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ABSTRACT: The production cross-section of $J/\psi$ pairs is measured using a data sample of $pp$ collisions collected by the LHCb experiment at a centre-of-mass energy of $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, corresponding to an integrated luminosity of $279 \pm 11$ pb$^{-1}$. The measurement is performed for $J/\psi$ mesons with a transverse momentum of less than 10 GeV/c in the rapidity range $2.0 < y < 4.5$. The production cross-section is measured to be $15.2 \pm 1.0 \pm 0.9$ nb. The first uncertainty is statistical, and the second is systematic. The differential cross-sections as functions of several kinematic variables of the $J/\psi$ pair are measured and compared to theoretical predictions.
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1 Introduction

The production mechanism of heavy quarkonia is a long-standing and intriguing problem in quantum chromodynamics (QCD), which is not fully understood even after over forty years of study. The colour-singlet model (CSM) [1–10] assumes the intermediate $Q\bar{Q}$ state to be colourless and to have the same $J^{PC}$ quantum numbers as the final quarkonium state. Leading-order calculations in the CSM underestimate the $J=1$ and $(2S)$ production cross-sections at high transverse momentum, $p_T$, by more than one order of magnitude [11]. The gap between CSM predictions and experimental measurements is reduced when including next-to-leading-order corrections, but the agreement is still not satisfactory [12–14]. The non-relativistic QCD (NRQCD) model takes into account both colour-singlet (CS) and colour-octet (CO) states of the $Q\bar{Q}$ pair [15–17]. It either describes the production cross-sections and polarisations at large $p_T$ or it describes the production cross-section at all $p_T$ values, but then fails to predict the polarisation [18–33]. This puzzle can be probed via the production of pairs of quarkonia [34–39], where the interpretation of the measured cross-section could be simpler. In quarkonium-pair production, the selection rules in the CS process of leading-order (LO) NRQCD forbid the feed-down from cascade decays of excited $C$-even states. This feed-down from $C$-even states, e.g. $\chi_c \to J/\psi \gamma$ or $\chi_b \to \Upsilon \gamma$, plays an important role in single quarkonium production. It significantly complicates the precise comparison between data and model predictions, and makes the interpretation of polarisation measurements difficult.

Besides the single parton scattering (SPS) process, the process of double parton scattering (DPS) can also contribute to quarkonium pair production. The DPS process is of great
importance since it can provide information on the transverse momenta of the partons and their correlations inside the proton, and can help in understanding various backgrounds, e.g. $Z + b\bar{b}$, $W^+ + W^-$, multi-jets etc., in searches for new physics. The DPS processes have been studied in several final states, e.g. 4-jets by the AFS [40], UA2 [41], CDF [42], and ATLAS [43] collaborations, $\gamma + 3$-jets by the CDF [44] and D0 [45, 46] collaborations, $2\gamma + 2$-jets by the D0 [47] collaboration, $W + 2$-jets [48] and $T + T$ [49] by the CMS collaboration, $J/\psi + W$ [50] and $J/\psi + Z$ [51] by the ATLAS collaboration, and double charm [52], $Z$ + open charm [53] and $J/\psi$ + open charm [54] by the LHCb collaboration. After having been first observed by the NA3 collaboration in pion-nuclear and proton-nuclear interactions [55, 56], $J/\psi$ pair production has been measured in $pp$ collisions by the LHCb [57] and CMS [58] experiments at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV and by the ATLAS experiment [59] at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV. The D0 experiment [60] measured it using $p\bar{p}$ collision data at $\sqrt{s} = 1.96$ TeV.

Within the DPS mechanism, two quarkonia are produced independently in different partonic interactions. Neglecting the parton correlations in the proton, the contribution of this mechanism is estimated according to the formula [61–63]

$$\sigma_{\text{DPS}}(J/\psi J/\psi) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\sigma(J/\psi)^2}{\sigma_{\text{eff}}}, \quad (1.1)$$

where $\sigma(J/\psi)$ is the inclusive prompt $J/\psi$ production cross-section, the factor $1/2$ accounts for two identical particles in the final state, and $\sigma_{\text{eff}}$ is an effective cross-section, which provides a proper normalisation of the DPS cross-section estimate. The effective cross-section is related to the transverse overlap function between partons in the proton, and is thought to be universal for all processes and energy scales. Most of the measured values of $\sigma_{\text{eff}}$ lie in the range $12 - 20$ mb [43, 54, 64], which supports the expectation that $\sigma_{\text{eff}}$ is universal for a large range of processes with different kinematics and scales, and for a wide spectrum of centre-of-mass energies in $pp$ and $p\bar{p}$ collisions.

The LHCb measurement of $\sigma(J/\psi J/\psi) = 5.1 \pm 1.0 \pm 1.1$ nb at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV is not precise enough to distinguish between the SPS and DPS contributions [65, 66]. The SPS contribution is calculated to be $4.0 \pm 1.2$ nb [67, 68] and $4.6 \pm 1.1$ nb [39] in the leading-order NRQCD CS approach, and $5.4_{-1.1}^{+2.7}$ nb [39] using complete next-to-leading order NRQCD CS approach. The DPS contribution is estimated to be $3.8 \pm 1.3$ nb with eq. (1.1) using $\sigma(J/\psi)$ from ref. [69] and $\sigma_{\text{eff}} = 14.5 \pm 1.7_{-2.3}^{+1.7}$ mb from ref. [44]. The large number of reconstructed $J/\psi$ pair events in the CMS data [58] allowed for study of $J/\psi$ correlations [70]. The observation of events with a large separation in rapidity of two $J/\psi$ mesons indicates a significant DPS contribution, leading to $\sigma_{\text{eff}} = 8.2 \pm 2.2$ mb [70], somewhat lower than the majority of other $\sigma_{\text{eff}}$ measurements. A similarly small value, $\sigma_{\text{eff}} = 6.3 \pm 1.9$ mb, is obtained by the ATLAS collaboration using a data-driven model-independent approach [59]. A small value of $\sigma_{\text{eff}} = 4.8 \pm 2.5$ mb is also obtained by the D0 collaboration [60] using the separation of the two $J/\psi$ mesons in pseudorapidity to distinguish SPS and DPS contributions. Together with an even smaller value of $\sigma_{\text{eff}} = 2.2 \pm 1.1$ mb, determined by the D0 collaboration from the measurement of the simultaneous production of $J/\psi$ and $T$ mesons [71], and the estimate of $\sigma_{\text{eff}} = 2.2 - 6.6$ mb by
the CMS collaboration from the production of $Y$ pairs [49], these results question the universality of $\sigma_{\text{eff}}$.

In this paper, the $J/\psi$ pair production cross-section is measured using $pp$ collision data collected by the LHCb experiment in 2015 at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with both $J/\psi$ mesons in the rapidity range $2.0 < y < 4.5$, and with a transverse momentum $p_T < 10 \text{ GeV}/c$. The polarisation of the $J/\psi$ mesons is assumed to be zero since there is as yet no knowledge of the polarisation of $J/\psi$ pairs, and all the LHC analyses indicate a small polarisation for the quarkonia [29–33]. The $J/\psi$ mesons are reconstructed via the $\mu^+\mu^-$ final state. In the following, the labels $J/\psi_1$ and $J/\psi_2$ are randomly assigned to the two $J/\psi$ candidates.

2 Detector and data set

The LHCb detector [72, 73] is a single-arm forward spectrometer covering the pseudorapidity range $2 < \eta < 5$, designed for the study of particles containing $b$ or $c$ quarks. The detector includes a high-precision tracking system consisting of a silicon-strap vertex detector surrounding the $pp$ interaction region, a large-area silicon-strip detector (TT) located upstream of a dipole magnet with a bending power of about 4 Tm, and three stations of silicon-strip detectors and straw drift tubes placed downstream of the magnet. The tracking system provides a measurement of momentum, $p$, of charged particles with a relative uncertainty that varies from 0.5% at low momentum to 1.0% at 200 GeV/$c$. The minimum distance of a track to a primary vertex (PV), the impact parameter, is measured with a resolution of $(15+29/p_T)\mu\text{m}$, where $p_T$ is in GeV/$c$. Different types of charged hadrons are distinguished using information from two ring-imaging Cherenkov detectors. Photons, electrons and hadrons are identified by a calorimeter system consisting of scintillating-pad and preshower detectors, an electromagnetic calorimeter and a hadronic calorimeter. Muons are identified by a system composed of alternating layers of iron and multiwire proportional chambers.

The online event selection is performed by a trigger [74], which consists of a hardware stage (L0), based on information from the calorimeter and muon systems, followed by a software stage, which applies a full event reconstruction. The L0 trigger requires two muons with $p_T(\mu_1) \times p_T(\mu_2) > (1.3 \text{ GeV}/c)^2$. In the first stage of the software trigger (HLT1), two muons with $p_T > 330 \text{ MeV}/c$ and $p > 6 \text{ GeV}/c$ are required to form a $J/\psi$ candidate with invariant mass $M(\mu^+\mu^-) > 2.7 \text{ GeV}/c^2$; alternatively, the event can also be accepted when it has a good quality muon with $p_T > 4.34 \text{ GeV}/c$ and $p > 6 \text{ GeV}/c$. In the second stage of the software trigger (HLT2), the two $J/\psi$ mesons are reconstructed from $\mu^+\mu^-$ pairs with good vertex-fit quality and invariant masses within $\pm120 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ of the known $J/\psi$ mass [75], using algorithms identical to the offline reconstruction. In the offline selection, all four muons in the final state are required to have $p_T > 650 \text{ MeV}/c$, $6 < p < 200 \text{ GeV}/c$ and $2 < \eta < 5$. Each track must have a good-quality track fit and be identified as a muon. The four muon tracks are required to originate from the same PV. This reduces to a negligible level the number of pile-up candidates, i.e. $J/\psi$ pairs from two independent $pp$ interactions. The reconstructed $J/\psi$ mesons are required to have a good-quality vertex and an invariant mass in the range $3000 < M(\mu^+\mu^-) < 3200 \text{ MeV}/c^2$. Only events explicitly
triggered by one of the $J/\psi$ candidates at the L0 and the HLT1 stages are retained. For events with multiple candidates, in particular where the four muons can be combined in two different ways to form a $J/\psi$ pair, which account for 1.4% of the total candidates, one randomly chosen candidate pair is retained.

Simulated $J/\psi$ samples are generated to study the behaviour of the signal. In the simulation, $pp$ collisions are generated using PYTHIA8 [76, 77] with a specific LHCb configuration [78]. Decays of hadronic particles are described by EvtGen [79], in which final-state radiation is generated using PHOTOS [80]. The interaction of the generated particles with the detector, and its response, are implemented using the GEANT4 toolkit [81] as described in ref. [82].

### 3 Cross-section determination

The inclusive $J/\psi$ pair production cross-section is measured as

$$\sigma(J/\psi, J/\psi) = \frac{N_{\text{cor}}}{\mathcal{L} \times B(J/\psi \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-)^2},$$

where $N_{\text{cor}}$ is the number of signal candidates after the efficiency correction, $B(J/\psi \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-) = (5.961 \pm 0.033)\%$ is the branching fraction of the $J/\psi \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ decay [75], and $\mathcal{L} = 279 \pm 11 \text{ pb}^{-1}$ is the integrated luminosity, determined using the beam-gas imaging and van der Meer scan methods [83].

The total detection efficiency of the $J/\psi$ pair is estimated as

$$\varepsilon_{\text{tot}} = \varepsilon_{\text{acc}} \times \varepsilon_{\text{rec&sel}} \times \varepsilon_{\text{PID}} \times \varepsilon_{\text{trig}},$$

where $\varepsilon_{\text{acc}}$ is the geometrical acceptance, $\varepsilon_{\text{rec&sel}}$ is the reconstruction and selection efficiency for candidates with all final-state muons inside the geometrical acceptance, $\varepsilon_{\text{PID}}$ is the muon particle identification (PID) efficiency for selected candidates, and $\varepsilon_{\text{trig}}$ is the trigger efficiency for selected candidates satisfying the PID requirement. The first three efficiencies of the $J/\psi$ pair, $\varepsilon_{\text{acc}}$, $\varepsilon_{\text{rec&sel}}$ and $\varepsilon_{\text{PID}}$, are factorized as

$$\varepsilon(J/\psi, J/\psi) = \varepsilon(J/\psi_1) \times \varepsilon(J/\psi_2).$$

Since the HLT2 trigger selection is performed using the same reconstruction algorithm as the offline selection and the selection criteria of the HLT2 trigger are a subset of those used in the final selection, the corresponding trigger efficiency for the reconstructed and selected events is 100%. Since at least one of the two $J/\psi$ meson candidates is required to have passed the L0 and HLT1 trigger, the efficiency $\varepsilon_{\text{trig}}$ of the $J/\psi$ pair can be expressed as

$$\varepsilon_{\text{trig}}(J/\psi, J/\psi) = 1 - (1 - \varepsilon_{\text{trig}}(J/\psi_1)) \times (1 - \varepsilon_{\text{trig}}(J/\psi_2)).$$

All terms in the single $J/\psi$ efficiency are estimated in bins of $p_T$ and $y$ of the $J/\psi$ mesons using the simulation. The track reconstruction and muon PID efficiency are corrected using data-driven techniques, as described in section 4, and the trigger efficiency measurement is validated on data.
The signal yield is determined by performing an extended unbinned maximum likelihood fit to the efficiency-corrected two-dimensional \( M(\mu^+_1 \mu^-_1), M(\mu^+_2 \mu^-_2) \) mass distribution. The total detection efficiency is applied individually on an event-by-event basis. The signal is modelled by the sum of a double-sided Crystal Ball (DSCB) function \cite{84} and a Gaussian function, which share the same mean value. The power law tail parameters of the DSCB, the relative fraction and the difference between the widths of the DSCB and the Gaussian function are fixed to the values obtained from simulation, leaving the peak value and the core width of the DSCB as free parameters. The combinatorial background is described by an exponential function. Since the labels \( J/\psi_1 \) and \( J/\psi_2 \) are assigned randomly, the fit function is symmetric under the exchange of the \( J/\psi_1 \) and \( J/\psi_2 \) masses. The fit projections on \( M(\mu^+_1 \mu^-_1) \) and \( M(\mu^+_2 \mu^-_2) \) are shown in figure 1. The corrected yield\(^1\) of \( J/\psi \) pairs is determined to be \( N^{\text{cor}} = (15.8 \pm 1.1) \times 10^3 \).

After the fit, the residual contamination, where either one or both \( J/\psi \) mesons come from \( b \)-hadron decays, must be corrected for. The fraction of background is evaluated with the help of simulation validated with data and normalized using the measured prompt \( J/\psi \) and inclusive \( b\bar{b} \rightarrow J/\psi \) production cross-sections within the LHCb acceptance at \( \sqrt{s} = 13 \text{ TeV} \) \cite{85}. The fraction of candidates with \( J/\psi \) mesons from \( b \)-hadron decays is determined to be 4.5%.

### 4 Systematic uncertainties

Several sources of systematic uncertainties on the \( J/\psi \) pair production cross-section are studied and summarized in table 1. The uncertainty due to the signal shape description is estimated by replacing the nominal model with two alternative models, the Hypatia function \cite{86} and a kernel estimate for the underlying probability distribution function of

\(^1\)The corresponding fit of the efficiency-uncorrected sample gives \((1.05 \pm 0.05) \times 10^3 \) signal events.
the simulated sample convolved with a Gaussian function [87]. The relative difference of 1.6% with respect to the nominal result is taken as a systematic uncertainty.

A difference between simulation and data, in particular in the fit quality of the candidates when constraining the muons to the PV, can lead to a bias in the efficiency determination. This is estimated by comparing the vertex-fit quality of the reconstructed \( J/\psi \) candidates between the simulated and the data samples, where the background is subtracted using the sPlot technique [88]. Data and simulation agree within 1.0%, which is taken as a systematic uncertainty.

The track reconstruction efficiency is studied in data using a tag-and-probe technique [89]. In this method, one of the muons from the \( J/\psi \) is fully reconstructed as the tag track, and the other muon track, the probe track, is reconstructed using only information from the TT detector and the muon stations. The tracking efficiency is taken as the fraction of \( J/\psi \) candidates whose probe tracks match fully reconstructed tracks. The simulated sample is corrected to match the track multiplicity of events in the data. The ratio of tracking efficiencies between data and simulation is taken as the systematic uncertainty. A systematic uncertainty of 0.8% per track is assigned for the difference in event multiplicity between data and simulation.

The muon PID efficiency is also determined using a tag-and-probe method [90], where only one track of the \( J/\psi \) is identified as a muon, i.e. the tag track. The single muon PID efficiency, defined as the fraction of \( J/\psi \) candidates with the other track (probe track) identified as a muon, is determined in bins of \( p \) and \( \eta \) of the probe track. Systematic effects arising from the choice of the binning scheme and for the difference in event multiplicity between data and simulation are studied. In total, the muon PID efficiency uncertainty is determined to be 2.3%.

The trigger efficiency \( \varepsilon_{\text{trig}}(J/\psi) \) measured with simulation is compared with the result obtained in data for inclusive \( J/\psi \) events using a tag-and-probe method [74]. A difference of 1.0% between the two results is observed and is taken as the systematic uncertainty.

An uncertainty of 1.0% is assigned to the determination of the fraction of candidates from \( b \)-hadron decays, which accounts for the uncertainty of the prompt \( J/\psi \) and \( b \bar{b} \) production cross-sections. The uncertainty introduced by the limited statistics of the simulated samples used to determine the efficiencies is estimated to be negligible. The 1.1% uncertainty on \( B(J/\psi \to \mu^+\mu^-) \) is propagated to the cross-section. The systematic uncertainty due to the luminosity calibration is 3.9%. The total systematic uncertainty is 6.1%.

5 Results and comparison to theory

The \( J/\psi \) pair production cross-section where both \( J/\psi \) mesons are in the region \( 2.0 < y < 4.5 \) and \( p_T < 10 \text{ GeV}/c \) is measured to be

\[
\sigma(J/\psi J/\psi) = 15.2 \pm 1.0 \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.9 \text{ (syst)} \text{ nb},
\]

assuming negligible polarisation of the \( J/\psi \) mesons. The detection efficiency of \( J/\psi \) mesons can be affected by the polarisation, especially by the polarisation parameter \( \lambda_\theta \) in the helicity frame [32, 85]. If a value of \( \lambda_\theta = \pm 20\% \) is assumed for both of the \( J/\psi \) mesons,
Table 1. Summary of the systematic uncertainties on the measurement of the $J/\psi$ pair production cross-section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Uncertainty[%]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signal shape</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data/simulation difference</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracking efficiency</td>
<td>$0.8 \times 4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muon PID efficiency</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trigger efficiency</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraction of $J=J$ from $b$-hadron candidates</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathcal{B}(J/\psi \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-)$</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luminosity</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ratio of the production cross-section of the $J/\psi$ pair to that of the inclusive prompt $J/\psi$ is calculated to be

$$\frac{\sigma(J/\psi;J/\psi)}{\sigma(J/\psi)} = (10.2 \pm 0.7 \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.9 \text{ (syst)}) \times 10^{-4}, \quad (5.1)$$

where the production cross-section of prompt $J/\psi$ mesons in the range $2.0 < y < 4.5$ and $p_T < 10 \text{ GeV/c}$ is $\sigma(J/\psi) = 14.94 \pm 0.02 \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.91 \text{ (syst)} \text{ pb} \ [85]$, and the systematic uncertainties of $\sigma(J/\psi;J/\psi)$ and $\sigma(J/\psi)$ are treated as uncorrelated. According to eq. (1.1), the ratio

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{\sigma(J/\psi)^2}{\sigma(J/\psi;J/\psi)} = 7.3 \pm 0.5 \text{ (stat)} \pm 1.0 \text{ (syst)} \text{ mb}. \quad (5.2)$$

can be interpreted as $\sigma_{\text{eff}}$ if all $J/\psi$ pairs are produced through the DPS process.

The results on $J/\psi$ pair production are compared with a data-driven prediction for the DPS mechanism and several calculations performed within the SPS mechanism. The DPS prediction is calculated via eq. (1.1) using the measured $J/\psi$ production cross-section at $\sqrt{s} = 13 \text{ TeV} \ [85]$ and the effective cross-section $\sigma_{\text{eff}} = 14.5 \pm 1.7^{+1.7}_{-2.3} \text{ mb}$ from refs. [44, 91].

Theoretical predictions of the production cross-section of $J/\psi$ pairs are summarized in table 2. The contribution from the SPS mechanism is calculated using several approaches: the state-of-art complete NLO colour-singlet (NLO CS) computations [39]; the incomplete (no-loops) next-to-leading-order colour-singlet (NLO* CS) calculations [70, 92–96]; leading-order colour-singlet (LO CS) [92] and colour-octet (LO CO) [95, 96] calculations and the approach based on the $k_T$-factorisation method [97–101], with the leading-order colour-singlet matrix element (LO $k_T$) [102, 103]. Even with the leading-order matrix element, the LO $k_T$ approach includes a large fraction of higher-order contributions via the evolution of parton densities [102]. Since NLO* CS calculations are divergent at small transverse momentum of the $J/\psi$ pair, two approaches are used: a simple cut-off for $p_T(J/\psi;J/\psi)$ [92] (denoted as NLO* CS'), and a cut on the mass of any light parton pair (NLO* CS'') [70, 93–96].
stable and practically invariant with respect to the choice of PDFs, scales and LDMEs. The shapes of the differential cross-sections are very sensitive to the theory uncertainties, the comparison of NLO and LO CS predictions in Table 2 shows that the predictions vary by a factor between 0.8 and 3 when varying the factorisation and renormalisation scales. For the LO CO predictions the third uncertainty corresponds to the variation of PDFs and gluon densities, while the second one corresponds to the variation of the factorisation and renormalisation scales. For the DPS predictions the first uncertainty is due to the measured prompt $J/\psi$ production cross-section [85] and the second is due to the uncertainty in $\sigma_{\text{eff}}$ [44, 91].

Gluon densities from refs. [104–108] are used for the LO $k_T$ approach, while CT14 parton distribution functions (PDF) [109] are used for LO CS and NLO* CS' calculations, NNPDF 3.0 NLO PDFs with $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.118$ [110] are used for LO CO and NLO* CS'' predictions, and CTEQ6L1 and CTEQ6M PDFs [111, 112] are used for NLO CS computations. For LO CO predictions the long-distance matrix elements (LDMEs) are taken from refs. [25, 113–119] and a smearing of transverse momenta of initial gluons, similar to that used in NLO* CS'', is applied. The production cross-section of $J/\psi$ pairs is sensitive to the choice of parameters; for example, it varies by a factor between 0.8 and 3 when varying the factorisation and renormalisation scales by a factor of two, or increases if the CTEQ 6L PDF set [120] is used instead of the nominal PDFs. The contribution of LO CO is very sensitive to the choice of the LDME; the absolute cross-section varies from the minimum of 0.11 nb, based on LDME set from ref. [113] to the maximum of 0.70 nb, calculated using LDME set from ref. [116], while most of the predictions cluster around 0.5 nb. The feed-down from $\psi(2S) \rightarrow J/\psi X$ decays is included in the LO $k_T$, LO CO and NLO* CS'' calculations and not in the LO CS and NLO* CS' calculations. Likewise, a tiny contribution from $J/\psi \chi_c$ production with subsequent decay $\chi_c \rightarrow J/\psi \gamma$ [92] is included in the NLO* CS' and LO CO results but neglected in the NLO* CS'' calculations.

While the predictions for the production cross-section of $J/\psi$ pairs are significantly affected by the theory uncertainties, the shapes of the differential cross-sections are very stable and practically invariant with respect to the choice of PDFs, scales and LDMEs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\sigma(J/\psi J/\psi)$ [nb]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no $p_T$ cut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_T &gt; 1$ GeV/$c$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_T &gt; 3$ GeV/$c$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO CS [92]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO CO [95, 96]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO $k_T$ [102]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLO* CS' [92]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLO* CS'' [70, 93–96]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLO CS [39]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS [44, 85, 91]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Summary of the theoretical predictions and the measurement of $\sigma(J/\psi J/\psi)$ for different regions of transverse momentum of the $J/\psi$ pair. For SPS predictions, the first uncertainty accounts for the variation of PDFs and gluon densities, while the second one corresponds to the variation of the factorisation and renormalisation scales. For the LO CO predictions the third uncertainty corresponds to the choice of LDMEs from refs. [25, 113–119]. For NLO CS predictions [39] the uncertainty corresponds to the variation of the factorisation and renormalisation scales. For the DPS prediction the first uncertainty is due to the measured prompt $J/\psi$ production cross-section [85] and the second is due to the uncertainty in $\sigma_{\text{eff}}$ [44, 91].
In contrast, the smearing of gluon transverse momenta for NLO CS’’ and LO CO models does not affect the production cross-section, but significantly affects some differential distributions.

The measured differential production cross-sections of $J/\psi$ pairs as a function of several kinematic variables are compared to the theoretical predictions. For each variable $v$, the differential production cross-section of $J/\psi$ pairs is calculated as

$$\frac{d\sigma(J/\psi J/\psi)}{dv} = \frac{1}{L \times B(J/\psi \to \mu^+ \mu^-)^2} \times \frac{\Delta N^\text{cor}_i}{\Delta v_i},$$

where $\Delta N^\text{cor}_i$ is the number of efficiency-corrected signal candidates in bin $i$, and $\Delta v_i$ is the corresponding bin width. The luminosity uncertainty and the uncertainty introduced by $B(J/\psi \to \mu^+ \mu^-)$ are common to all bins and are fully correlated. The tracking efficiency and muon PID efficiency uncertainties are strongly correlated. In figures 2–8 of the differential cross-sections, only the statistical uncertainties are shown as the systematic ones are negligibly small and almost 100% correlated.

The comparison between measurements and theoretical predictions is performed for the following kinematical variables: transverse momentum and rapidity of the $J/\psi$ pair, transverse momentum and rapidity of each $J/\psi$ meson, differences in the azimuthal angle and rapidity between the two $J/\psi$ mesons ($|\Delta \phi|$ and $|\Delta y|$), the mass of the $J/\psi$ pair and the transverse momentum asymmetry, defined as

$$A_T \equiv \frac{|p_T(J/\psi_1) - p_T(J/\psi_2)|}{p_T(J/\psi_1) + p_T(J/\psi_2)}.$$
the azimuthal angle $\phi$. For LO CO and NLO$^*$ CS$''$ models two values of Gaussian smearing of the initial transverse momentum of gluon $k_T$ are used, namely $\langle k_T \rangle = 0.5$ and $2$ GeV/c. The $p_T(J/\psi,J/\psi)$ distribution, shown in figure 2, demonstrates the large dependence of the shape on the choice of the $\langle k_T \rangle$ parameter. For the NLO$^*$ CS$''$ approach [70, 93–96], relatively large smearing of the initial gluon transverse momenta $k_T = 2$ GeV/c is required to eliminate peaking structures in the distribution. The distributions of the variables $p_T(J/\psi J/\psi)$, $|\Delta\phi|$ and $A_T$, predicted by the LO CS model, are trivial, $p_T(J/\psi J/\psi) \sim 0$, $|\Delta\phi| \sim \pi$ and $A_T \sim 0$, and omitted from the plots. A similar trivial pattern is expected for the LO CO model, but due to the $k_T$-smearing, the actual shape of the distributions strongly depends on the choice of the $\langle k_T \rangle$ parameter. The NLO$^*$ CS$''$ model also demonstrates a large dependence on the $\langle k_T \rangle$ parameter for $|\Delta\phi| / \pi$ distribution.

Neither the DPS model with the given value of the $\sigma_{\text{eff}}$ parameter, nor any of the SPS models can describe simultaneously the measured cross-section and the differential shapes. However, the sum of the DPS and SPS contributions can adequately describe both the measured production cross-sections and the differential distributions. To discriminate between the SPS and DPS contributions, the differential distribution for each variable $v$ is

Figure 3. Comparisons between measurements and theoretical predictions for the differential cross-sections as functions of (top left) $p_T(J/\psi)$, (top right) $y(J/\psi J/\psi)$ and (bottom) $y(J/\psi)$. The (black) points with error bars represent the measurements.

LHCb 13 TeV
Figure 4. Comparisons between measurements and theoretical predictions for the differential cross-sections as functions of (top left) $|\Delta y|$, (top right) $|\Delta \phi|$, (bottom left) $A_T$ and (bottom right) $m(J/\psi J/\psi)$. The (black) points with error bars represent the measurements.

fitted with the simple two-component model

$$\frac{d\sigma}{dv} = \sigma_{DPS} F_{DPS}(v) + \sigma_{SPS} F_{SPS}(v),$$

(5.3)

where $F_{DPS}$ and $F_{SPS}$ are templates for the DPS and SPS models and $\sigma_{DPS}$ and $\sigma_{SPS}$ are floating fit parameters representing the DPS and SPS contributions. The theory normalisation is not used in the fits. The DPS fraction $f_{DPS}$ is defined as

$$f_{DPS} \equiv \frac{\sigma_{DPS}}{\sigma_{SPS} + \sigma_{DPS}}.$$  (5.4)

Some distributions give little discrimination between SPS and DPS. The percentages of the DPS component obtained from the fits for the most discriminating variables are presented in table 3. The fit results are presented in the appendix. All the fits indicate a large DPS contribution to the $J/\psi$ pair production process. The inclusion of the CO component in the fit does not have a large effect on the determination of the DPS fraction $f_{DPS}$, and the fraction of the CO component determined in such a fit procedure is significantly smaller than the CS contribution. The value of $\sigma_{SPS}$, calculated as $(1 - f_{DPS}) \times \sigma(J/\psi J/\psi)$,
Figure 5. Comparisons between measurements and theoretical predictions with $p_T(J/\psi J/\psi) > 1$ GeV/c for the differential cross-sections as functions of (top left) $p_T(J/\psi)$, (top right) $y(J/\psi J/\psi)$ and (bottom) $y(J/\psi)$. The (black) points with error bars represent the measurements.

is smaller than expectations from the NLO* CS" [70, 93–96] and NLO CS [39] approaches and roughly agrees with the NLO* CS' [92] and LO $k_T$ [102] predictions.

The value $\sigma_{DPS}$ determined with eq. (5.3) is converted to $\sigma_{\text{eff}}$,

$$\sigma_{\text{eff}} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\sigma(J/\psi)}{\sigma_{\text{DPS}}}, \tag{5.5}$$

where $\sigma(J/\psi)$ is the production cross-section of prompt $J/\psi$ mesons from ref. [85]. The values obtained for $\sigma_{\text{eff}}$ are summarized in table 4. Values between 10.0 and 12.5 mb are found for the models considered in this analysis. These values are slightly larger than those measured from central $J/\psi$ pair production at LHC, $\sigma_{\text{eff}} = 8.2 \pm 2.2$ mb [70] and $\sigma_{\text{eff}} = 6.3 \pm 1.9$ mb [59], and significantly exceed the values obtained by the D0 collaboration from analysis of $J/\psi$ pair production, $\sigma_{\text{eff}} = 4.8 \pm 2.5$ mb [60], and $\Upsilon J/\psi$ production, $\sigma_{\text{eff}} = 2.2 \pm 1.1$ mb [71]. On the other hand, they are smaller than the values of $\sigma_{\text{eff}}$ measured by the LHCb collaboration in the processes of multiple associated heavy quark production [52, 54], in particular $\sigma_{\text{eff}} \sim 15$ mb measured for various $J/\psi + \bar{c}c$ production processes [52] and $\sigma_{\text{eff}} = 18.0 \pm 1.8$ mb measured for the $\Upsilon(1S) + D^{0,+}$ production processes [54].
### Table 3.
Percentages of the DPS component, $f_{DPS}$, determined with the simple two-component fit to different distributions for different SPS models.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>LO CS</th>
<th>LO $k_T$</th>
<th>NLO* CS$''$</th>
<th>NLO CS</th>
<th>NLO* CS$''$</th>
<th>NLO CS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_T(J/\psi J/\psi)$</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>78 ± 3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>88 ± 56</td>
<td>81 ± 7</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$y(J/\psi J/\psi)$</td>
<td>83 ± 39</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>75 ± 37</td>
<td>68 ± 34</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m(J/\psi J/\psi)$</td>
<td>76 ± 7</td>
<td>74 ± 7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>78 ± 7</td>
<td>77 ± 7</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>\Delta y</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>59 ± 21</td>
<td>61 ± 18</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>63 ± 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_T(J/\psi J/\psi) &gt; 1$ GeV/c</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>75 ± 24</td>
<td>71 ± 38</td>
<td>68 ± 34</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$y(J/\psi J/\psi)$</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>73 ± 8</td>
<td>76 ± 7</td>
<td>88 ± 1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m(J/\psi J/\psi)$</td>
<td>57 ± 20</td>
<td>59 ± 19</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>60 ± 18</td>
<td>60 ± 19</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>\Delta y</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>42 ± 25</td>
<td>53 ± 21</td>
<td>53 ± 21</td>
<td>53 ± 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_T(J/\psi J/\psi) &gt; 3$ GeV/c</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>77 ± 18</td>
<td>64 ± 38</td>
<td>64 ± 35</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$y(J/\psi J/\psi)$</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>76 ± 10</td>
<td>84 ± 7</td>
<td>87 ± 2</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m(J/\psi J/\psi)$</td>
<td>42 ± 25</td>
<td>53 ± 21</td>
<td>53 ± 21</td>
<td>53 ± 21</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>\Delta y</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>12.5 ± 4.1</td>
<td>12.2 ± 3.7</td>
<td>12.4 ± 3.9</td>
<td>11.2 ± 2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.
Summary of the $\sigma_{eff}$ values (in mb) from DPS fits for different SPS models. The uncertainty is statistical only, originating from the statistical uncertainty in $\sigma_{DPS}$ (and $d\sigma(J/\psi J/\psi)/dv$). The common systematic uncertainty of 12%, accounting for the systematic uncertainty of $\sigma(J/\psi J/\psi)$ and the total uncertainty for $\sigma(J/\psi)$, is not shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>LO $k_T$</th>
<th>NLO* CS$''$</th>
<th>NLO CS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_T(J/\psi J/\psi)$</td>
<td>11.3 ± 0.6</td>
<td>10.1 ± 6.5</td>
<td>10.9 ± 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$y(J/\psi J/\psi)$</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>11.9 ± 7.5</td>
<td>10.0 ± 5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m(J/\psi J/\psi)$</td>
<td>10.6 ± 1.1</td>
<td>10.2 ± 1.0</td>
<td>10.4 ± 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>\Delta y</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>12.5 ± 4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6. Comparisons between measurements and theoretical predictions with $p_T(J/\psi J/\psi) > 1$ GeV/c for the differential cross-sections as functions of (top left) $|\Delta y|$, (top right) $|\Delta \phi|$, (bottom left) $A_T$ and (bottom right) $m(J/\psi J/\psi)$. The (black) points with error bars represent the measurements.
Figure 7. Comparisons between measurements and theoretical predictions with $p_T(J/\psi J/\psi) > 3\text{ GeV}/c$ for the differential cross-sections as functions of (top left) $p_T(J/\psi)$, (top right) $y(J/\psi J/\psi)$ and (bottom) $y(J/\psi)$. The (black) points with error bars represent the measurements.
Figure 8. Comparisons between measurements and theoretical predictions with $p_T(J/\psi J/\psi) > 3$ GeV/c for the differential cross-sections as functions of (top left) $|\Delta y|$, (top right) $|\Delta \phi|$, (bottom left) $A_T$ and (bottom right) $m(J/\psi J/\psi)$. The (black) points with error bars represent the measurements.
6 Summary

The $J/\psi$ pair production cross-section with both $J/\psi$ mesons in the region $2.0 < y < 4.5$ and $p_T < 10\text{ GeV}/c$ is measured to be $15.2 \pm 1.0\text{ (stat)} \pm 0.9\text{ (syst)} \text{ nb}$, using $pp$ collision data collected by LHCb at $\sqrt{s} = 13\text{ TeV}$, corresponding to an integrated luminosity of $279\text{ pb}^{-1}$. The differential production cross-sections as functions of $p_T(J/\psi J/\psi)$, $m(J/\psi J/\psi)$, $y(J/\psi J/\psi)$, $y(J/\psi)$, $|\Delta \phi|$, $|\Delta y|$ and $A_T$ are compared to theoretical predictions. A fit to the differential cross-sections using simple DPS plus SPS models indicates a significant DPS contribution. The data can be reasonably well described with a sum of DPS and SPS colour-singlet contributions, with no evidence for a large SPS colour-octet contribution. The obtained SPS contribution is overestimated in the NLO* CS'' [70, 93–96] and NLO CS [39] approaches and roughly agrees with the NLO* CS' [92] and LO $k_T$ [102] predictions. Good agreement with the data for the differential cross-sections calculated within the LO $k_T$ [102] and NLO* CS' [92] approaches indicates that a significant part of high-order contributions can be properly accounted via the evolution of parton densities [102]. Relatively large smearing of initial gluon transverse momenta $\langle k_T \rangle = 2\text{ GeV}/c$ is preferred over $\langle k_T \rangle = 0.5\text{ GeV}/c$ for the NLO* CS'' approach [70, 93–96]. An improvement in the precision for SPS predictions is needed for a better discrimination between the different theory approaches. A large DPS contribution results in values of $\sigma_{eff}$ that are smaller than the values of $\sigma_{eff}$ measured previously by the LHCb collaboration in the processes of multiple associated heavy quark production [52, 54], and slightly larger than those measured from central $J/\psi$ pair production at the CMS [58] and ATLAS [59] experiments.
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A Fits to the differential cross-sections with SPS and DPS components

The results of fits used for the determination of $\sigma_{\text{eff}}$ are shown in figures 9, 10 and 11. The fits used only for determination of $f_{\text{DPS}}$ in $p_T(J/\psi,J/\psi) > 1 \text{ GeV}/c$ and $p_T(J/\psi,J/\psi) > 3 \text{ GeV}/c$ regions are shown in figures 12, 13, 14 and 15.
Figure 9. Result of templated DPS fit for $d\sigma(J/\psi J/\psi)$ and $dy(J/\psi J/\psi)$. The (black) points with error bars represent the data. The total fit result is shown with the thick (red) solid line and the DPS component is shown with the thin (orange) solid line.
Figure 10. Result of templated DPS fit for $\frac{d\sigma(J/\psi J/\psi)}{dm(J/\psi J/\psi)}$. The (black) points with error bars represent the data. The total fit result is shown with the thick (red) solid line and the DPS component is shown with the thin (orange) solid line.
Figure 11. Result of templated DPS fit for $\frac{d\sigma(J/\psi J/\psi)}{d|\Delta y|}$. The (black) points with error bars represent the data. The total fit result is shown with the thick (red) solid line and the DPS component is shown with the thin (orange) solid line.
Figure 12. Result of templated DPS fit for $\frac{d\sigma(J/\psi J/\psi)}{dy(J/\psi J/\psi)}$ and $\frac{d\sigma(J/\psi)}{dm(J/\psi J/\psi)}$ for the $p_T(J/\psi J/\psi) > 1$ GeV/$c$ region. The (black) points with error bars represent the data. The total fit result is shown with the thick (red) solid line and the DPS component is shown with the thin (orange) solid line.
Figure 13. Result of templated DPS fit for $\frac{d\sigma(J/\psi J/\psi)}{d|\Delta y|}$ for the $p_T(J/\psi J/\psi) > 1$ GeV/c region. The (black) points with error bars represent the data. The total fit result is shown with the thick (red) solid line and the DPS component is shown with the thin (orange) solid line.
Figure 14. Result of templated DPS fit for $\frac{d\sigma(J/\psi J/\psi)}{dy(J/\psi J/\psi)}$ and $\frac{d\sigma(J/\psi J/\psi)}{dm(J/\psi J/\psi)}$ for the $p_T(J/\psi J/\psi) > 3$ GeV/$c$ region. The (black) points with error bars represent the data. The total fit result is shown with the thick (red) solid line and the DPS component is shown with the thin (orange) solid line.
Figure 15. Result of templated DPS fit for $\frac{d\sigma(J/\psi J/\psi)}{d|\Delta y|}$ for the $p_T(J/\psi J/\psi) > 3\text{ GeV}/c$ region. The (black) points with error bars represent the data. The total fit result is shown with the thick (red) solid line and the DPS component is shown with the thin (orange) solid line.
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