

Long-range near-side correlation in e^+e^- Collisions at 183-209 GeV with ALEPH Archived Data

Yu-Chen Chen,¹ Yi Chen,¹ Anthony Badea,² Austin Baty,³ Gian Michele Innocenti,⁴ Marcello Maggi,⁵ Christopher McGinn,¹ Michael Peters,¹ Tzu-An Sheng,¹ Jesse Thaler,¹ and Yen-Jie Lee^{1,*}

¹*Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA*

²*University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, USA*

³*University Illinois Chicago, Illinois, USA*

⁴*CERN, Geneva, Switzerland*

⁵*INFN Sezione di Bari, Bari, Italy*

(Dated: December 13, 2023)

The first measurement of two-particle angular correlations for charged particles produced in e^+e^- annihilation up to $\sqrt{s} = 209$ GeV with LEP-II data is presented. Hadronic e^+e^- data, archived at center-of-mass energies ranging from 183 to 209 GeV, were collected using the ALEPH detector at LEP. The angular correlation functions have been measured across a wide range of pseudorapidities and the full azimuth in bins of charged particle multiplicity. Results for e^+e^- data at high energies, which allow for higher event multiplicities reaching approximately 50 than LEP-I at Z pole energy, are presented for the first time. A long-range near-side excess in the correlation function has been identified in the analysis when calculating particle kinematic variables with respect to the thrust axis. Moreover, the two-particle correlation functions were decomposed using a Fourier series, and the resulting Fourier coefficients v_n were compared with event generator outputs. In events with high multiplicity featuring more than 50 particles, the extracted v_2 magnitude from the data are compared to those from the Monte Carlo reference.

In heavy-ion collision experiments, two-particle angular correlations [1–6] are extracted for studying the Quark-Gluon Plasma (QGP) [7]. In these measurements, a long-range angular correlation, known as the ridge [2, 3], has been observed in various collision systems and at different collision energies. Since the beginning of LHC operations, this ridge structure has also been observed in high-multiplicity proton-proton (pp) collisions by the CMS collaboration [8] and confirmed by experiments at the LHC and RHIC using smaller collision systems than ion-ion collisions, such as proton-proton [9], proton-ion (pA) [10–14], and deuteron-ion [15] collisions. In heavy-ion collisions, the ridge structure is associated with the fluctuating initial state of the ions [16, 17]. However, the physical origin of the ridge structure in small systems remains under debate [18–22]. The potential correlations in the initial state partons arising from hadronic structure make understanding pp and pA measurements challenging. Numerous theoretical models exist to explain these systems with high particle densities. These models incorporate various mechanisms, from initial state correlations as suggested in [19], through final-state interactions [21], to hydrodynamic effects [20].

Lately, the focus has intensified on assessing two-particle correlations in even smaller systems than pp and pA collisions. This includes systems like photonuclear collisions with ultra-peripheral proton-lead and lead-lead data as demonstrated by ATLAS and CMS [23, 24], electron-proton collisions reported by ZEUS [25], and

e^+e^- [26–28]. Such studies are invaluable complements to those done on larger collision systems, shedding light on the bare minimum conditions required for collective behavior [29]. Electron beams, in particular, are free from issues like multiple parton interactions and initial state correlations. Notably, no significant ridge-like patterns have been detected in the electron-positron annihilations, giving further clarity to the emergence of the collectivity signal as discussed in various studies [30–35].

There are two potential approaches to making progress in detecting a possible ridge-like signal. The first approach involves increasing the final state multiplicity of the system. This is because the probability of parton-parton scattering increases with rising parton density, which results in larger final state multiplicity. Additionally, insights gained from pp and photonuclear collisions suggest that a larger multiplicity decreases the magnitude of the negative direct flow (v_1) due to momentum conservation. A diminished v_1 could facilitate the detection of the possible ridge-like signal. The second approach involves exploring different physics processes. As recommended in Ref. [29], a two-string configuration simulated in AMPT strengthens the ridge-like signal compared to a single-string configuration. Investigating data with a two-string configuration could increase the chances of detecting a ridge-like signal in the most elementary collisions.

This study utilizes archived data collected by the ALEPH detector at LEP-II [36] between 1996 and 2000.

To analyze these data, an MIT Open Data format was created [37]. Unlike the 91.2 GeV sample at LEP-I, which is dominated by Z -decays, the high-energy sample sees significant contributions from various processes beyond $e^+e^- \rightarrow q\bar{q}$ fragmentation, including a notable “radiative-return-to- Z ” effect due to initial-state QED radiation. Adopting the selection criteria from the ALEPH collaboration [38], we cluster the event into two jets to determine the effective center-of-mass energy ($\sqrt{s'}$) using the equation

$$s' = \frac{\sin\theta_1 + \sin\theta_2 - |\sin(\theta_1 + \theta_2)|}{\sin\theta_1 + \sin\theta_2 + |\sin(\theta_1 + \theta_2)|} \times s, \quad (1)$$

where $\theta_{1,2}$ are the angles of these jets to the beam direction. Using this, the visible two-jet invariant mass (M_{vis}) is derived, aiding in minimizing the QED radiation background. In our analysis, $\sqrt{s'}$ must exceed $0.9\sqrt{s}$, and M_{vis} must surpass $0.7\sqrt{s}$. Furthermore, adhering to the hadronic event criteria from previous LEP-I work [26], events are selected based on the event sphericity axis’s polar angle ($7\pi/36 < \theta_{\text{lab}} < 29\pi/36$), and those with under five tracks or with total reconstructed charged-particle energy below 15 GeV are discarded.

High-quality tracks from particles are selected using requirements identical to those in previous ALEPH analyses [39]. They are also required to have a transverse momentum with respect to the beam axis ($p_{\text{T}}^{\text{lab}}$) above 0.2 GeV/c and $|\cos\theta_{\text{lab}}| < 0.94$ in the lab frame. Secondary charged particles from neutral particle decays are suppressed by V^0 reconstruction in the energy flow algorithm [39]. We employed the Monte Carlo (MC) events from the ALEPH collaboration for reconstruction effects and data correction. Specifically, we relied on archived PYTHIA 6.1 [40] MC simulation samples produced by ALEPH detector conditions at LEP-II. These samples informed our tracking efficiency and event selection corrections. The various MC subprocesses were weighted based on cross-sections from event generators.

The analysis procedure aligns with prior two-particle correlation function studies [10, 26]. For each event, the efficiency-corrected differential yield of charged-particle pairs, denoted as $\frac{d^2N^{\text{same}}}{d\Delta\eta d\Delta\phi}$ (where “same” means particles from the same event), is computed. It is then normalized by the average corrected number of charged particles in the event, $N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{corr}}$, yielding:

$$S(\Delta\eta, \Delta\phi) = \frac{1}{N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{corr}}} \frac{d^2N^{\text{same}}}{d\Delta\eta d\Delta\phi}. \quad (2)$$

A mixed-event background correlation, $B(\Delta\eta, \Delta\phi)$, pairs charged particles from one event with those from 48 random events of the same multiplicity, giving

$$B(\Delta\eta, \Delta\phi) = \frac{1}{N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{corr}}} \frac{d^2N^{\text{mix}}}{d\Delta\eta d\Delta\phi}. \quad (3)$$




FIG. 1: Two-particle correlation functions for events with the number of charged particle tracks in hadronic e^+e^- in the thrust coordinate analysis with $N_{\text{trk}} \geq 5$ (left) and $N_{\text{trk}} \geq 50$ (right). The sharp near-side peaks arise from jet correlations and have been truncated to illustrate the structure outside that region better.

N_{trk} range	Fraction of data (%)	$\langle N_{\text{trk}} \rangle$	$\langle N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{corr}} \rangle$
[10, 20)	58.6	15.2	17.3
[20, 30)	33.1	23.1	25.7
[30, 40)	3.7	32.6	35.9
[40, 50)	0.4	42.8	47.1
[50, ∞)	< 0.1	53.0	58.4

TABLE I: Fraction of the full event sample for each multiplicity class. The last two columns show the observed and corrected multiplicities, respectively, of charged particles with $p_{\text{T}}^{\text{lab}} > 0.2$ GeV/c and $|\cos\theta_{\text{lab}}| < 0.94$.

Here, N^{mix} is the efficiency-corrected pair count from the mixed event. By dividing this by $B(0,0)$, computed using pairs with $|\Delta\eta| < 0.32$ and $|\Delta\phi| < \pi/20$, we obtain the detector’s pair acceptance for uncorrelated particles. Hence, the acceptance-corrected pair yield is:

$$\frac{1}{N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{corr}}} \frac{d^2N^{\text{pair}}}{d\Delta\eta d\Delta\phi} = B(0,0) \times \frac{S(\Delta\eta, \Delta\phi)}{B(\Delta\eta, \Delta\phi)}. \quad (4)$$

For multiplicity-dependent analysis, events are grouped into five intervals based on reconstructed charged track count, N_{trk} , with $p_{\text{T}}^{\text{lab}} > 0.2$ GeV/c. Details, including multiplicity ranges and average track counts before and after correction, are in Table I.

Experimentally, the thrust axis [41], closely related to the outgoing $q\bar{q}$ direction, establishes the coordinate system for thrust coordinate analysis. The thrust axis serves as the reference to address the outgoing-state energy flow orientation in e^+e^- collisions. Including an extra particle representing the event’s unreconstructed momentum in the thrust axis calculation mitigates the effect of detector inefficiencies on the correlation function. All tracks meeting quality criteria then have their kinematic variables (p_{T} , η , ϕ) recalculated, with the thrust axis substituting the beam axis, using the prescription of the LEP-I analysis [26]. Kinematics are recalculated for particles in

paired events relative to the signal event’s thrust axis for the background correlation calculation. The η and ϕ distributions of charged tracks in these paired events are reweighted to align with the distributions of the signal events. This strategy accounts for the random pairing effect under the detector acceptance in the thrust coordinate for different signal events.

In hadronic collision systems, the azimuthal anisotropy of charged particle production is typically quantified with the azimuthal anisotropy coefficients (v_n), v_n [17, 42, 43]. In particular, the second order coefficient, v_2 is sensitive to the collective behavior and the level of thermalization of the system in relativistic heavy ion collisions [16, 44]. However, it is often difficult to make a direct quantitative connection between the size of any associated yields and the corresponding value of v_2 because most of the structure of the correlation functions comes from jetlike correlations. These correlations are sometimes referred to as “nonflow” [45–48].

We employ the Fourier decomposition analysis used in prior studies to investigate potential flow-like signatures. This helps us understand anisotropy harmonics through two-particle azimuthal correlations. The non-flow effects diminish significantly at large $|\Delta\eta|$. The long-range azimuthal differential yields can be described by:

$$Y_l(\Delta\phi) = \frac{1}{N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{corr}}} \frac{dN^{\text{pair}}}{d\Delta\phi} = \frac{N^{\text{assoc}}}{2\pi} \left(1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2V_{n\Delta} \cos(n\Delta\phi) \right),$$

with N^{assoc} representing associated track pairs in specified $|\Delta\eta|$ and $\Delta\phi$ ranges. The long-range associated yield is a histogram, and the Discrete Fourier Transform is used to determine Fourier coefficients ($V_{n\Delta}$) and normalization (N^{assoc}). These coefficients relate to single-particle Fourier harmonics, assuming they originate from hydrodynamic flow effects. In our approach, the trigger and associated particles are in the same p_T bin, leading to $v_n = v_n^{\text{trig}} = v_n^{\text{assoc}}$.

This analysis uses Bayesian inference to assess the statistical uncertainties for the observables of interest: correlation yields and flow coefficients v_n . The primary rationale behind adopting the Bayesian analysis is to offer a more detailed estimation of uncertainties, particularly when assuming a Gaussian distribution is not ideal for a data set with a non-Gaussian distribution. With Bayes’ theorem, we obtain the posterior probability for an observable of interest, using a flat prior and a “weighted Poisson distribution [49]” as the likelihood function. Reported central values and uncertainties for pairing yields and flow coefficients are based on the “maximum a posteriori (MAP)” method. The comprehensive Bayesian calculation has been documented in the note [50].

Systematic uncertainties for the long-range associated yield $Y_l(\Delta\phi)$ and v_n arise from event and track selections, the $B(0,0)$ normalization factor, and residual MC corrections. For event selections, variations involve altering

the ISR requirements [38] on the visible two-jet invariant mass M_{vis} from $0.7\sqrt{s}$ to $0.65\sqrt{s}$ and adjusting the effective center-of-mass energy $\sqrt{s'}$ from $0.9\sqrt{s}$ to $0.87\sqrt{s}$. Meanwhile, consistent with the LEP-I analysis approach, the hadronic event selection criteria adjust the number of particles from 13 to 10 and the reconstructed charged-particle energy from 15 GeV to 10 GeV. ISR selections have a more pronounced impact on systematic uncertainties. Track selection changes involve the number of track hits in the time projection chamber, shifting from 4 to 7. Including the $B(0,0)$ factor as the normalization choice also introduces a systematic uncertainty. We evaluate its impact based on the statistical uncertainty of the $B(0,0)$ normalization factor. Generally, these systematic uncertainties affect $\Delta\phi$ bins uniformly. Lastly, the residual MC correction factor results in an uncorrelated uncertainty across $\Delta\phi$ bins ascertained through different fit attempts on this correction factor. Three function types are evaluated, with half of their maximum deviation deemed as the associated uncertainty.

The two-particle correlation functions for inclusive and high multiplicity events are shown in Fig. 1. No significant ridge-like structure was observed in the correlation function at low multiplicity ($N_{\text{trk}} < 50$). In the highest multiplicity bin ($N_{\text{trk}} > 50$), an intriguing U shape was revealed at the large $|\Delta\eta|$ and small $\Delta\phi$ phase space, which is studied further in the later sections.

One-dimensional distributions in $\Delta\phi$ are studied by averaging the two-particle correlation function over the region between $1.6 < |\Delta\eta| < 3.2$ to investigate the long-range correlation in finer detail. Fig. 2 shows the comparisons between data and MC on the long-range azimuthal differential associated yields. The MC simulation aligns well with the data for low multiplicity events with $N_{\text{trk}} < 40$. However, in the highest multiplicity class, where $N_{\text{trk}} > 50$, the data reveals a long-range near-side signal that the MC simulation does not capture. Moreover, the data display a more significant slope when going to large $\Delta\phi$ than predictions from MC. We also examined the correlation functions using the PYTHIA 8 simulation, which allows for the inclusion of microscopic collective effects from the shoving mechanism [31, 51]. However, a similar long-range near-side enhancement is not seen in the PYTHIA 8 simulation, either with or without the inclusion of the shoving model.

The size of any potential enhancement around $\Delta\phi = 0$ is calculated by fitting this distribution from $0 < \Delta\phi < \pi/2$ and then performing a zero yield at minimum (ZYAM) subtraction procedure using the fit minimum, c_{ZYAM} [52]. A constant, combined with a three-term Fourier series, was used as the nominal fit function. Fits with a purely-even quartic function and a purely-even quadratic function plus a $\cos 2\Delta\phi$ term were also attempted. Discrepancies resulting from these different choices of fit function were found to be small and are included in the systematic uncertainties of the total near-




FIG. 2: For the long-range region $1.6 < |\Delta\eta| < 3.2$, the azimuthal associated yield is presented for $N_{\text{trk}} \geq 5$ (left) and $N_{\text{trk}} \geq 50$ (right). Data is presented in red dots with statistical error bars, while systematic uncertainties are detailed in the text. The PYTHIA 6 model is shown in blue with its statistical error band.

side yield calculation. After this subtraction and correction for reconstruction effects, the results are shown for $N_{\text{trk}} \geq 5$ and $N_{\text{trk}} \geq 50$ in Fig. 2.

The excess yield of particle pairs near $\Delta\phi = 0$ is determined by integrating the data up to the ZYAM fit's minimum position in $\Delta\phi$. For low multiplicity, a confidence limit (C.L.) on the near-side pair excess is deduced using a bootstrap method [54]. This considers the variability in correlation function data points based on uncertain-




FIG. 3: Confidence limits on associated yield as a function of $\langle N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{corr}} \rangle$ in the thrust axis analysis. This work (LEP-II analysis, $\sqrt{s} = 183 - 209$ GeV) is shown in red, overlapping with results from Belle (pale purple) [27], LEP-I (pale orange) [26], and ALICE (pale gray, lab frame) [53]. The label “ $> 5\sigma$ ” indicates the 5σ confidence level upper limit.

ties. For each N_{trk} bin, the bootstrap samples 2×10^5 variations. Most yield a minimum at $\Delta\phi = 0$, implying zero associated yield. If over 5% of variations exceed a yield of 1×10^{-7} , a 95% C.L. is given. Otherwise, a C.L. for variations below this threshold is stated. This typically occurs in low multiplicity scenarios due to minor uncertainties. At high multiplicity, the central value and the total uncertainty are reported, and the results are shown in Fig. 3. The results are also overlaid with the associated yield reported in other small systems: e^+e^- collisions by Belle [27], ALEPH (LEP-I) [26], and low-multiplicity pp collisions by ALICE [53]. Incorporating the same scaling treatment for e^+e^- and pp collisions as detailed in ALICE publication [53], we scale the x axis of the ALICE data by the acceptance correction coefficients $c_{ee} = 0.78$ and $c_{pp} = 0.57$ for ALEPH and ALICE experiments, respectively. The scaled $\langle N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{corr}} \rangle$ for ALICE data points are displayed with uncertainty deviation from the scaling process. A half of the maximum deviation between the correction coefficients is quoted as the relative uncertainty. The reported thrust C.L.s are compatible or lower than the central values of the associated yield reported by CMS and ALICE, although the systematic uncertainties of the CMS measurements at low multiplicity are large. These C.L.s contrast measurements of a nonzero azimuthal anisotropy signal in lower multiplicity pp collisions [55, 56]. At a high multiplicity above 50, the results are compatible with pp results from ALICE.

In Fig. 4, the extracted v_n coefficients between the ALEPH data and the archived PYTHIA6 simulation are compared as a function of p_T . The quoted v_n coefficients are obtained from $V_{n\Delta}$ assuming a factorization between v_n^{assoc} and v_n^{trig} , leading to $v_n = \text{sign}(V_{n\Delta})\sqrt{|V_{n\Delta}|}$. The inclusive result, dominated by events with lower N_{trk} , is presented in the left panel. We observe a decent agreement between data and simulation. A difference is seen for high multiplicity events with $N_{\text{trk}} \geq 50$, as shown in the right panel. The simulation generally predicts a smaller magnitude for $|v_n|$, reflecting the more complex event topologies selected by the large particle multiplicity. The data, however, shows an intriguing trend compared to the simulation, especially in v_2 and v_3 , where the magnitude is larger.

The $V_{2\Delta}$ for high multiplicity events with $N_{\text{trk}} \geq 50$ is also compared with measurements from the CMS collaboration in high multiplicity proton-proton data [57] across three different collision energies, as shown in Fig. 5. To further suppress contributions from known processes, the $V_{2\Delta}$ from the simulation is subtracted from that of the data. There is no large dependence of $v_2^{\text{sub}}\{2\}$ on collision energy in high multiplicity proton-proton collisions. A remarkably similar trend is observed in the ALEPH data compared to $v_2^{\text{sub}}\{2\}$ in proton-proton collisions. Both datasets exhibit a rising trend as a function of p_T up to 3 GeV with a similar magnitude.

In summary, we present the first measurement of two-




FIG. 4: v_n as a function of the track pairs' p_T requirement in different multiplicity intervals for the thrust axis analysis for the LEP-II high-energy sample. Data's v_1 , v_2 , and v_3 are shown in black, red, and purple error bars. MC results are dashed lines with corresponding colors.




FIG. 5: Excess of flow coefficient $\text{sign}(\Delta V_2)\sqrt{|\Delta V_2|}$, where $\Delta V_2 = V_{2,\text{data}} - V_{2,\text{MC}}$, as a function of the track pairs' p_T requirement for $N_{\text{trk}} \geq 50$ in the thrust axis analysis for LEP-II high-energy sample. The result is overlaid with CMS subtracted flow coefficient measurements [57].

particle angular correlations from e^+e^- annihilation at energies $\sqrt{s} = 183\text{--}209$ GeV using archived ALEPH LEP-II data recorded between 1996 and 2000. In analyzing the thrust axis of these collisions between $\sqrt{s} = 183$ to 209 GeV, a long-range near-side excess in the correlation function emerges. For the first time, we decomposed two-particle correlation functions in e^+e^- collisions using a Fourier series. The resulting Fourier coefficients v_n from LEP-II provided a comparison to the archived

MC, especially in high multiplicity events where particle counts exceeded 50; the magnitudes of v_2 and v_3 in data are larger than those in the Monte Carlo reference. Highlighting these contrasts, we present the difference in v_2 between data and the MC. The difference between data- and MC-derived v_2 as a function of associated particle p_T is remarkably similar to the $v_2^{\text{sub}}\{2\}$ measured in high multiplicity pp collisions. These intriguing findings fortify our understanding of the underlying mechanisms in particle collisions and shed light on the origins of flow-like signals in smaller collision systems.

The authors would like to thank the ALEPH Collaboration for their support and foresight in archiving their data. We would like to thank the valuable comments and suggestions from Roberto Tenchini, Guenther Dissertori, Wei Li, Jiangyong Jia, Wit Busza, Néstor Armesto, Jean-Yves Ollitrault, Jürgen Schukraft and Jan Fiete Grosse-Oetringhaus. This work has been supported by the Department of Energy, Office of Science, under Grant No. DE-SC0011088 (to Y.-C.C., Y.C., M.P., T.S., C.M., Y.-J.L.), Eric and Wendy Schmidt AI in Science Postdoctoral Fellowship (A. Badea) and Grant No. DE-SC0012567 (to J.T.).

* Electronic address: yjenjie@mit.edu

- [1] J. Adams et al. (STAR), Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 152301 (2005), nucl-ex/0501016.
- [2] B. I. Abelev et al. (STAR), Phys. Rev. C **80**, 064912 (2009), 0909.0191.
- [3] B. Alver et al. (PHOBOS), Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 062301 (2010), 0903.2811.
- [4] S. Chatrchyan et al. (CMS), Eur. Phys. J. **C72**, 2012 (2012), 1201.3158.
- [5] K. Aamodt et al. (ALICE), Phys. Lett. B **708**, 249 (2012), 1109.2501.
- [6] J. Adam et al. (STAR), Phys. Rev. Lett. **122**, 172301 (2019), 1901.08155.
- [7] W. Busza, K. Rajagopal, and W. van der Schee, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **68**, 339 (2018), 1802.04801.
- [8] V. Khachatryan et al. (CMS), JHEP **09**, 091 (2010), 1009.4122.
- [9] G. Aad et al. (ATLAS), Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 172301 (2016), 1509.04776.
- [10] S. Chatrchyan et al. (CMS), Phys. Lett. **B718**, 795 (2013), 1210.5482.
- [11] B. Abelev et al. (ALICE), Phys. Lett. B **719**, 29 (2013), 1212.2001.
- [12] B. B. Abelev et al. (ALICE), Phys. Lett. B **726**, 164 (2013), 1307.3237.
- [13] G. Aad et al. (ATLAS), Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 182302 (2013), 1212.5198.
- [14] R. Aaij et al. (LHCb), Phys. Lett. **B762**, 473 (2016), 1512.00439.
- [15] A. Adare et al. (PHENIX), Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 212301 (2013), 1303.1794.
- [16] J.-Y. Ollitrault, Phys. Rev. **D46**, 229 (1992).
- [17] B. Alver and G. Roland, Phys. Rev. **C81**, 054905 (2010),

- [Erratum: Phys. Rev.C82,039903(2010)], 1003.0194.
- [18] A. Dumitru, K. Dusling, F. Gelis, J. Jalilian-Marian, T. Lappi, and R. Venugopalan, Phys. Lett. B **697**, 21 (2011), 1009.5295.
- [19] K. Dusling and R. Venugopalan, Phys. Rev. **D87**, 094034 (2013), 1302.7018.
- [20] P. Bozek, Phys. Rev. **C85**, 014911 (2012), 1112.0915.
- [21] L. He, T. Edmonds, Z.-W. Lin, F. Liu, D. Molnar, and F. Wang, Phys. Lett. **B753**, 506 (2016), 1502.05572.
- [22] J. L. Nagle and W. A. Zajc, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **68**, 211 (2018), 1801.03477.
- [23] G. Aad et al. (ATLAS), Phys. Rev. C **104**, 014903 (2021), 2101.10771.
- [24] A. Tumasyan et al. (CMS), Phys. Lett. B **844**, 137905 (2023), 2204.13486.
- [25] I. Abt et al. (ZEUS), JHEP **04**, 070 (2020), 1912.07431.
- [26] A. Badea, A. Baty, P. Chang, G. M. Innocenti, M. Maggi, C. McGinn, M. Peters, T.-A. Sheng, J. Thaler, and Y.-J. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **123**, 212002 (2019), 1906.00489.
- [27] Y. C. Chen et al. (Belle), Phys. Rev. Lett. **128**, 142005 (2022), 2201.01694.
- [28] Y. C. Chen et al. (Belle), JHEP **03**, 171 (2023), 2206.09440.
- [29] J. L. Nagle, R. Belmont, K. Hill, J. Orjuela Koop, D. V. Perepelitsa, P. Yin, Z.-W. Lin, and D. McGlinchey, Phys. Rev. **C97**, 024909 (2018), 1707.02307.
- [30] C. Bierlich and C. O. Rasmussen, JHEP **10**, 026 (2019), 1907.12871.
- [31] C. Bierlich, S. Chakraborty, G. Gustafson, and L. Lönnblad, JHEP **03**, 270 (2021), 2010.07595.
- [32] P. Castorina, D. Lanteri, and H. Satz, Eur. Phys. J. A **57**, 111 (2021), 2011.06966.
- [33] P. Agostini, T. Altinoluk, and N. Armesto, Eur. Phys. J. C **81**, 760 (2021), 2103.08485.
- [34] A. J. Larkoski and T. Melia, JHEP **10**, 094 (2021), 2107.04041.
- [35] A. Baty, P. Gardner, and W. Li (2021), 2104.11735.
- [36] D. Decamp et al. (ALEPH), Nucl. Instrum. Meth. **A294**, 121 (1990), [Erratum: Nucl. Instrum. Meth.A303,393(1991)].
- [37] A. Tripathy, W. Xue, A. Larkoski, S. Marzani, and J. Thaler, Phys. Rev. **D96**, 074003 (2017), 1704.05842.
- [38] A. Heister et al. (ALEPH), Eur. Phys. J. C **35**, 457 (2004).
- [39] R. Barate et al. (ALEPH), Phys. Rept. **294**, 1 (1998).
- [40] T. Sjostrand, P. Eden, C. Friberg, L. Lonnblad, G. Miu, S. Mrenna, and E. Norrbin, Comput. Phys. Commun. **135**, 238 (2001), hep-ph/0010017.
- [41] E. Farhi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **39**, 1587 (1977).
- [42] S. Voloshin and Y. Zhang, Z. Phys. **C70**, 665 (1996), hep-ph/9407282.
- [43] A. M. Poskanzer and S. A. Voloshin, Phys. Rev. **C58**, 1671 (1998), nucl-ex/9805001.
- [44] K. H. Ackermann et al. (STAR), Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 402 (2001), nucl-ex/0009011.
- [45] C. Adler et al. (STAR), Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 082302 (2003), nucl-ex/0210033.
- [46] A. Adare et al. (PHENIX), Phys. Rev. **C78**, 014901 (2008), 0801.4545.
- [47] K. Aamodt et al. (ALICE), Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 252302 (2010), 1011.3914.
- [48] A. M. Sirunyan et al. (CMS), Phys. Lett. **B776**, 195 (2018), 1702.00630.
- [49] G. Bohm and G. Zech, Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A **748**, 1 (2014), 1309.1287.
- [50] Y.-C. Chen, Y.-J. Lee, Y. Chen, P. Chang, C. McGinn, T.-A. Sheng, G. M. Innocenti, and M. Maggi (2023), 2309.09874.
- [51] C. Bierlich, G. Gustafson, and L. Lönnblad, Phys. Lett. B **779**, 58 (2018), 1710.09725.
- [52] N. N. Ajitanand, J. M. Alexander, P. Chung, W. G. Holzmann, M. Issah, R. A. Lacey, A. Shevel, A. Taranenko, and P. Danielewicz, Phys. Rev. **C72**, 011902 (2005), nucl-ex/0501025.
- [53] S. Acharya et al. (ALICE) (2023), 2311.14357.
- [54] B. Efron, Ann. Statist. **7**, 1 (1979), URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1176344552>.
- [55] M. Aaboud et al. (ATLAS), Phys. Rev. **C96**, 024908 (2017), 1609.06213.
- [56] V. Khachatryan et al. (CMS), Phys. Lett. **B765**, 193 (2017), 1606.06198.
- [57] V. Khachatryan et al. (CMS), Phys. Lett. B **765**, 193 (2017), 1606.06198.