momentum correlations in multi-hadronic final states in e^+e^- interactions at $\sqrt{s} = 91.2$ GeV”, *Phys. Lett.* **B320** (1994) 417.
doi:10.1016/0370-2693(94)90680-7.
- [8] A. H. Mueller, “Multiplicity distributions in Regge pole dominated inclusive reactions”, *Phys. Rev.* **D4** (1971) 150. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.4.150.
- [9] L. S. Brown, “Inclusive- and exclusive-cross-section functionals - conservation constraints and multiplicity distributions”, *Phys. Rev.* **D5** (1972) 748.
doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.5.748.
- [10] K. J. Biebl and J. Wolf, “A statistical view of exclusive and inclusive cross- sections”, *Nucl. Phys.* **B44** (1972) 301. doi:10.1016/0550-3213(72)90286-6.
- [11] B. R. Webber, “Multiplicities and correlations in hadron production processes”, *Nucl. Phys.* **B43** (1972) 541. doi:10.1016/0550-3213(72)90036-3.
- [12] Z. Koba, “Many-particle inclusive cross-sections and correlations in hadronic production processes at very high energy”, *Acta Phys. Polon.* **B4** (1973) 95.
- [13] S. Barshay, “Monotonically increasing hadronic temperature in high-multiplicity events at the CERN proton-antiproton collider”, *Phys. Lett.* **B127** (1983) 129.
doi:10.1016/0370-2693(83)91646-5.
- [14] L. Van Hove, “Multiplicity dependence of p_T spectrum as a possible signal for a phase transition in hadronic collisions”, *Phys. Lett.* **B118** (1982) 138.
doi:10.1016/0370-2693(82)90617-7.
- [15] R. Hagedorn, “Multiplicities, p_T distributions and the expected hadron-quark-gluon phase-transition”, *Riv. Nuovo Cimento* **6** (1983).
- [16] J. D. Bjorken, “Highly relativistic nucleus-nucleus collisions: the central rapidity region”, *Phys. Rev.* **D27** (1983) 140. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.27.140.

- [17] X.-N. Wang and R. C. Hwa, “Effect of jet production on the multiplicity dependence of average transverse momentum”, *Phys. Rev.* **D39** (1989) 187.
doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.39.187.
- [18] F. W. Bopp, P. Aurenche, and J. Ranft, “Transverse momenta in minimum-bias events at collider energies”, *Phys. Rev.* **D33** (1986) 1867. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.33.1867.
- [19] CDF Collaboration, “Measurement of particle production and inclusive differential cross-sections in $p\bar{p}$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 1.96$ TeV”, *Phys. Rev.* **D79** (2009) 112005, arXiv:0904.1098. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.79.112005.
- [20] Z. Koba, H. B. Nielsen, and P. Olesen, “Scaling of multiplicity distributions in high-energy hadron collisions”, *Nucl. Phys.* **B40** (1972) 317.
doi:10.1016/0550-3213(72)90551-2.
- [21] S. Hegyi, “KNO scaling 30 years later”, *Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl.* **92** (2001) 122, arXiv:hep-ph/0011301. doi:10.1016/S0920-5632(00)01026-4.
- [22] CMS Collaboration, “Track and vertex reconstruction in CMS”, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth.* **A582** (2007) 781. doi:10.1016/j.nima.2007.07.091.
- [23] CMS Collaboration, “CMS Tracking Performance Results from Early LHC Operation”, arXiv:1007.1988.
- [24] T. Sjostrand, S. Mrenna, and P. Z. Skands, “PYTHIA 6.4 Physics and Manual”, *JHEP* **05** (2006) 026, arXiv:hep-ph/0603175.
- [25] CDF Collaboration, “Charged jet evolution and the underlying event in $p\bar{p}$ collisions at 1.8 TeV”, *Phys. Rev.* **D65** (2002) 092002. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.65.092002.
- [26] P. Bartalini et al., “Multi-parton interactions and underlying events from Tevatron to LHC”, *Proceedings of the 38th International Symposium on Multiparticle Dynamics* (2008). doi:10.3204/DESY-PROC-2009-01/43.
- [27] A. Moraes, C. Buttar, and I. Dawson, “Prediction for minimum bias and the underlying event at LHC energies”, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C50** (2007) 435.
doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-007-0239-1.
- [28] A. Buckley et al., “Systematic event generator tuning for the LHC”, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C65** (2010) 331, arXiv:0907.2973. doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-009-1196-7.
- [29] P. Z. Skands, “The Perugia Tunes”, arXiv:1005.3457.
- [30] R. Engel, “Photoproduction within the two component dual parton model: amplitudes and cross-sections”, *Z. Phys.* **C66** (1995) 203. doi:10.1007/BF01496594.
- [31] R. Engel and J. Ranft, “Hadronic photon-photon interactions at high-energies”, *Phys. Rev.* **D54** (1996) 4244, arXiv:hep-ph/9509373. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.54.4244.
- [32] A. Capella et al., “Dual parton model”, *Phys. Rept.* **236** (1994) 225.
doi:10.1016/0370-1573(94)90064-7.
- [33] W. D. Walker, “Multiparton interactions and hadron structure”, *Phys. Rev.* **D69** (2004) 034007. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.69.034007.

-
- [34] S. G. Matinyan and W. D. Walker, “Multiplicity distribution and mechanisms of the high-energy hadron collisions”, *Phys. Rev.* **D59** (1999) 034022, [arXiv:hep-ph/9801219](#).
[doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.59.034022](#).
 - [35] UA5 Collaboration, “Scaling violation favoring high-multiplicity events at 540 GeV cms energy”, *Phys. Lett.* **B138** (1984) 304. [doi:10.1016/0370-2693\(84\)91666-6](#).
 - [36] UA5 Collaboration, “Scaling violations in multiplicity distributions at 200 GeV and 900 GeV”, *Phys. Lett.* **B167** (1986) 476. [doi:10.1016/0370-2693\(86\)91304-3](#).
 - [37] UA1 Collaboration, “A study of the general characteristics of $p\bar{p}$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 0.2$ TeV to 0.9 TeV”, *Nucl. Phys.* **B335** (1990) 261. [doi:10.1016/0550-3213\(90\)90493-W](#).
 - [38] T. Alexopoulos et al., “Multiplicity dependence of the transverse momentum spectrum for centrally produced hadrons in $p\bar{p}$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 1.8$ TeV”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **60** (1988) 1622. [doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.60.1622](#).
 - [39] A. Capella and A. Krzywicki, “On the correlation between transverse momentum and multiplicity of secondaries at collider energy”, *Phys. Rev.* **D29** (1984) 1007.
[doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.29.1007](#).
 - [40] UA5 Collaboration, “Charged particle correlations in $p\bar{p}$ collisions at c.m. energies of 200 GeV, 546 GeV and 900 GeV”, *Z. Phys.* **C37** (1988) 191. [doi:10.1007/BF01579906](#).
 - [41] E. Gotsman et al., “QCD motivated approach to soft interactions at high energies: nucleus-nucleus and hadron-nucleus collisions”, *Nucl. Phys.* **A842** (2010) 82,
[arXiv:0912.4689](#). [doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysa.2010.04.016](#).
 - [42] A. K. Likhoded, A. V. Luchinsky, and A. A. Novoselov, “Light hadron production in semi-inclusive pp-scattering at LHC”, [arXiv:1005.1827](#).
 - [43] A. B. Kaidalov and M. G. Poghosyan, “Predictions of quark-gluon string model for pp at LHC”, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C67** (2010) 397, [arXiv:0910.2050](#).
[doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-010-1301-y](#).
 - [44] E. Levin and A. H. Rezaeian, “Gluon saturation and inclusive hadron production at LHC”, *Phys. Rev.* **D82** (2010) 014022, [arXiv:1005.0631](#).
 - [45] T. Sjostrand, S. Mrenna, and P. Z. Skands, “A brief introduction to PYTHIA 8.1”, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **178** (2008) 852, [arXiv:0710.3820](#).
[doi:10.1016/j.cpc.2008.01.036](#).
 - [46] GEANT4 Collaboration, “GEANT4: A simulation toolkit”, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth.* **A506** (2003) 250. [doi:10.1016/S0168-9002\(03\)01368-8](#).
 - [47] CMS Collaboration, “Transverse momentum and pseudorapidity distributions of charged hadrons in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 0.9$ and 2.36 TeV”, *JHEP* **02** (2010) 041,
[arXiv:1002.0621](#). [doi:10.1007/JHEP02\(2010\)041](#).
 - [48] CMS Collaboration, “Transverse momentum and pseudorapidity distributions of charged hadrons in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105** (2010) 022002.
[doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.105.022002](#).
 - [49] F. Sikler, “Study of clustering methods to improve primary vertex finding for collider detectors”, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth.* **A621** (2010) 526.

- [50] F. Becattini et al., “Predictions of hadron abundances in pp collisions at the LHC”, arXiv:0912.2855.
- [51] UA5 Collaboration, “Particle multiplicities in $p\bar{p}$ Interactions at $\sqrt{s} = 540$ GeV”, *Phys. Lett. B* **121** (1983) 209. doi:10.1016/0370-2693(83)90916-4.
- [52] UA5 Collaboration, “Strange particle production at the CERN SPS collider”, *Phys. Lett. B* **115** (1982) 65. doi:10.1016/0370-2693(82)90515-9.
- [53] G. Cowan, “Statistical data analysis”. Oxford, UK: Clarendon, 1998.
- [54] G. Bohm and G. Zech, “Introduction to statistics and measurement analysis for physicists”. Hamburg, Germany: DESY, 2010.
- [55] G. D’Agostini, “A multidimensional unfolding method based on Bayes’ theorem”, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **362** (1995) 487. doi:10.1016/0168-9002(95)00274-X.
- [56] CMS Collaboration, “Studies of Tracker Material”, *CMS Physics Analysis Summary TRK-10-003* (2010).
- [57] ALICE Collaboration, “Charged-particle multiplicity measurement in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 0.9$ and 2.36 TeV with ALICE at LHC”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **68** (2010) 89, arXiv:1004.3034. doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-010-1339-x.
- [58] ALICE Collaboration, “Charged-particle multiplicity measurement in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV with ALICE at LHC”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **68** (2010) 345, arXiv:1004.3514. doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-010-1350-2.
- [59] T. Alexopoulos et al., “The role of double parton collisions in soft hadron interactions”, *Phys. Lett. B* **435** (1998) 453. doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(98)00921-6.
- [60] A. Giovannini and R. Ugoccioni, “Soft and semi-hard components structure in multiparticle production in high energy collisions”, *Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl.* **71** (1999) 201, arXiv:hep-ph/9710361. doi:10.1016/S0920-5632(98)00343-0.
- [61] L. McLerran and M. Praszalowicz, “Saturation and scaling of multiplicity, mean p_T and p_T distributions from $200 \text{ GeV} < \sqrt{s} < 7 \text{ TeV}$ ”, *Acta Phys. Polon.* **B41** (2010) 1917, arXiv:1006.4293.
- [62] A. M. Polyakov, “A similarity hypothesis in the strong interactions. I. Multiple-hadron production in e^+e^- annihilation”, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **32** (1971) 296.
- [63] A. M. Polyakov, “A similarity hypothesis in the strong interactions. II. Cascade production of hadrons and their energy distribution associated with e^+e^- annihilation”, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **33** (1971) 850.
- [64] S. J. Orfanidis and V. Rittenberg, “On the connection between branching processes and scale invariant field theory for e^+e^- annihilation”, *Phys. Rev. D* **10** (1974) 2892. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.10.2892.
- [65] G. Cohen-Tannoudji and W. Ochs, “Jet model with exclusive parton hadron duality”, *Z. Phys.* **C39** (1988) 513. doi:10.1007/BF01555980.
- [66] Y. L. Dokshitzer, “Improved QCD treatment of the KNO phenomenon”, *Phys. Lett. B* **305** (1993) 295. doi:10.1016/0370-2693(93)90121-W.

-
- [67] S. Carius and G. Ingelman, "The Log normal distribution for cascade multiplicities in hadron collisions", *Phys. Lett.* **B252** (1990) 647.
doi:10.1016/0370-2693(90)90500-6.
 - [68] R. Szwed and G. Wrochna, "Scaling predictions for multiplicity distributions at LEP", *Z. Phys.* **C47** (1990) 449. doi:10.1007/BF01565866.
 - [69] M. Gazdzicki et al., "Scaling of multiplicity distributions and collision dynamics in e^+e^- and pp interactions", *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A6** (1991) 981.
doi:10.1142/S0217732391001032.
 - [70] EHS/NA22 Collaboration, "Phase space dependence of the multiplicity distribution in π^+p and pp collisions at 250 GeV/c", *Z. Phys.* **C37** (1988) 215.
doi:10.1007/BF01579907.
 - [71] UA5 Collaboration, "An investigation of multiplicity distributions in different pseudorapidity intervals in $p\bar{p}$ reactions at a cms energy of 540 GeV", *Phys. Lett.* **B160** (1985) 193. doi:10.1016/0370-2693(85)91491-1.
 - [72] UA5 Collaboration, "Charged-particle multiplicity distributions at 200 GeV and 900 GeV center-of-mass energy", *Z. Phys.* **C43** (1989) 357. doi:10.1007/BF01506531.
 - [73] DELPHI Collaboration, "Charged particle multiplicity distributions for fixed number of jets in Z^0 hadronic decays", *Z. Phys.* **C56** (1992) 63. doi:10.1007/BF01589707.
 - [74] DELPHI Collaboration, "Charged particle multiplicity distributions in restricted rapidity intervals in Z^0 hadronic decays", *Z. Phys.* **C52** (1991) 271.
doi:10.1007/BF01560444.
 - [75] ALEPH Collaboration, "Measurement of the charged particle multiplicity distribution in hadronic Z decays", *Phys. Lett.* **B273** (1991) 181.
doi:10.1016/0370-2693(91)90575-B.
 - [76] ALEPH Collaboration, "Measurements of the charged particle multiplicity distribution in restricted rapidity intervals", *Z. Phys.* **C69** (1995) 15. doi:10.1007/s002880050002.
 - [77] OPAL Collaboration, "A Study of charged-particle multiplicities in hadronic decays of the Z^0 ", *Z. Phys.* **C53** (1992) 539. doi:10.1007/BF01559731.
 - [78] Aachen-CERN-Heidelberg-Munich Collaboration, "Charged-particle multiplicity distributions in pp collisions at ISR energies", *Nucl. Phys.* **B129** (1977) 365.
doi:10.1016/0550-3213(77)90122-5.
 - [79] Ames-Bologna-CERN-Dortmund-Heidelberg-Warsaw Collaboration, "Charged multiplicity distribution in pp interactions at ISR energies", *Phys. Rev.* **D30** (1984) 528.
doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.30.528.
 - [80] NA22 Collaboration, "Rapidity dependence of negative and all charged multiplicities in non-diffractive π^+p and pp collisions at 250 GeV/c", *Phys. Lett.* **B177** (1986) 239.
doi:10.1016/0370-2693(86)91064-6.
 - [81] CDF Collaboration, "Soft and hard interactions in $p\bar{p}$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 1800$ GeV and 630 GeV", *Phys. Rev.* **D65** (2002) 072005. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.65.072005.

- [82] C. Fuglesang, “UA5 multiplicity distributions and fits of various functions”, in *Multiparticle Dynamics: Festschrift for Léon Van Hove*, A. Giovannini and W. Kittel, eds., p. 193. Singapore: World Scientific, 1990.
- [83] V. A. Abramovskii and O. V. Kancheli, “Regge branching and distribution of hadron multiplicity at high energies”, *Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **15** (1972) 559.
- [84] P. Aurenche et al., “Multiparticle production in a two-component dual parton model”, *Phys. Rev.* **D45** (1992) 92. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.45.92.
- [85] UA1 Collaboration, “Charged-particle multiplicity distributions in proton anti-proton collisions at 540 GeV center-of-mass energy”, *Phys. Lett.* **B123** (1983) 108. doi:10.1016/0370-2693(83)90969-3.
- [86] CDF Collaboration, “Multiplicity distributions in $p\bar{p}$ interactions at $\sqrt{s} = 1800$ GeV”, *23rd International symposium on multiparticle dynamics : proceedings* (1993) 400.
- [87] H1 Collaboration, “Charged-particle multiplicities in deep inelastic scattering at HERA”, *Z. Phys.* **C72** (1996) 573, arXiv:hep-ex/9608011. doi:10.1007/s002880050280.

A The CMS Collaboration

Yerevan Physics Institute, Yerevan, Armenia

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

Institut für Hochenergiephysik der OeAW, Wien, Austria

W. Adam, T. Bergauer, M. Dragicevic, J. Erö, C. Fabjan, M. Friedl, R. Frühwirth, V.M. Ghete, J. Hammer¹, S. Häseler, C. Hartl, M. Hoch, N. Hörmann, J. Hrubec, M. Jeitler, G. Kasieczka, W. Kiesenhofer, M. Krammer, D. Liko, I. Mikulec, M. Pernicka, H. Rohringer, R. Schöfbeck, J. Strauss, A. Taurok, F. Teischinger, W. Waltenberger, G. Walzel, E. Widl, C.-E. Wulz

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

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

Universiteit Antwerpen, Antwerpen, Belgium

L. Benucci, L. Ceard, K. Cerny, E.A. De Wolf, X. Janssen, T. Maes, L. Mucibello, S. Ochesanu, B. Roland, R. Rougny, M. Selvaggi, H. Van Haevermaet, P. Van Mechelen, N. Van Remortel

Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussel, Belgium

V. Adler, S. Beauceron, F. Blekman, S. Blyweert, J. D'Hondt, O. Devroede, A. Kalogeropoulos, J. Maes, M. Maes, S. Tavernier, W. Van Doninck, P. Van Mulders, G.P. Van Onsem, I. Villella

Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium

O. Charaf, B. Clerbaux, G. De Lentdecker, V. Dero, A.P.R. Gay, G.H. Hammad, T. Hreus, P.E. Marage, L. Thomas, C. Vander Velde, P. Vanlaer, J. Wickens

Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

S. Costantini, M. Grunewald, B. Klein, A. Marinov, D. Ryckbosch, F. Thyssen, M. Tytgat, L. Vanelderen, P. Verwilligen, S. Walsh, N. Zaganidis

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

S. Basegmez, G. Bruno, J. Caudron, J. De Favereau De Jeneret, C. Delaere, P. Demin, D. Favart, A. Giammanco, G. Grégoire, J. Hollar, V. Lemaitre, J. Liao, O. Militaru, S. Ovyn, D. Pagano, A. Pin, K. Piotrkowski, L. Quertenmont, N. Schul

Université de Mons, Mons, Belgium

N. Bely, T. Caebergs, E. Daubie

Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Físicas, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

G.A. Alves, D. De Jesus Damiao, M.E. Pol, M.H.G. Souza

Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

W. Carvalho, E.M. Da Costa, C. De Oliveira Martins, S. Fonseca De Souza, L. Mundim, H. Nogima, V. Oguri, W.L. Prado Da Silva, A. Santoro, S.M. Silva Do Amaral, A. Sznajder, F. Torres Da Silva De Araujo

Instituto de Física Teórica, Universidade Estadual Paulista, Sao Paulo, Brazil

F.A. Dias, M.A.F. Dias, T.R. Fernandez Perez Tomei, E. M. Gregores², F. Marinho, S.F. Novaes, Sandra S. Padula

Institute for Nuclear Research and Nuclear Energy, Sofia, Bulgaria

N. Darmanov¹, L. Dimitrov, V. Genchev¹, P. Iaydjiev¹, S. Piperov, M. Rodozov, S. Stoykova, G. Sultanov, V. Tcholakov, R. Trayanov, I. Vankov

University of Sofia, Sofia, Bulgaria

M. Dyulendarova, R. Hadjiiska, V. Kozhuharov, L. Litov, E. Marinova, M. Mateev, B. Pavlov, P. Petkov

Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing, China

J.G. Bian, G.M. Chen, H.S. Chen, C.H. Jiang, D. Liang, S. Liang, J. Wang, J. Wang, X. Wang, Z. Wang, M. Yang, J. Zang, Z. Zhang

State Key Lab. of Nucl. Phys. and Tech., Peking University, Beijing, China

Y. Ban, S. Guo, W. Li, Y. Mao, S.J. Qian, H. Teng, B. Zhu

Universidad de Los Andes, Bogota, Colombia

A. Cabrera, B. Gomez Moreno, A.A. Ocampo Rios, A.F. Osorio Oliveros, J.C. Sanabria

Technical University of Split, Split, Croatia

N. Godinovic, D. Lelas, K. Lelas, R. Plestina³, D. Polic, I. Puljak

University of Split, Split, Croatia

Z. Antunovic, M. Dzelalija

Institute Rudjer Boskovic, Zagreb, Croatia

V. Brigljevic, S. Duric, K. Kadija, S. Morovic

University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus

A. Attikis, R. Fereos, M. Galanti, J. Mousa, C. Nicolaou, F. Ptochos, P.A. Razis, H. Rykaczewski

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

Y. Assran⁴, M.A. Mahmoud⁵

National Institute of Chemical Physics and Biophysics, Tallinn, Estonia

A. Hektor, M. Kadastik, K. Kannike, M. Müntel, M. Raidal, L. Rebane

Department of Physics, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

V. Azzolini, P. Eerola

Helsinki Institute of Physics, Helsinki, Finland

S. Czellar, J. Härkönen, A. Heikkinen, V. Karimäki, R. Kinnunen, J. Klem, M.J. Kortelainen, T. Lampén, K. Lassila-Perini, S. Lehti, T. Lindén, P. Luukka, T. Mäenpää, E. Tuominen, J. Tuominiemi, E. Tuovinen, D. Ungaro, L. Wendland

Lappeenranta University of Technology, Lappeenranta, Finland

K. Banzuzi, A. Korpela, T. Tuuva

Laboratoire d'Annecy-le-Vieux de Physique des Particules, IN2P3-CNRS, Annecy-le-Vieux, France

D. Sillou

DSM/IRFU, CEA/Saclay, Gif-sur-Yvette, France

M. Besancon, M. Dejardin, D. Denegri, B. Fabbro, J.L. Faure, F. Ferri, S. Ganjour, F.X. Gentit, A. Givernaud, P. Gras, G. Hamel de Monchenault, P. Jarry, E. Locci, J. Malcles, M. Marionneau, L. Millischer, J. Rander, A. Rosowsky, I. Shreyber, M. Titov, P. Verrecchia

Laboratoire Leprince-Ringuet, Ecole Polytechnique, IN2P3-CNRS, Palaiseau, France

S. Baffioni, F. Beaudette, L. Bianchini, M. Bluj⁶, C. Broutin, P. Busson, C. Charlot, L. Dobrzynski, R. Granier de Cassagnac, M. Haguenauer, P. Miné, C. Mironov, C. Ochando, P. Paganini, S. Porteboeuf, D. Sabes, R. Salerno, Y. Sirois, C. Thiebaux, B. Wyslouch⁷, A. Zabi

Institut Pluridisciplinaire Hubert Curien, Université de Strasbourg, Université de Haute Alsace Mulhouse, CNRS/IN2P3, Strasbourg, France

J.-L. Agram⁸, J. Andrea, A. Besson, D. Bloch, D. Bodin, J.-M. Brom, M. Cardaci, E.C. Chabert, C. Collard, E. Conte⁸, F. Drouhin⁸, C. Ferro, J.-C. Fontaine⁸, D. Gelé, U. Goerlach, S. Greder, P. Juillot, M. Karim⁸, A.-C. Le Bihan, Y. Mikami, P. Van Hove

Centre de Calcul de l'Institut National de Physique Nucleaire et de Physique des Particules (IN2P3), Villeurbanne, France

F. Fassi, D. Mercier

Université de Lyon, Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, CNRS-IN2P3, Institut de Physique Nucléaire de Lyon, Villeurbanne, France

C. Baty, N. Beaupere, M. Bedjidian, O. Bondu, G. Boudoul, D. Boumediene, H. Brun, N. Chanon, R. Chierici, D. Contardo, P. Depasse, H. El Mamouni, A. Falkiewicz, J. Fay, S. Gascon, B. Ille, T. Kurca, T. Le Grand, M. Lethuillier, L. Mirabito, S. Perries, V. Sordini, S. Tosi, Y. Tschudi, P. Verdier, H. Xiao

E. Andronikashvili Institute of Physics, Academy of Science, Tbilisi, Georgia

V. Roinishvili

RWTH Aachen University, I. Physikalisches Institut, Aachen, Germany

G. Anagnostou, M. Edelhoff, L. Feld, N. Heracleous, O. Hindrichs, R. Jussen, K. Klein, J. Merz, N. Mohr, A. Ostapchuk, A. Perieanu, F. Raupach, J. Sammet, S. Schael, D. Sprenger, H. Weber, M. Weber, B. Wittmer

RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut A, Aachen, Germany

M. Ata, W. Bender, M. Erdmann, J. Frangenheim, T. Hebbeker, A. Hinzmann, K. Hoepfner, C. Hof, T. Klimkovich, D. Klingebiel, P. Kreuzer¹, D. Lanske[†], C. Magass, G. Masetti, M. Merschmeyer, A. Meyer, P. Papacz, H. Pieta, H. Reithler, S.A. Schmitz, L. Sonnenschein, J. Steggemann, D. Teyssier

RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut B, Aachen, Germany

M. Bontenackels, M. Davids, M. Duda, G. Flügge, H. Geenen, M. Giffels, W. Haj Ahmad, D. Heydhausen, T. Kress, Y. Kuessel, A. Linn, A. Nowack, L. Perchalla, O. Pooth, J. Rennefeld, P. Sauerland, A. Stahl, M. Thomas, D. Tornier, M.H. Zoeller

Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Hamburg, Germany

M. Aldaya Martin, W. Behrenhoff, U. Behrens, M. Bergholz⁹, K. Borras, A. Cakir, A. Campbell, E. Castro, D. Dammann, G. Eckerlin, D. Eckstein, A. Flossdorf, G. Flucke, A. Geiser, I. Glushkov, J. Hauk, H. Jung, M. Kasemann, I. Katkov, P. Katsas, C. Kleinwort, H. Kluge, A. Knutsson, D. Krücker, E. Kuznetsova, W. Lange, W. Lohmann⁹, R. Mankel, M. Marienfeld, I.-A. Melzer-Pellmann, A.B. Meyer, J. Mnich, A. Mussgiller, J. Olzem, A. Parenti, A. Raspereza, A. Raval, R. Schmidt⁹, T. Schoerner-Sadenius, N. Sen, M. Stein, J. Tomaszewska, D. Volyanskyy, R. Walsh, C. Wissing

University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany

C. Autermann, S. Bobrovskiy, J. Draeger, H. Enderle, U. Gebbert, K. Kaschube, G. Kaussen, R. Klanner, B. Mura, S. Naumann-Emme, F. Nowak, N. Pietsch, C. Sander, H. Schettler, P. Schleper, M. Schröder, T. Schum, J. Schwandt, A.K. Srivastava, H. Stadie, G. Steinbrück, J. Thomsen, R. Wolf

Institut für Experimentelle Kernphysik, Karlsruhe, Germany

J. Bauer, V. Buege, T. Chwalek, W. De Boer, A. Dierlamm, G. Dirkes, M. Feindt, J. Gruschke, C. Hackstein, F. Hartmann, S.M. Heindl, M. Heinrich, H. Held, K.H. Hoffmann, S. Honc,

T. Kuhr, D. Martschei, S. Mueller, Th. Müller, M. Niegel, O. Oberst, A. Oehler, J. Ott, T. Peiffer, D. Piparo, G. Quast, K. Rabbertz, F. Ratnikov, M. Renz, C. Saout, A. Scheurer, P. Schieferdecker, F.-P. Schilling, G. Schott, H.J. Simonis, F.M. Stober, D. Troendle, J. Wagner-Kuhr, M. Zeise, V. Zhukov¹⁰, E.B. Ziebarth

Institute of Nuclear Physics "Demokritos", Aghia Paraskevi, Greece

G. Daskalakis, T. Gerasis, S. Kesisoglou, A. Kyriakis, D. Loukas, I. Manolagos, A. Markou, C. Markou, C. Mavrommatis, E. Petrakou

University of Athens, Athens, Greece

L. Gouskos, T.J. Mertzimekis, A. Panagiotou¹

University of Ioánnina, Ioánnina, Greece

I. Evangelou, C. Foudas, P. Kokkas, N. Manthos, I. Papadopoulos, V. Patras, F.A. Triantis

KFKI Research Institute for Particle and Nuclear Physics, Budapest, Hungary

A. Aranyi, G. Bencze, L. Boldizsar, G. Debreczeni, C. Hajdu¹, D. Horvath¹¹, A. Kapusi, K. Krajczar¹², A. Laszlo, F. Sikler, G. Vesztergombi¹²

Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary

N. Beni, J. Molnar, J. Palinkas, Z. Szillasi, V. Veszpremi

University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary

P. Raics, Z.L. Trocsanyi, B. Ujvari

Panjab University, Chandigarh, India

S. Bansal, S.B. Beri, V. Bhatnagar, N. Dhingra, M. Jindal, M. Kaur, J.M. Kohli, M.Z. Mehta, N. Nishu, L.K. Saini, A. Sharma, A.P. Singh, J.B. Singh, S.P. Singh

University of Delhi, Delhi, India

S. Ahuja, S. Bhattacharya, B.C. Choudhary, P. Gupta, S. Jain, S. Jain, A. Kumar, R.K. Shivpuri

Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, Mumbai, India

R.K. Choudhury, D. Dutta, S. Kailas, S.K. Kataria, A.K. Mohanty¹, L.M. Pant, P. Shukla, P. Suggiseti

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research - EHEP, Mumbai, India

T. Aziz, M. Guchait¹³, A. Gurtu, M. Maity¹⁴, D. Majumder, G. Majumder, K. Mazumdar, G.B. Mohanty, A. Saha, K. Sudhakar, N. Wickramage

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research - HECR, Mumbai, India

S. Banerjee, S. Dugad, N.K. Mondal

Institute for Studies in Theoretical Physics & Mathematics (IPM), Tehran, Iran

H. Arfaei, H. Bakhshiansohi, S.M. Etesami, A. Fahim, M. Hashemi, A. Jafari, M. Khakzad, A. Mohammadi, M. Mohammadi Najafabadi, S. Paktinat Mehdiabadi, B. Safarzadeh, M. Zeinali

INFN Sezione di Bari ^a, Università di Bari ^b, Politecnico di Bari ^c, Bari, Italy

M. Abbrescia^{a,b}, L. Barbone^{a,b}, C. Calabria^{a,b}, A. Colaleo^a, D. Creanza^{a,c}, N. De Filippis^{a,c}, M. De Palma^{a,b}, A. Dimitrov^a, F. Fedele^a, L. Fiore^a, G. Iaselli^{a,c}, L. Lusito^{a,b,1}, G. Maggi^{a,c}, M. Maggi^a, N. Manna^{a,b}, B. Marangelli^{a,b}, S. My^{a,c}, S. Nuzzo^{a,b}, N. Pacifico^{a,b}, G.A. Pierro^a, A. Pompili^{a,b}, G. Pugliese^{a,c}, F. Romano^{a,c}, G. Roselli^{a,b}, G. Selvaggi^{a,b}, L. Silvestris^a, R. Trentadue^a, S. Tupputi^{a,b}, G. Zito^a

INFN Sezione di Bologna ^a, Università di Bologna ^b, Bologna, Italy

G. Abbiendi^a, A.C. Benvenuti^a, D. Bonacorsi^a, S. Braibant-Giacomelli^{a,b}, P. Capiluppi^{a,b}, A. Castro^{a,b}, F.R. Cavallo^a, M. Cuffiani^{a,b}, G.M. Dallavalle^a, F. Fabbri^a, A. Fanfani^{a,b}, D. Fasanella^a, P. Giacomelli^a, M. Giunta^a, C. Grandi^a, S. Marcellini^a, M. Meneghelli^{a,b}, A. Montanari^a, F.L. Navarria^{a,b}, F. Odorici^a, A. Perrotta^a, A.M. Rossi^{a,b}, T. Rovelli^{a,b}, G. Siroli^{a,b}, R. Travaglini^{a,b}

INFN Sezione di Catania ^a, Università di Catania ^b, Catania, Italy

S. Albergo^{a,b}, G. Cappello^{a,b}, M. Chiorboli^{a,b,1}, S. Costa^{a,b}, A. Tricomi^{a,b}, C. Tuve^a

INFN Sezione di Firenze ^a, Università di Firenze ^b, Firenze, Italy

G. Barbagli^a, V. Ciulli^{a,b}, C. Civinini^a, R. D'Alessandro^{a,b}, E. Focardi^{a,b}, S. Frosali^{a,b}, E. Gallo^a, C. Genta^a, P. Lenzi^{a,b}, M. Meschini^a, S. Paoletti^a, G. Sguazzoni^a, A. Tropiano^{a,1}

INFN Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, Frascati, Italy

L. Benussi, S. Bianco, S. Colafranceschi¹⁵, F. Fabbri, D. Piccolo

INFN Sezione di Genova, Genova, Italy

P. Fabbriatore, R. Musenich

INFN Sezione di Milano-Bicocca ^a, Università di Milano-Bicocca ^b, Milano, Italy

A. Benaglia^{a,b}, G.B. Cerati^{a,b}, F. De Guio^{a,b,1}, L. Di Matteo^{a,b}, A. Ghezzi^{a,b,1}, M. Malberti^{a,b}, S. Malvezzi^a, A. Martelli^{a,b}, A. Massironi^{a,b}, D. Menasce^a, L. Moroni^a, M. Paganoni^{a,b}, D. Pedrini^a, S. Ragazzi^{a,b}, N. Redaelli^a, S. Sala^a, T. Tabarelli de Fatis^{a,b}, V. Tancini^{a,b}

INFN Sezione di Napoli ^a, Università di Napoli "Federico II" ^b, Napoli, Italy

S. Buontempo^a, C.A. Carrillo Montoya^a, A. Cimmino^{a,b}, A. De Cosa^{a,b}, M. De Gruttola^{a,b}, F. Fabozzi^{a,16}, A.O.M. Iorio^a, L. Lista^a, M. Merola^{a,b}, P. Noli^{a,b}, P. Paolucci^a

INFN Sezione di Padova ^a, Università di Padova ^b, Università di Trento (Trento) ^c, Padova, Italy

P. Azzi^a, N. Bacchetta^a, P. Bellan^{a,b}, M. Biasotto^{a,17}, D. Bisello^{a,b}, A. Branca^a, R. Carlin^{a,b}, P. Checchia^a, E. Conti^a, M. De Mattia^{a,b}, T. Dorigo^a, F. Fanzago^a, F. Gasparini^{a,b}, P. Giubilato^{a,b}, A. Gresele^{a,c}, S. Lacaprara^{a,17}, I. Lazzizzera^{a,c}, M. Margoni^{a,b}, A.T. Meneguzzo^{a,b}, M. Nespolo^a, L. Perrozzi^{a,1}, N. Pozzobon^{a,b}, P. Ronchese^{a,b}, F. Simonetto^{a,b}, E. Torassa^a, M. Tosi^{a,b}, S. Vanini^{a,b}, S. Ventura^a, P. Zotto^{a,b}, G. Zumerle^{a,b}

INFN Sezione di Pavia ^a, Università di Pavia ^b, Pavia, Italy

P. Baesso^{a,b}, U. Berzano^a, C. Riccardi^{a,b}, P. Torre^{a,b}, P. Vitulo^{a,b}, C. Viviani^{a,b}

INFN Sezione di Perugia ^a, Università di Perugia ^b, Perugia, Italy

M. Biasini^{a,b}, G.M. Bilei^a, B. Caponeri^{a,b}, L. Fano^{a,b}, P. Lariccia^{a,b}, A. Lucaroni^{a,b,1}, G. Mantovani^{a,b}, M. Menichelli^a, A. Nappi^{a,b}, A. Santocchia^{a,b}, L. Servoli^a, S. Taroni^{a,b}, M. Valdata^{a,b}, R. Volpe^{a,b,1}

INFN Sezione di Pisa ^a, Università di Pisa ^b, Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa ^c, Pisa, Italy

P. Azzurri^{a,c}, G. Bagliesi^a, J. Bernardini^{a,b}, T. Boccali^{a,1}, G. Broccolo^{a,c}, R. Castaldi^a, R.T. D'Agnolo^{a,c}, R. Dell'Orso^a, F. Fiori^{a,b}, L. Foà^{a,c}, A. Giassi^a, A. Kraan^a, F. Ligabue^{a,c}, T. Lomtadze^a, L. Martini^a, A. Messineo^{a,b}, F. Palla^a, F. Palmonari^a, S. Sarkar^{a,c}, G. Segneri^a, A.T. Serban^a, P. Spagnolo^a, R. Tenchini^a, G. Tonelli^{a,b,1}, A. Venturi^{a,1}, P.G. Verdini^a

INFN Sezione di Roma ^a, Università di Roma "La Sapienza" ^b, Roma, Italy

L. Barone^{a,b}, F. Cavallari^a, D. Del Re^{a,b}, E. Di Marco^{a,b}, M. Diemoz^a, D. Franci^{a,b}, M. Grassi^a, E. Longo^{a,b}, G. Organtini^{a,b}, A. Palma^{a,b}, F. Pandolfi^{a,b,1}, R. Paramatti^a, S. Rahatlou^{a,b}

INFN Sezione di Torino ^a, Università di Torino ^b, Università del Piemonte Orientale (Novara) ^c, Torino, Italy

N. Amapane^{a,b}, R. Arcidiacono^{a,c}, S. Argiro^{a,b}, M. Arneodo^{a,c}, C. Biino^a, C. Botta^{a,b,1}, N. Cartiglia^a, R. Castello^{a,b}, M. Costa^{a,b}, N. Demaria^a, A. Graziano^{a,b,1}, C. Mariotti^a, M. Marone^{a,b}, S. Maselli^a, E. Migliore^{a,b}, G. Mila^{a,b}, V. Monaco^{a,b}, M. Musich^{a,b}, M.M. Obertino^{a,c}, N. Pastrone^a, M. Pelliccioni^{a,b,1}, A. Romero^{a,b}, M. Ruspa^{a,c}, R. Sacchi^{a,b}, V. Sola^{a,b}, A. Solano^{a,b}, A. Staiano^a, D. Trocino^{a,b}, A. Vilela Pereira^{a,b,1}

INFN Sezione di Trieste ^a, Università di Trieste ^b, Trieste, Italy

F. Ambroglini^{a,b}, S. Belforte^a, F. Cossutti^a, G. Della Ricca^{a,b}, B. Gobbo^a, D. Montanino^{a,b}, A. Penzo^a

Kangwon National University, Chunchon, Korea

S.G. Heo

Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea

S. Chang, J. Chung, D.H. Kim, G.N. Kim, J.E. Kim, D.J. Kong, H. Park, D. Son, D.C. Son

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

Zero Kim, J.Y. Kim, S. Song

Korea University, Seoul, Korea

S. Choi, B. Hong, M. Jo, H. Kim, J.H. Kim, T.J. Kim, K.S. Lee, D.H. Moon, S.K. Park, H.B. Rhee, E. Seo, S. Shin, K.S. Sim

University of Seoul, Seoul, Korea

M. Choi, S. Kang, H. Kim, C. Park, I.C. Park, S. Park, G. Ryu

Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon, Korea

Y. Choi, Y.K. Choi, J. Goh, J. Lee, S. Lee, H. Seo, I. Yu

Vilnius University, Vilnius, Lithuania

M.J. Bilinskas, I. Grigalionis, M. Janulis, D. Martisiute, P. Petrov, T. Sabonis

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

H. Castilla Valdez, E. De La Cruz Burelo, R. Lopez-Fernandez, A. Sánchez Hernández, L.M. Villasenor-Cendejas

Universidad Iberoamericana, Mexico City, Mexico

S. Carrillo Moreno, F. Vazquez Valencia

Benemerita Universidad Autonoma de Puebla, Puebla, Mexico

H.A. Salazar Ibarguen

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

E. Casimiro Linares, A. Morelos Pineda, M.A. Reyes-Santos

University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

P. Allfrey, D. Krofcheck, J. Tam

University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand

P.H. Butler, R. Doesburg, H. Silverwood

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

M. Ahmad, I. Ahmed, M.I. Asghar, H.R. Hoorani, W.A. Khan, T. Khurshid, S. Qazi

Institute of Experimental Physics, Warsaw, Poland

M. Cwiok, W. Dominik, K. Doroba, A. Kalinowski, M. Konecki, J. Krolikowski

Soltan Institute for Nuclear Studies, Warsaw, Poland

T. Frueboes, R. Gokieli, M. Górski, M. Kazana, K. Nawrocki, K. Romanowska-Rybinska, M. Szleper, G. Wrochna, P. Zalewski

Laboratório de Instrumentação e Física Experimental de Partículas, Lisboa, Portugal

N. Almeida, A. David, P. Faccioli, P.G. Ferreira Parracho, M. Gallinaro, P. Martins, P. Musella, A. Nayak, P.Q. Ribeiro, J. Seixas, P. Silva, J. Varela¹, H.K. Wöhri

Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia

I. Belotelov, P. Bunin, M. Finger, M. Finger Jr., I. Golutvin, A. Kamenev, V. Karjavin, G. Kozlov, A. Lanev, P. Moisenz, V. Palichik, V. Perelygin, S. Shmatov, V. Smirnov, A. Volodko, A. Zarubin

Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, Gatchina (St Petersburg), Russia

N. Bondar, V. Golovtsov, Y. Ivanov, V. Kim, P. Levchenko, V. Murzin, V. Oreshkin, I. Smirnov, V. Sulimov, L. Uvarov, S. Vasilov, A. Vorobyev

Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia

Yu. Andreev, S. Gninenko, N. Golubev, M. Kirsanov, N. Krasnikov, V. Matveev, A. Pashenkov, A. Toropin, S. Troitsky

Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia

V. Epshteyn, V. Gavrilov, V. Kaftanov[†], M. Kossov¹, A. Krokhotin, N. Lychkovskaya, G. Safronov, S. Semenov, V. Stolin, E. Vlasov, A. Zhokin

Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia

E. Boos, M. Dubinin¹⁸, L. Dudko, A. Ershov, A. Gribushin, O. Kodolova, I. Lokhtin, S. Obraztsov, S. Petrushanko, L. Sarycheva, V. Savrin, A. Snigirev

P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia

V. Andreev, M. Azarkin, I. Dremin, M. Kirakosyan, S.V. Rusakov, A. Vinogradov

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

I. Azhgirey, S. Bitioukov, V. Grishin¹, V. Kachanov, D. Konstantinov, A. Korablev, V. Krychkin, V. Petrov, R. Ryutin, S. Slabospitsky, A. Sobol, L. Tourtchanovitch, S. Troshin, N. Tyurin, A. Uzunian, A. Volkov

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

P. Adzic¹⁹, M. Djordjevic, D. Krpic¹⁹, J. Milosevic

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

M. Aguilar-Benitez, J. Alcaraz Maestre, P. Arce, C. Battilana, E. Calvo, M. Cepeda, M. Cerrada, N. Colino, B. De La Cruz, C. Diez Pardos, C. Fernandez Bedoya, J.P. Fernández Ramos, A. Ferrando, J. Flix, M.C. Fouz, P. Garcia-Abia, O. Gonzalez Lopez, S. Goy Lopez, J.M. Hernandez, M.I. Josa, G. Merino, J. Puerta Pelayo, I. Redondo, L. Romero, J. Santaolalla, C. Willmott

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain

C. Albajar, G. Codispoti, J.F. de Trocóniz

Universidad de Oviedo, Oviedo, Spain

J. Cuevas, J. Fernandez Menendez, S. Folgueras, I. Gonzalez Caballero, L. Lloret Iglesias, J.M. Vizan Garcia

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

J.A. Brochero Cifuentes, I.J. Cabrillo, A. Calderon, M. Chamizo Llatas, S.H. Chuang, J. Duarte Campderros, M. Felcini²⁰, M. Fernandez, G. Gomez, J. Gonzalez Sanchez, R. Gonzalez Suarez, C. Jorda, P. Lobelle Pardo, A. Lopez Virto, J. Marco, R. Marco, C. Martinez Rivero, F. Matorras, F.J. Munoz Sanchez, J. Piedra Gomez²¹, T. Rodrigo, A. Ruiz Jimeno, L. Scodellaro, M. Sobron Sanudo, I. Vila, R. Vilar Cortabitarte

CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland

D. Abbaneo, E. Auffray, G. Auzinger, P. Baillon, A.H. Ball, D. Barney, A.J. Bell²², D. Benedetti, C. Bernet³, W. Bialas, P. Bloch, A. Bocci, S. Bolognesi, H. Breuker, G. Bruna, K. Bunkowski, T. Camporesi, E. Cano, G. Cerminara, T. Christiansen, J.A. Coarasa Perez, R. Covarelli, B. Curé, D. D'Enterria, T. Dahms, A. De Roeck, F. Duarte Ramos, A. Elliott-Peisert, W. Funk, A. Gaddi, S. Gennai, G. Georgiou, H. Gerwig, D. Gigi, K. Gill, D. Giordano, F. Glege, R. Gomez-Reino Garrido, M. Gouzevitch, P. Govoni, S. Gowdy, L. Guiducci, M. Hansen, J. Harvey, J. Hegeman, B. Hegner, C. Henderson, H.F. Hoffmann, A. Honma, V. Innocente, P. Janot, E. Karavakis, P. Lecoq, C. Leonidopoulos, C. Lourenço, A. Macpherson, T. Mäki, L. Malgeri, M. Mannelli, L. Masetti, F. Meijers, S. Mersi, E. Meschi, R. Moser, M.U. Mozer, M. Mulders, E. Nesvold¹, M. Nguyen, T. Orimoto, L. Orsini, E. Perez, A. Petrilli, A. Pfeiffer, M. Pierini, M. Pimiä, G. Polese, A. Racz, G. Rolandi²³, T. Rommerskirchen, C. Rovelli²⁴, M. Rovere, H. Sakulin, C. Schäfer, C. Schwick, I. Segoni, A. Sharma, P. Siegrist, M. Simon, P. Sphicas²⁵, D. Spiga, M. Spiropulu¹⁸, F. Stöckli, M. Stoye, P. Tropea, A. Tsiros, A. Tsyganov, G.I. Veres¹², P. Vichoudis, M. Voutilainen, W.D. Zeuner

Paul Scherrer Institut, Villigen, Switzerland

W. Bertl, K. Deiters, W. Erdmann, K. Gabathuler, R. Horisberger, Q. Ingram, H.C. Kaestli, S. König, D. Kotlinski, U. Langenegger, F. Meier, D. Renker, T. Rohe, J. Sibille²⁶, A. Starodumov²⁷

Institute for Particle Physics, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

P. Bortignon, L. Caminada²⁸, Z. Chen, S. Cittolin, G. Dissertori, M. Dittmar, J. Eugster, K. Freudenreich, C. Grab, A. Hervé, W. Hintz, P. Lecomte, W. Lustermann, C. Marchica²⁸, P. Martinez Ruiz del Arbol, P. Meridiani, P. Milenovic²⁹, F. Moortgat, P. Nef, F. Nessi-Tedaldi, L. Pape, F. Pauss, T. Punz, A. Rizzi, F.J. Ronga, L. Sala, A.K. Sanchez, M.-C. Sawley, B. Stieger, L. Tauscher[†], A. Thea, K. Theofilatos, D. Treille, C. Urscheler, R. Wallny²⁰, M. Weber, L. Wehrli, J. Weng

Universität Zürich, Zurich, Switzerland

E. Aguiló, C. Amsler, V. Chiochia, S. De Visscher, C. Favaro, M. Ivova Rikova, B. Millan Mejias, C. Regenfus, P. Robmann, A. Schmidt, H. Snoek, L. Wilke

National Central University, Chung-Li, Taiwan

Y.H. Chang, K.H. Chen, W.T. Chen, S. Dutta, A. Go, C.M. Kuo, S.W. Li, W. Lin, M.H. Liu, Z.K. Liu, Y.J. Lu, J.H. Wu, S.S. Yu

National Taiwan University (NTU), Taipei, Taiwan

P. Bartalini, P. Chang, Y.H. Chang, Y.W. Chang, Y. Chao, K.F. Chen, W.-S. Hou, Y. Hsiung, K.Y. Kao, Y.J. Lei, R.-S. Lu, J.G. Shiu, Y.M. Tzeng, M. Wang

Cukurova University, Adana, Turkey

A. Adiguzel, M.N. Bakirci, S. Cerci³⁰, C. Dozen, I. Dumanoglu, E. Eskut, S. Girgis, G. Gökbulut, Y. Güler, E. Gurpinar, I. Hos, E.E. Kangal, T. Karaman, A. Kayis Topaksu, A. Nart, G. Önengüt, K. Ozdemir, S. Ozturk, A. Polatöz, K. Sogut³¹, B. Tali, H. Topakli, D. Uzun, L.N. Vergili, M. Vergili, C. Zorbilmez

Middle East Technical University, Physics Department, Ankara, Turkey

I.V. Akin, T. Aliev, S. Bilmis, M. Deniz, H. Gamsizkan, A.M. Guler, K. Ocalan, A. Ozpineci, M. Serin, R. Sever, U.E. Surat, E. Yildirim, M. Zeyrek

Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey

M. Deliomeroğlu, D. Demir³², E. Gülmez, A. Halu, B. Isildak, M. Kaya³³, O. Kaya³³, M. Özbek, S. Ozkorucuklu³⁴, N. Sonmez³⁵

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

L. Levchuk

University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom

P. Bell, F. Bostock, J.J. Brooke, T.L. Cheng, E. Clement, D. Cussans, R. Frazier, J. Goldstein, M. Grimes, M. Hansen, D. Hartley, G.P. Heath, H.F. Heath, B. Huckvale, J. Jackson, L. Kreczko, S. Metson, D.M. Newbold³⁶, K. Nirunpong, A. Poll, S. Senkin, V.J. Smith, S. Ward

Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom

L. Basso, K.W. Bell, A. Belyaev, C. Brew, R.M. Brown, B. Camanzi, D.J.A. Cockerill, J.A. Coughlan, K. Harder, S. Harper, B.W. Kennedy, E. Olaiya, D. Petyt, B.C. Radburn-Smith, C.H. Shepherd-Themistocleous, I.R. Tomalin, W.J. Womersley, S.D. Worm

Imperial College, London, United Kingdom

R. Bainbridge, G. Ball, J. Ballin, R. Beuselinck, O. Buchmuller, D. Colling, N. Cripps, M. Cutajar, G. Davies, M. Della Negra, J. Fulcher, D. Futyan, A. Guneratne Bryer, G. Hall, Z. Hatherell, J. Hays, G. Iles, G. Karapostoli, L. Lyons, A.-M. Magnan, J. Marrouche, R. Nandi, J. Nash, A. Nikitenko²⁷, A. Papageorgiou, M. Pesaresi, K. Petridis, M. Pioppi³⁷, D.M. Raymond, N. Rompotis, A. Rose, M.J. Ryan, C. Seez, P. Sharp, A. Sparrow, A. Tapper, S. Tourneur, M. Vazquez Acosta, T. Virdee, S. Wakefield, D. Wardrope, T. Whyntie

Brunel University, Uxbridge, United Kingdom

M. Barrett, M. Chadwick, J.E. Cole, P.R. Hobson, A. Khan, P. Kyberd, D. Leslie, W. Martin, I.D. Reid, L. Teodorescu

Baylor University, Waco, USA

K. Hatakeyama

Boston University, Boston, USA

T. Bose, E. Carrera Jarrin, A. Clough, C. Fantasia, A. Heister, J. St. John, P. Lawson, D. Lazic, J. Rohlf, D. Sperka, L. Sulak

Brown University, Providence, USA

A. Avetisyan, S. Bhattacharya, J.P. Chou, D. Cutts, S. Esen, A. Ferapontov, U. Heintz, S. Jabeen, G. Kukartsev, G. Landsberg, M. Narain, D. Nguyen, M. Segala, T. Speer, K.V. Tsang

University of California, Davis, Davis, USA

M.A. Borgia, R. Breedon, M. Calderon De La Barca Sanchez, D. Cebra, S. Chauhan, M. Chertok, J. Conway, P.T. Cox, J. Dolen, R. Erbacher, E. Friis, W. Ko, A. Kopecky, R. Lander, H. Liu, S. Maruyama, T. Miceli, M. Nikolic, D. Pellett, J. Robles, T. Schwarz, M. Searle, J. Smith, M. Squires, M. Tripathi, R. Vasquez Sierra, C. Veelken

University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, USA

V. Andreev, K. Arisaka, D. Cline, R. Cousins, A. Deisher, J. Duris, S. Erhan¹, C. Farrell, J. Hauser, M. Ignatenko, C. Jarvis, C. Plager, G. Rakness, P. Schlein[†], J. Tucker, V. Valuev

University of California, Riverside, Riverside, USA

J. Babb, R. Clare, J. Ellison, J.W. Gary, F. Giordano, G. Hanson, G.Y. Jeng, S.C. Kao, F. Liu, H. Liu, A. Luthra, H. Nguyen, G. Pasztor³⁸, A. Satpathy, B.C. Shen[†], R. Stringer, J. Sturdy, S. Sumowidagdo, R. Wilken, S. Wimpenny

University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, USA

W. Andrews, J.G. Branson, E. Dusinger, D. Evans, F. Golf, A. Holzner, R. Kelley, M. Lebourgeois, J. Letts, B. Mangano, J. Muelmenstaedt, S. Padhi, C. Palmer, G. Petrucciani, H. Pi, M. Pieri, R. Ranieri, M. Sani, V. Sharma¹, S. Simon, Y. Tu, A. Vartak, F. Würthwein, A. Yagil

University of California, Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, USA

D. Barge, R. Bellan, C. Campagnari, M. D'Alfonso, T. Danielson, P. Geffert, J. Incandela, C. Justus, P. Kalavase, S.A. Koay, D. Kovalskyi, V. Krutelyov, S. Lowette, N. Mccoll, V. Pavlunin, F. Rebassoo, J. Ribnik, J. Richman, R. Rossin, D. Stuart, W. To, J.R. Vlimant

California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA

A. Bornheim, J. Bunn, Y. Chen, M. Gataullin, D. Kcira, V. Litvine, Y. Ma, A. Mott, H.B. Newman, C. Rogan, V. Timciuc, P. Traczyk, J. Veverka, R. Wilkinson, Y. Yang, R.Y. Zhu

Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, USA

B. Akgun, R. Carroll, T. Ferguson, Y. Iiyama, D.W. Jang, S.Y. Jun, Y.F. Liu, M. Paulini, J. Russ, N. Terentyev, H. Vogel, I. Vorobiev

University of Colorado at Boulder, Boulder, USA

J.P. Cumalat, M.E. Dinardo, B.R. Drell, C.J. Edelmaier, W.T. Ford, B. Heyburn, E. Luiggi Lopez, U. Nauenberg, J.G. Smith, K. Stenson, K.A. Ulmer, S.R. Wagner, S.L. Zang

Cornell University, Ithaca, USA

L. Agostino, J. Alexander, A. Chatterjee, S. Das, N. Eggert, L.J. Fields, L.K. Gibbons, B. Heltsley, W. Hopkins, A. Khukhunaishvili, B. Kreis, V. Kuznetsov, G. Nicolas Kaufman, J.R. Patterson, D. Puigh, D. Riley, A. Ryd, X. Shi, W. Sun, W.D. Teo, J. Thom, J. Thompson, J. Vaughan, Y. Weng, L. Winstrom, P. Wittich

Fairfield University, Fairfield, USA

A. Biselli, G. Cirino, D. Winn

Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, USA

S. Abdullin, M. Albrow, J. Anderson, G. Apollinari, M. Atac, J.A. Bakken, S. Banerjee, L.A.T. Bauerdick, A. Beretvas, J. Berryhill, P.C. Bhat, I. Bloch, F. Borchering, K. Burkett, J.N. Butler, V. Chetluru, H.W.K. Cheung, F. Chlebana, S. Cihangir, M. Demarteau, D.P. Eartly, V.D. Elvira, I. Fisk, J. Freeman, Y. Gao, E. Gottschalk, D. Green, K. Gunthoti, O. Gutsche, A. Hahn, J. Hanlon, R.M. Harris, J. Hirschauer, B. Hooberman, E. James, H. Jensen, M. Johnson, U. Joshi, R. Khatiwada, B. Kilminster, B. Klima, K. Kousouris, S. Kunori, S. Kwan, P. Limon, R. Lipton, J. Lykken, K. Maeshima, J.M. Marraffino, D. Mason, P. McBride, T. McCauley, T. Miao, K. Mishra, S. Mrenna, Y. Musienko³⁹, C. Newman-Holmes, V. O'Dell, S. Popescu⁴⁰, R. Pordes, O. Prokofyev, N. Saoulidou, E. Sexton-Kennedy, S. Sharma, A. Soha, W.J. Spalding, L. Spiegel, P. Tan, L. Taylor, S. Tkaczyk, L. Uplegger, E.W. Vaandering, R. Vidal, J. Whitmore, W. Wu, F. Yang, F. Yumiceva, J.C. Yun

University of Florida, Gainesville, USA

D. Acosta, P. Avery, D. Bourilkov, M. Chen, G.P. Di Giovanni, D. Dobur, A. Drozdetskiy, R.D. Field, M. Fisher, Y. Fu, I.K. Furic, J. Gartner, S. Goldberg, B. Kim, S. Klimenko, J. Konigsberg, A. Korytov, A. Kropivnitskaya, T. Kypreos, K. Matchev, G. Mitselmakher, L. Muniz, Y. Pakhotin, C. Prescott, R. Remington, M. Schmitt, B. Scurlock, P. Sellers, N. Skhirtladze, D. Wang, J. Yelton, M. Zakaria

Florida International University, Miami, USA

C. Ceron, V. Gaultney, L. Kramer, L.M. Lebolo, S. Linn, P. Markowitz, G. Martinez, J.L. Rodriguez

Florida State University, Tallahassee, USA

T. Adams, A. Askew, D. Bandurin, J. Bochenek, J. Chen, B. Diamond, S.V. Gleyzer, J. Haas, S. Hagopian, V. Hagopian, M. Jenkins, K.F. Johnson, H. Prosper, S. Sekmen, V. Veeraraghavan

Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, USA

M.M. Baarmand, B. Dorney, S. Guragain, M. Hohlmann, H. Kalakhety, R. Ralich, I. Vodopyanov

University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC), Chicago, USA

M.R. Adams, I.M. Anghel, L. Apanasevich, Y. Bai, V.E. Bazterra, R.R. Betts, J. Callner, R. Cavanaugh, C. Dragoiu, E.J. Garcia-Solis, C.E. Gerber, D.J. Hofman, S. Khalatyan, F. Lacroix, C. O'Brien, C. Silvestre, A. Smoron, D. Strom, N. Varelas

The University of Iowa, Iowa City, USA

U. Akgun, E.A. Albayrak, B. Bilki, K. Cankocak⁴¹, W. Clarida, F. Duru, C.K. Lae, E. McCliment, J.-P. Merlo, H. Mermerkaya, A. Mestvirishvili, A. Moeller, J. Nachtman, C.R. Newsom, E. Norbeck, J. Olson, Y. Onel, F. Ozok, S. Sen, J. Wetzel, T. Yetkin, K. Yi

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA

B.A. Barnett, B. Blumenfeld, A. Bonato, C. Eskew, D. Fehling, G. Giurgiu, A.V. Gritsan, Z.J. Guo, G. Hu, P. Maksimovic, S. Rappoccio, M. Swartz, N.V. Tran, A. Whitbeck

The University of Kansas, Lawrence, USA

P. Baringer, A. Bean, G. Benelli, O. Grachov, M. Murray, D. Noonan, V. Radicci, S. Sanders, J.S. Wood, V. Zhukova

Kansas State University, Manhattan, USA

T. Bolton, I. Chakaberia, A. Ivanov, M. Makouski, Y. Maravin, S. Shrestha, I. Svintradze, Z. Wan

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, USA

J. Gronberg, D. Lange, D. Wright

University of Maryland, College Park, USA

A. Baden, M. Boutemour, S.C. Eno, D. Ferencek, J.A. Gomez, N.J. Hadley, R.G. Kellogg, M. Kirn, Y. Lu, A.C. Mignerey, K. Rossato, P. Rumerio, F. Santanastasio, A. Skuja, J. Temple, M.B. Tonjes, S.C. Tonwar, E. Twedt

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, USA

B. Alver, G. Bauer, J. Bendavid, W. Busza, E. Butz, I.A. Cali, M. Chan, V. Dutta, P. Everaerts, G. Gomez Ceballos, M. Goncharov, K.A. Hahn, P. Harris, Y. Kim, M. Klute, Y.-J. Lee, W. Li, C. Loizides, P.D. Luckey, T. Ma, S. Nahn, C. Paus, C. Roland, G. Roland, M. Rudolph, G.S.F. Stephans, K. Sumorok, K. Sung, E.A. Wenger, S. Xie, M. Yang, Y. Yilmaz, A.S. Yoon, M. Zanetti

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, USA

P. Cole, S.I. Cooper, P. Cushman, B. Dahmes, A. De Benedetti, P.R. Duerdo, G. Franzoni, J. Haupt, K. Klapoetke, Y. Kubota, J. Mans, V. Rekovic, R. Rusack, M. Sasseville, A. Singovsky

University of Mississippi, University, USA

L.M. Cremaldi, R. Godang, R. Kroeger, L. Perera, R. Rahmat, D.A. Sanders, D. Summers

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, USA

K. Bloom, S. Bose, J. Butt, D.R. Claes, A. Dominguez, M. Eads, J. Keller, T. Kelly, I. Kravchenko, J. Lazo-Flores, C. Lundstedt, H. Malbouisson, S. Malik, G.R. Snow

State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, USA

U. Baur, A. Godshalk, I. Iashvili, A. Kharchilava, A. Kumar, K. Smith

Northeastern University, Boston, USA

G. Alverson, E. Barberis, D. Baumgartel, O. Boeriu, M. Chasco, K. Kaadze, S. Reucroft, J. Swain, D. Wood, J. Zhang

Northwestern University, Evanston, USA

A. Anastassov, A. Kubik, N. Odell, R.A. Ofierzynski, B. Pollack, A. Pozdnyakov, M. Schmitt, S. Stoynev, M. Velasco, S. Won

University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, USA

L. Antonelli, D. Berry, M. Hildreth, C. Jessop, D.J. Karmgard, J. Kolb, T. Kolberg, K. Lannon, W. Luo, S. Lynch, N. Marinelli, D.M. Morse, T. Pearson, R. Ruchti, J. Slaunwhite, N. Valls, J. Warchol, M. Wayne, J. Ziegler

The Ohio State University, Columbus, USA

B. Bylsma, L.S. Durkin, J. Gu, C. Hill, P. Killewald, K. Kotov, T.Y. Ling, M. Rodenburg, G. Williams

Princeton University, Princeton, USA

N. Adam, E. Berry, P. Elmer, D. Gerbaudo, V. Halyo, P. Hebda, A. Hunt, J. Jones, E. Laird, D. Lopes Pegna, D. Marlow, T. Medvedeva, M. Mooney, J. Olsen, P. Piroué, X. Quan, H. Saka, D. Stickland, C. Tully, J.S. Werner, A. Zuranski

University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez, USA

J.G. Acosta, X.T. Huang, A. Lopez, H. Mendez, S. Oliveros, J.E. Ramirez Vargas, A. Zatserklyaniy

Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA

E. Alagoz, V.E. Barnes, G. Bolla, L. Borrello, D. Bortoletto, A. Everett, A.F. Garfinkel, Z. Gecse, L. Gutay, M. Jones, O. Koybasi, A.T. Laasanen, N. Leonardo, C. Liu, V. Maroussov, P. Merkel, D.H. Miller, N. Neumeister, K. Potamianos, I. Shipsey, D. Silvers, A. Svyatkovskiy, H.D. Yoo, J. Zablocki, Y. Zheng

Purdue University Calumet, Hammond, USA

P. Jindal, N. Parashar

Rice University, Houston, USA

C. Boulahouache, V. Cuplov, K.M. Ecklund, F.J.M. Geurts, J.H. Liu, J. Morales, B.P. Padley, R. Redjimi, J. Roberts, J. Zabel

University of Rochester, Rochester, USA

B. Betchart, A. Bodek, Y.S. Chung, P. de Barbaro, R. Demina, Y. Eshaq, H. Flacher, A. Garcia-

Bellido, P. Goldenzweig, Y. Gotra, J. Han, A. Harel, D.C. Miner, D. Orbaker, G. Petrillo, D. Vishnevskiy, M. Zielinski

The Rockefeller University, New York, USA

A. Bhatti, L. Demortier, K. Goulianos, G. Lungu, C. Mesropian, M. Yan

Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, Piscataway, USA

O. Atramentov, A. Barker, D. Duggan, Y. Gershtein, R. Gray, E. Halkiadakis, D. Hidas, D. Hits, A. Lath, S. Panwalkar, R. Patel, A. Richards, K. Rose, S. Schnetzer, S. Somalwar, R. Stone, S. Thomas

University of Tennessee, Knoxville, USA

G. Cerizza, M. Hollingsworth, S. Spanier, Z.C. Yang, A. York

Texas A&M University, College Station, USA

J. Asaadi, R. Eusebi, J. Gilmore, A. Gurrola, T. Kamon, V. Khotilovich, R. Montalvo, C.N. Nguyen, J. Pivarski, A. Safonov, S. Sengupta, A. Tatarinov, D. Toback, M. Weinberger

Texas Tech University, Lubbock, USA

N. Akchurin, C. Bardak, J. Damgov, C. Jeong, K. Kovitanggoon, S.W. Lee, P. Mane, Y. Roh, A. Sill, I. Volobouev, R. Wigmans, E. Yazgan

Vanderbilt University, Nashville, USA

E. Appelt, E. Brownson, D. Engh, C. Florez, W. Gabella, W. Johns, P. Kurt, C. Maguire, A. Melo, P. Sheldon, J. Velkovska

University of Virginia, Charlottesville, USA

M.W. Arenton, M. Balazs, S. Boutle, M. Buehler, S. Conetti, B. Cox, B. Francis, R. Hirosky, A. Ledovskoy, C. Lin, C. Neu, R. Yohay

Wayne State University, Detroit, USA

S. Gollapinni, R. Harr, P.E. Karchin, M. Mattson, C. Milstène, A. Sakharov

University of Wisconsin, Madison, USA

M. Anderson, M. Bachtis, J.N. Bellinger, D. Carlsmith, S. Dasu, J. Efron, L. Gray, K.S. Grogg, M. Grothe, R. Hall-Wilton¹, M. Herndon, P. Klabbers, J. Klukas, A. Lanaro, C. Lazaridis, J. Leonard, D. Lomidze, R. Loveless, A. Mohapatra, W. Parker, D. Reeder, I. Ross, A. Savin, W.H. Smith, J. Swanson, M. Weinberg

†: Deceased

1: Also at CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland

2: Also at Universidade Federal do ABC, Santo Andre, Brazil

3: Also at Laboratoire Leprince-Ringuet, Ecole Polytechnique, IN2P3-CNRS, Palaiseau, France

4: Also at Suez Canal University, Suez, Egypt

5: Also at Fayoum University, El-Fayoum, Egypt

6: Also at Soltan Institute for Nuclear Studies, Warsaw, Poland

7: Also at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, USA

8: Also at Université de Haute-Alsace, Mulhouse, France

9: Also at Brandenburg University of Technology, Cottbus, Germany

10: Also at Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia

11: Also at Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary

12: Also at Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary

13: Also at Tata Institute of Fundamental Research - HECR, Mumbai, India

14: Also at University of Visva-Bharati, Santiniketan, India

- 15: Also at Facoltà Ingegneria Università di Roma "La Sapienza", Roma, Italy
- 16: Also at Università della Basilicata, Potenza, Italy
- 17: Also at Laboratori Nazionali di Legnaro dell' INFN, Legnaro, Italy
- 18: Also at California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA
- 19: Also at Faculty of Physics of University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia
- 20: Also at University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, USA
- 21: Also at University of Florida, Gainesville, USA
- 22: Also at Université de Genève, Geneva, Switzerland
- 23: Also at Scuola Normale e Sezione dell' INFN, Pisa, Italy
- 24: Also at INFN Sezione di Roma; Università di Roma "La Sapienza", Roma, Italy
- 25: Also at University of Athens, Athens, Greece
- 26: Also at The University of Kansas, Lawrence, USA
- 27: Also at Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia
- 28: Also at Paul Scherrer Institut, Villigen, Switzerland
- 29: Also at University of Belgrade, Faculty of Physics and Vinca Institute of Nuclear Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia
- 30: Also at Adiyaman University, Adiyaman, Turkey
- 31: Also at Mersin University, Mersin, Turkey
- 32: Also at Izmir Institute of Technology, Izmir, Turkey
- 33: Also at Kafkas University, Kars, Turkey
- 34: Also at Suleyman Demirel University, Isparta, Turkey
- 35: Also at Ege University, Izmir, Turkey
- 36: Also at Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom
- 37: Also at INFN Sezione di Perugia; Università di Perugia, Perugia, Italy
- 38: Also at KFKI Research Institute for Particle and Nuclear Physics, Budapest, Hungary
- 39: Also at Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia
- 40: Also at Horia Hulubei National Institute of Physics and Nuclear Engineering (IFIN-HH), Bucharest, Romania
- 41: Also at Istanbul Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey