Observation of an Excited $\Omega^-$ Baryon
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Using data recorded with the Belle detector, we observe a new excited hyperon, an $\Omega^-$ candidate decaying into $\Xi^0 K^-$ and $\Xi^- K^0_S$ with a mass of $2024.4 \pm 0.7$ (stat) $\pm 0.6$ (syst) MeV/$c^2$ and a width of $\Gamma = 6.4^{+2.5}_{-1.6}$ (stat) $\pm 1.6$ (syst) MeV. The $\Omega^-$ is seen primarily in $\Upsilon(1S)$, $\Upsilon(2S)$, and $\Upsilon(3S)$ decays.

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.121.052003

The $\Omega^-$ comprises three strange quarks. Its excited states have proved difficult to find. The Particle Data Group (PDG) [1] lists only one of them, the $\Omega(2250)$, in its summary tables, and it has a mass almost 600 MeV/$c^2$ higher than that of the ground state. In addition, the particle listings detail two other states for which the evidence of existence is considered to be “only fair,” and they are at even higher masses. The gap in the spectrum is surprising, as there are negative-parity orbital excitations of many other baryons approximately 300 MeV/$c^2$ above their respective ground states, and the quark model [2–5], Skyrme model [6], and lattice gauge theory [7] all predict a $J^P = \frac{1}{2}^-$ and $J^P = \frac{3}{2}^-$ pair of excited $\Omega^-$ states with masses in the 2000 MeV/$c^2$ region.

A particular feature of $\Omega^-$ baryons are their zero isospin which means that $\Omega^--\Omega^0\pi^0$ decays are highly suppressed, and this restricts the possible decays of excited states, with the largest expected decay mode for low-lying states being $\Xi K$. Such decays are analogous to the $\Omega^0 \rightarrow \Xi^0 K^-$ decays recently discovered by the LHCb Collaboration [8] and confirmed soon after by the Belle Collaboration [9].

In this Letter, we present the results of a search for $\Omega^-$ using a data sample of $e^+e^-$ annihilations, corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 980 fb$^{-1}$, recorded by the Belle detector [10] operating at the KEKB asymmetric-energy $e^+e^-$ collider [11]. The analysis concentrates on data taken with the accelerator energy tuned for the production of the $\Upsilon(1S)$, $\Upsilon(2S)$, and $\Upsilon(3S)$ resonances, with integrated luminosities of 5.7, 24.9, and 2.9 fb$^{-1}$, respectively. The decays of these narrow resonances proceed via gluons, and it has long been known that they contain an enhanced baryon fraction compared with continuum $e^+e^- \rightarrow q\bar{q}$ events [12–14].

We search for excited $\Omega^-$ decays into $\Xi^0 K^-$ and $\Xi^- K^0_S$ [15], with subsequent decays into $\Xi^0 \rightarrow \Lambda\pi^-$, $\Xi^- \rightarrow \Lambda\pi^0$, $K^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$, $\Lambda \rightarrow p\pi^-$, and $\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$. An excited $\Omega^-$ would be expected to decay strongly, and, because of isospin symmetry, with almost equal branching fractions, into the above two decay modes, and they would likely dominate the decays of any $\Omega^-$ with a mass between the $\Xi K$ and $\Xi(1530)\bar{K}$ thresholds.

The Belle detector was a large solid-angle spectrometer comprising six subdetectors: the silicon vertex detector (SVD), the 50-layer central drift chamber (CDC), the aerogel Cherenkov counter (ACC), the time-of-flight scintillation counter (TOF), the electromagnetic calorimeter (ECL), divided into the barrel ECL in the central region and the forward and backward end caps at smaller angles with respect to the beam axis), and the $K^0_L$ and muon detector. A superconducting solenoid produces a 1.5 T magnetic field throughout the first five of these subdetectors. The detector is described in more detail in Ref. [10]. Two inner detector configurations were used. The first comprised a 2.0 cm radius beam pipe and a 3-layer SVD and the second a 1.5 cm radius beam pipe and a 4-layer SVD and a small-cell inner CDC.

Charged particles $\pi^\pm$, $K^\pm$, and $p$ are selected using the information from the tracking (SVD, CDC) and charged-hadron identification (CDC, ACC, TOF) systems combined into a likelihood $\mathcal{L}(h_1: h_2) = \mathcal{L}_{h_1}/(\mathcal{L}_{h_1} + \mathcal{L}_{h_2})$, where $h_1$ and $h_2$ are $p$, $K$, and $\pi$ as appropriate. Kaon candidates are defined as those with $\mathcal{L}(K:p) > 0.9$ and $\mathcal{L}(K:K) > 0.9$, which is approximately 83% efficient. For protons, the requirements are $\mathcal{L}(p:K) > 0.2$ and $\mathcal{L}(p:p) > 0.2$, while for charged pions $\mathcal{L}(\pi:p) > 0.2$ and $\mathcal{L}(\pi:K) > 0.2$; these requirements are approximately 99% efficient.

The $\pi^0$ candidates are reconstructed from two neutral clusters detected in the ECL, each consistent with being due to a photon and having an energy greater than 30 MeV in the laboratory frame (for those in the end cap calorimeter, the energy threshold is increased to 50 MeV).

Candidate $\Lambda(K^0_L)$ decays are made from $p\pi^-(\pi^+\pi^-)$ pairs with a production vertex significantly separated from
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the average interaction point (IP) and a reconstructed invariant mass within 3.5 (5.0) MeV/c² of the peak values.

Each Ξ⁻ candidate is reconstructed by combining a Λ candidate with a π⁻ candidate. The vertex formed from these two is required to be at least 0.35 cm from the IP, to be a shorter distance from the IP than the Λ decay vertex, and to signify a positive Ξ⁻ flight distance. The Ξ⁰ → Λπ⁰ reconstruction is complicated by the fact that the π⁰ has negligible vertex position information. Combinations of Λ and π⁰ candidates are made, and then, assuming the IP to be the production point of the Ξ⁰, the sum of the Λ and π⁰ momenta is taken as the momentum vector of the Ξ⁰ candidate. The intersection of this trajectory with the reconstructed Λ trajectory is then found, and this position is taken as the decay location of the Ξ⁰ hyperon. The π⁰ is then remade from the two photons using this location as its point of origin. The reconstructed invariant mass of the π⁰ candidate must be within 10.8 MeV/c² of the nominal mass (approximately 94% efficient). To reduce the large combinatorial background, the momentum of the π⁰ candidate is required to be greater than 200 MeV/c. Combinations are retained if they have a decay location of the Ξ⁰ indicating a positive Ξ⁰ path length of greater than 2 cm but less than the distance between the Λ decay vertex and the IP. The refitting of the π⁰ at the reconstructed Ξ⁰ decay vertex improves the Ξ⁰ mass resolution by around 15%.

The resultant invariant mass plots for the Ξ⁰ and Ξ⁻ candidates are shown in Fig. 1. The red vertical arrows indicate the limits of the reconstructed invariant masses of the candidates retained for further analysis, which are ±5.0 and ±3.5 MeV/c² around the central values of the Ξ⁰ and Ξ⁻ mass peaks, respectively, which are each approximately 95% efficient. For the Ξ⁰, the value of the mass peak is 1.3155 GeV/c² and is higher than the PDG [1] value of 1.31486 ± 0.00020 GeV/c². This difference is later used in the estimate of the systematic uncertainty of the Ω⁻ resonance mass measurement.

The Ξ⁰ and Ξ⁻ candidates are kinematically constrained to their nominal masses [1] and then combined with K⁻ and K⁰ candidates, respectively. The two particle combinations are kinematically constrained to come from a common vertex at the IP, and the χ² of this is required to be consistent with the daughters being produced by a common parent. For the Ξ⁰K⁻ case, if there is more than one candidate with the same Λ and K⁻ but a different π⁰, the one with the higher Λ momentum is kept and others discarded to avoid double counting. This occurs around 3% of the time.

Figure 2 shows the Ξ⁰K⁻ and Ξ⁻K⁰ invariant mass distributions in data taken at the Ψ(1S), Ψ(2S), and Ψ(3S) resonance energies. Excesses are present in both distributions at around 2.01 GeV/c². It should be noted that real Ξ⁰K⁻ combinations have three units of strangeness and are therefore highly suppressed. In contrast, Ξ⁻K⁰ combinations may have one unit of strangeness and thus have a larger combinatorial background.

A simultaneous fit applied to the two distributions is shown in Fig. 2 and uses fitting functions where the signal functions are Voigtian functions (Breit-Wigners convolved with a Gaussian resolution functions) and the background functions second-order Chebyshev polynomials. The masses and intrinsic widths of the two Voigtian functions are kept the same. The resolution functions are obtained from Monte Carlo (MC) events, generated using EvtGen [16] with the Belle detector response simulated using the GEANT3 [17] framework, and parametrized as Gaussian distributions with widths of 2.27 MeV/c² for Ξ⁰K⁻ and 1.77 MeV/c² for Ξ⁻K⁰. The fit is made to the binned invariant mass distributions with a large number of small bins, using the maximum-likelihood method. A convenient test of the goodness-of-fit is the χ² per degree of freedom (χ²/d.o.f.) for the distribution plotted in 2.5 MeV/c² bins. The signal yields, mass, intrinsic width, and χ²/d.o.f. resulting from this fit are listed in Table I. We calculate the statistical significance of the signal by excluding the peaks from the fit, finding the change in the log-likelihood (Δ|ln(L)|) and converting this to a p-value taking into account the change in d.o.f. This is then converted to an
effectivene of standard deviations \( n_\sigma \), and for this simultaneous fit, we find \( n_\sigma = 8.3 \).

Table I also lists results obtained from fitting to each of the two distributions separately. The signals in the \( \Xi^0 K^- \) and \( \Xi^- K_S^0 \) mass distributions have significances of \( n_\sigma = 6.9 \) and \( n_\sigma = 4.4 \), respectively, and have statistically compatible masses and widths.

We have performed a series of checks to confirm the stability of the signal peak. Reasonable changes to the selection criteria of the daughter particles produce changes in the signal yield consistent with statistics. It would be surprising if an \( \Omega^- \) were not also produced in continuum \( e^+ e^- \rightarrow q\bar{q} \) events. In Fig. 3, we present mass distributions as in Fig. 2 but for the remainder of the Belle data, which comprise a total of 946 fb\(^{-1} \) taken mostly at the \( \Upsilon(4S) \) energy but also in the continuum below and above this energy as well as at the \( \Upsilon(5S) \). For the fits shown in Fig. 3, we use second-order Chebyshev background functions together with signal functions with mass and width fixed to the values found in the \( \Upsilon(1S, 2S, 3S) \) data. Both distributions show excesses in the signal region, and their statistical significances are listed in Table I.

Taking into account the detection efficiency of the two modes, we use the results of the simultaneous fit to the \( \Upsilon(1S, 2S, 3S) \) data to calculate the branching fraction ratio \( \mathcal{R} = [B(\Omega^- \rightarrow \Xi^0 K^-)/B(\Omega^- \rightarrow \Xi^- K_S^0)] = 1.2 \pm 0.3, \) where statistical uncertainties dominate. With perfect isospin symmetry, this ratio would be 1, but the isospin mass splitting of the \( \Xi \) and \( K \) doublets will lead to an increase of up to approximately 15% depending on the spin associated with decay. The obtained value of \( \mathcal{R} \) is consistent with the expectation.

The significance of the observation is largely unaffected by systematic uncertainties associated with the limited knowledge of the resolution and momentum scale of the detector. However, the use of different background functions can change the significance values. If we replace the background functions by third-order Chebyshev polynomials, the significance of the signal in the simultaneous fit is reduced to \( n_\sigma = 7.2 \). We take this value as the signal significance including systematic uncertainties. We also investigated the possibility of a further signal at around a mass of 1.95 GeV/c\(^2 \) where the data show an excess of events. This excess is not statistically significant \(( n_\sigma < 3 \), and its inclusion in the fit makes a negligible change to the significance of the signal at 2.012 GeV/c\(^2 \).

The dominant systematic uncertainty of the mass measurement is due to the masses of the \( \Xi^0 \) and \( \Xi^- \) hyperons, which enter almost directly into the calculation of the \( \Omega^- \) mass. Conservatively, we take the difference between the reconstructed \( \Xi^0 \) mass and the PDG value 0.6 MeV/c\(^2 \). The Belle charged-particle momentum scale is very well understood, and the uncertainty in the \( \Omega^- \) mass measurement due to this is much smaller than 0.6 MeV/c\(^2 \). Similarly, changing the fit function to a relativistic Breit-Wigner has negligible effect on the mass value.

MC simulation is known to reproduce the resolution of mass peaks within 10% over a large number of different systems. The resultant systematic uncertainty in \( \Gamma \) from this source is \( \pm 0.37 \) MeV. Changing the background shapes to third-order Chebyshev polynomials changes the measured value of \( \Gamma \) by 1.6 MeV, and this is the dominant contributor to the systematic uncertainty of the width.

The theoretical models \([2–7]\) predict a \( J^P = \frac{1}{2}^- \) and \( J^P = \frac{3}{2}^- \) pair of excited \( \Omega^- \) states in this mass region but with large differences in their mass predictions. Our value
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FIG. 3. The (a) $\Xi^0 K^-$, (b) $\Xi^0 \pi$ invariant mass distributions in data taken at energies other than $\Upsilon(1S), \Upsilon(2S)$, and $\Upsilon(3S)$ resonance energies. The curves show the result of independent fits to the two distributions with masses and widths fixed to those found by the fit shown in Fig. 2.

is, in general, closer to the those for the $J^P = \frac{3}{2}^-$ state. We also note that an $\Omega^-\pi^-$ with $J^P = \frac{1}{2}^-$ is restricted to decay to $\Xi K$ via a $d$ wave, whereas a state with $J^P = \frac{1}{2}^-$ could decay via an $s$ wave. Thus, the rather narrow width observed implies that the $\frac{3}{2}^-$ identification is more likely.

In summary, we have reported the observation of a new resonance, which we identify as an excited $\Omega^-$ baryon, found in the decay modes $\Omega^-\pi^-\to \Xi^0 K^-$ and $\Omega^-\pi^-\to \Xi^- K^0_S$. The measured mass of the resonance is $[2012.4\pm 0.7 \text{ (stat)}\pm 0.6 \text{ (syst)}] \text{ MeV}/c^2$, and its width $\Gamma = [6.4^{+2.4}_{-2.0} \text{ (stat)}\pm 1.6 \text{ (syst)}] \text{ MeV}$. This new resonance has a mass $340 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ higher than the ground state, and thus helps fill the large gap in the $\Omega^-$ spectrum between the ground state and the already observed excited states. It is found primarily in the decay of the narrow resonances $\Upsilon(1S), \Upsilon(2S)$, and $\Upsilon(3S)$.
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