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Abstract

Event-by-event correlations of azimuthal anisotropy Fourier coefficients ($v_n$) in 8.16 TeV pPb collision data, collected by the CMS experiment at the LHC, are extracted using a subevent four-particle cumulant technique. The pseudorapidity range of the CMS tracker from $-2.4$ to $2.4$ is divided into either two, three, or four distinct subevent regions. Each combination of four particles constructed from tracks with transverse momentum between 0.3 and 3.0 GeV is then analyzed in terms of how the particles populate the subevents. Using the subevent technique, correlations between $v_n$ of different orders are measured as functions of particle multiplicity and compared to the standard cumulant method without subevents. At high multiplicity, the $v_2$ and $v_3$ coefficients exhibit an anticorrelation; this behavior is observed consistently using various methods. The $v_2$ and $v_4$ correlation strength is found to depend on the number of subevents used in the calculation. At low multiplicities, the results from different methods diverge because of different contributions of few-particle correlations. These findings significantly lower the multiplicity range that was previously established for the onset of collective behavior in small systems.
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1 Introduction

In high-energy ultrarelativistic nucleus-nucleus (AA) collisions, an extremely dense and hot state of matter called the quark gluon plasma (QGP) is produced [1, 2]. Studies of multiparticle correlations provide important insights into the underlying mechanism of particle production in this strongly coupled, non-perturbative regime. A key feature of such multiparticle correlations in AA collisions is a pronounced structure on the near side relative azimuthal angle (|Δφ| ≈ 0) that extends over a large range in relative pseudorapidity (|Δη| up to 4 units or more). This feature, known as the “ridge”, has been found over a wide range of center-of-mass energies and system sizes in AA collisions at both the BNL RHIC [3–7] and the CERN LHC [8–12]. It is interpreted as arising primarily from the initial anisotropic geometry and its fluctuations coupled with the collective hydrodynamic flow of a strongly interacting, expanding medium [13, 14]. The azimuthal correlations of emitted particle pairs are typically characterized by their Fourier components as:

\[
\frac{dN_{\text{pair}}}{d\Delta\phi} \propto 1 + \sum_n 2V_n \cos(n\Delta\phi),
\]

where \(V_n\) are the two-particle Fourier coefficients. If factorization is assumed, \(v_n = \sqrt{V_n}\) denote the single-particle anisotropy harmonics [15]. In particular, the second, third, and fourth Fourier components are known as elliptic (\(v_2\)), triangular (\(v_3\)), and quadrangular (\(v_4\)) flow, respectively [14].

In order to constrain the effects of the geometry and its fluctuations in the initial conditions, and the transport properties of the produced medium in AA collisions, new studies were carried out looking at correlations between different orders of \(v_n\) harmonics. In particular, event-by-event fluctuations of \(v_n\) harmonic amplitudes in PbPb collisions at the LHC were studied using the event shape engineering technique [16], and the four-particle symmetric cumulant (SC) method [17, 18], where the SC method for two different harmonic orders \(n\) and \(m\) is defined as:

\[
\text{SC}(n, m) = \langle\langle\cos(n\phi_1 + m\phi_2 - n\phi_3 - m\phi_4)\rangle\rangle - \langle\langle\cos(n\phi_1 - n\phi_2)\rangle\langle\cos(m\phi_3 - m\phi_4)\rangle\rangle = \langle v_n^2 v_m^2 \rangle - \langle v_n^2 \rangle \langle v_m^2 \rangle.
\]

Here, the double angular brackets indicate that the averaging procedure is done first on all distinct particle quadruplets in an event, and then over all the events, by weighting each single event average with its number of quadruplets. Over the full range of impact parameters in PbPb collisions, it was found that the \(v_2\) harmonic exhibits a negative event-by-event correlation with the \(v_3\) harmonic, while the correlation is positive between the \(v_2\) and \(v_4\) harmonics. These correlations are shown to be sensitive probes of initial-state fluctuations (\(v_2\) vs. \(v_3\)) and medium transport coefficients (\(v_2\) vs. \(v_4\)) [17, 19–22].

In high-multiplicity pp and pA collisions, the “ridge” has been observed [23–29] and detailed studies have highlighted its collective nature [30]. Event-by-event correlations among the \(v_2\), \(v_3\) and \(v_4\) Fourier harmonics have also been measured for both systems using the SC method [34]. The correlation data reveal features similar to those observed in PbPb collisions, where a negative correlation is found between the \(v_2\) and \(v_3\) harmonics, while the correlation is positive between the \(v_2\) and \(v_4\) harmonics. These observations may further support the hydrodynamic origin of collective correlations in high-multiplicity events for these small systems [17]. However, for the low-multiplicity region, the results are contaminated by noncollective correlations (nonflow), such as few-particle correlations from jets, where the correlation between \(v_2\) and
\(v_3\) harmonics becomes positive. In order to suppress and explore these few-particle correlations and possible collective correlation signals in the low-multiplicity region in small systems, subevent cumulant techniques were proposed \[35, 36\]. The rapidity gaps among particles required by these techniques suppress few-particle correlations. As detailed in Refs. \[36–38\], each combination of four particles is required to fall in two, three or four distinct subevents within the full \(\eta\) range. There are already studies highlighting the importance of the nonflow contribution in cumulant calculations and the ability of the subevent techniques to strongly suppress it \[37, 38\].

Using the CMS detector, this paper presents the first measurement of event-by-event correlations of \(v_2\) vs. \(v_3\) and \(v_2\) vs. \(v_4\) using the method of SC with subevents in pPb collisions at a nucleon-nucleon center-of mass energy \(\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 8.16\) TeV over a wide multiplicity range. The correlation measurements are performed using 2, 3, and 4 subevents, where the impact of few-particle correlations is systematically reduced as the number of subevents increases. The results are also compared to previous measurements without the subevent technique.

\section{The CMS detector}

The central feature of the CMS apparatus is a superconducting solenoid of 6 m internal diameter, providing a magnetic field of 3.8 T. Within the solenoid volume, there are four primary subdetectors including a silicon pixel and strip tracker detector, a lead tungstate crystal electromagnetic calorimeter (ECAL), and a brass and scintillator hadron calorimeter (HCAL), each composed of a barrel and two endcap sections. The silicon tracker measures charged particles within the range \(|\eta| < 2.5\). For charged particles with transverse momentum \(1 < p_T < 10\) GeV/c and \(|\eta| < 1.4\), the track resolutions are typically 1.5\% in \(p_T\) and 25–90 (45–150) \(\mu m\) in the transverse (longitudinal) impact parameter \[39\]. The Monte Carlo (MC) simulation of the full CMS detector response is based on \textsc{geant4} \[40\]. The detailed description of the CMS detector can be found in Ref. \[41\].

\section{Event and track selections}

The measurements presented in this paper use the 8.16 TeV pPb data set with an integrated luminosity of 186 nb\(^{-1}\), where the beam directions were reversed during the run after collecting the first 62.6 nb\(^{-1}\). The beam energies were 6.5 TeV for protons and 2.56 TeV per nucleon for lead nuclei \[42\]. The results from both beam directions are combined using the convention that the proton-going direction defines positive pseudorapidity. As a result of the energy difference between the colliding beams, the nucleon-nucleon center-of-mass frame in the pPb collisions is not at rest with respect to the laboratory frame. Massless particles emitted at \(\eta_{CM} = 0\) in the nucleon-nucleon center-of-mass frame will be detected at \(\eta_{lab} = 0.465\) in the laboratory frame. All pseudorapidities reported in this paper are given with respect to the laboratory frame. During the data taking, the average number of collisions per bunch crossing (pileup) varied from 0.10 to 0.25. A procedure similar to that described in Ref. \[43\] is used for identifying and rejecting events with pileup.

The minimum bias (MB) 8.16 TeV pPb events are triggered by requiring energy deposits in at least one of the two HF calorimeters above 1 GeV and the presence of at least one track with \(p_T > 0.4\) GeV/c reconstructed using hits from the pixel tracker only. In order to collect a large sample of high-multiplicity pPb collisions, a dedicated trigger is implemented using the CMS level-1 (L1) and high-level trigger (HLT) systems \[44\]. At L1, the total number of ECAL+HCAL
towers having deposited energy above an energy threshold of 0.5 GeV in transverse energy ($E_T$) is required to be greater than a given threshold (120 and 150 towers depending on the targeted multiplicity range). As part of the HLT trigger, the track reconstruction is performed online with the identical reconstruction algorithm used offline [39]. For each event selected at L1, the reconstructed vertex with the highest number of associated tracks is selected as the primary vertex at the HLT. The number of tracks with $|\eta| < 2.4$, $p_T > 0.4$ GeV/c, and a distance of closest approach less than 0.12 cm along the beam axis to the primary vertex is determined for each event and is required to exceed 120, 185 and 250 to enrich the sample with high-multiplicity (HM) events in the ranges 120–185, 185–250 and 250–∞, respectively. The events are required to contain a primary vertex within 15 cm of the nominal interaction point along the beam axis and 0.2 cm in the transverse direction. Finally, for high-multiplicity events, the trigger efficiency is required to be greater than 95%. In the multiplicity region where this requirement is not met ($N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{offline}} < 120$), MB triggered events are used.

In the offline analysis, the primary tracks, i.e. reconstructed tracks that originate from the primary vertex and satisfy the high-quality criteria of Ref. [39], are used to perform the correlation measurements, as well as to evaluate the charged-particle multiplicity ($N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{offline}}$) for each event. In addition, the significances of the track impact parameter with respect to the primary vertex in the transverse and longitudinal direction divided by their uncertainties are required to be less than 3.

The relative $p_T$ uncertainty must be less than 10%. To ensure high tracking efficiency, only tracks with $|\eta| < 2.4$ and $p_T > 0.3$ GeV/c are used in this analysis [39]. The pPb data are shown in classes of $N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{offline}}$, which is the number of primary tracks with $|\eta| < 2.4$ and $p_T > 0.4$ GeV/c. The $N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{offline}}$ boundaries used for the results of this paper are: 10, 20, 40, 80, 120, 150, 185, 250, and 350. These boundaries are chosen to minimize the statistical uncertainty in each bin. In this analysis, about 250M MB and 304M HM events are used.

4 Analysis technique

The SC technique, first introduced in Ref. [17], is based on four-particle correlations using cumulants. The four-particle cumulant technique, by simultaneously correlating four particles, is known to have the advantage of suppressing nonflow quite efficiently compared to other methods [18, 31]. To study the correlation between the Fourier coefficients $n$ and $m$, one can build, for each event, a 2-particle correlator ($\langle \cos(n \phi_1 - n \phi_2) \rangle$) and a 4-particle correlator ($\langle \cos(n \phi_1 + m \phi_2 - n \phi_3 - m \phi_4) \rangle$) with a complex notation average over all the events as:

$$\langle 2_{n,-n} \rangle \equiv \left\langle e^{i(n \phi_1 - n \phi_2)} \right\rangle, \quad \langle 4_{n,m,-n,-m} \rangle \equiv \left\langle e^{i(n \phi_1 + m \phi_2 - n \phi_3 - m \phi_4)} \right\rangle.$$

In the above equations, the real part of the 2- and 4-particle correlators are the cosine terms presented in Eq. (2). The final observable, the SC, is defined as follows:

$$\text{SC}(n, m) = \langle 4_{n,m,-n,-m} \rangle - \langle 2_{n,-n} \rangle \langle 2_{m,-m} \rangle. \quad (4)$$

Nevertheless, it was shown in previous studies [34] that the standard four-particle cumulant technique does not suppress all of the short-range correlation contribution. In particular, the increasing trend of SC toward low multiplicities, following a power law, is characteristic of remaining nonflow contaminations [45]. In that paper, to further suppress nonflow, the subevent technique is used based on the calculation published in Ref. [35]. In the two-subevent case, the
first and second subevents are defined as $-2.4 < \eta < 0$ and $0 < \eta < 2.4$. The bounds for three subevents are $-2.4, -0.8, 0.8, 2.4$, and for four subevents are $-2.4, -1.2, 0, 1.2, 2.4$. The formula of the SC calculation can be derived from Eq. (4):

$$\text{SC}_{2\text{sub}}(n, m) = \langle \langle 4 \rangle_{n,m|-n,-m}^{a|b} - \langle 2 \rangle_{n|-n}^{a|b} \rangle_{m|-m},$$

$$\text{SC}_{3\text{sub}}(n, m) = \langle \langle 4 \rangle_{n,m|-n,-m}^{a|b|c} - \langle 2 \rangle_{n|-n}^{a|b} \langle 2 \rangle_{m|-m}^{c} \rangle,$$

$$\text{SC}_{4\text{sub}}(n, m) = \langle \langle 4 \rangle_{n,m|-n,-m}^{a|b|c|d} - \langle 2 \rangle_{n|-n}^{a|b} \langle 2 \rangle_{m|-m}^{c|d} \rangle,$$

where $a, b, c,$ and $d$ denote the particles chosen in each subevent for the calculation and $n, m$ the corresponding harmonic attributed to this subevent. In Eq. (5), the notation $a|b$ in the 4-particle correlator means that two particles are required to be in the first subevent $(ab)$ while the other two are required to be in the second subevent $(bc)$. Similarly, for the 2-particle correlator, one particle in each subevent is required $(a|b)$. A similar reasoning is applied in Eqs. (6) and (7).

The systematic uncertainties in the experimental procedure are evaluated by varying the conditions in extracting SC. The systematic uncertainties due to tracking inefficiency and misreconstructed track rate are studied by varying the track quality requirements. The selection thresholds on the significance of the transverse and longitudinal track impact parameter divided by their uncertainties are varied from 2 to 5. In addition, the relative $p_T$ uncertainty is varied from 5 to 10%.

The results of symmetric cumulants SC(2, 3) and SC(2, 4) for $0.3 < p_T < 3$ GeV/$c$ are shown in Fig. 1 as functions of multiplicity in pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 8.16$ TeV for 2, 3, and 4 subevents. For comparison, the results with no subevents from Ref. [34] are also shown for the range $40 < N_{\text{trk}} < 350$ (the SC with no subevents for lower multiplicities are out of range because of the choice of the $y$-axis scale). The multiplicity, $N_{\text{trk}}$, is the number of tracks reconstructed without corrections for acceptance and efficiency. The systematic uncertainties are the same for no and $n$-subevents ($n = 2, 3, 4$).

For low-$N_{\text{trk}}$ ranges ($N_{\text{trk}} < 80$), both SC(2, 3) and SC(2, 4) diverge toward positive values in the no-subevent method, likely because of a dominant contribution from few-particle correlations. Using the subevent method, the rising trend, seen in the standard cumulant approach, is heavily suppressed at low multiplicities. For $N_{\text{trk}} > 50$, SC(2, 3) shows clear negative values, while SC(2, 4) stays positive, similar to what is observed in PbPb collisions [34].

As already discussed in this paper and in Refs. [37, 38], the ability of the subevent technique to suppress short-range correlations is clearly demonstrated. For $N_{\text{trk}} > 80$, the no-subevent and $n$-subevent methods give consistent results for SC(2, 3), suggesting that the contribution
from nonflow effects is small. For SC(2, 4), there is a clear difference between no-subevent and $n$-subevent results up to the highest multiplicities investigated.

One explanation for the difference in behavior of SC(2, 3) and SC(2, 4) as functions of the number of subevents is that SC(2, 4) has a greater sensitivity to nonflow contributions. As more subevents would further suppress nonflow contribution [37, 38], the values of SC(2, 4) from different numbers of subevents would be expected to follow the ordering:

$$\text{SC}(2, 4) \geq \text{SC}_{2\text{sub}}(2, 4) \geq \text{SC}_{3\text{sub}}(2, 4) \geq \text{SC}_{4\text{sub}}(2, 4).$$  

(8)

This behavior is observed for both SC(2, 3) and SC(2, 4) for $N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{offline}} < 80$. For $N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{offline}} > 100$, while for SC(2, 3) results are consistent with each other among different number of subevents, the expected ordering from Eq. (8) is not followed for SC(2, 4).

This observation is illustrated more clearly in Fig. 2, which shows the SC(2, 3) and SC(2, 4) relative differences between 2 subevents and 3 or 4 subevents. The SC(2, 3) results from 3 and 4 subevents are similar to those from 2 subevents. For SC(2, 4), there is a clear difference between $n$-subevent results, which appears to be about 10–40% for $N_{\text{trk}}^{\text{offline}} > 100$. The 3-subevent SC(2, 4) values are greater than the 2-subevent values, contrary to what is expected from nonflow contributions. This behavior shows the sensitivity of SC(2, 4) to other effects. In particular, the event-plane decorrelation [46] could be an important contribution to the observed behavior as also observed in Ref. [33]. The impact of event-plane decorrelation and how it is different for SC(2, 3) and SC(2, 4) remains to be understood.

6 Summary

The first measurement of event-by-event correlations of different Fourier harmonic orders in symmetric cumulants SC(2, 3) and SC(2, 4) with 2, 3, and 4 subevents in proton-lead (pPb)
collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 8.16$ TeV is presented using data collected by the CMS experiment. The pPb data analyzed with the subevent method are compared to previously published results using the technique without subevents. In all cases, an anticorrelation is observed between the single-particle anisotropy harmonics $v_2$ and $v_3$, while $v_2$ and $v_4$ are positively correlated. For charged-particle multiplicity $N_{\text{offline}} > 100$, both standard and $n$-subevent methods give similar results for SC(2,3), suggesting that nonflow effects have a small contribution in this region. The SC(2,4) results show a different behavior in the same multiplicity region for different numbers of subevents. The contributions from other effects which might explain this difference for SC(2,3) and SC(2,4) remain to be studied. By suppressing the nonflow contribution, the subevent method reveals that harmonic correlations from collectivity extend below $N_{\text{offline}} \sim 80$, most clearly for SC(2,3). The results presented in this paper show that the collectivity observed in small systems extends down to multiplicities $N_{\text{offline}} \sim 50$, and impose more constraints on theoretical interpretations of the origin of such observed collectivity.
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