Mixing of the low-lying three- and five-quark Ω states with negative parity
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Mixing of the low-lying three- and five-quark Ω states with spin-parity quantum numbers \( \frac{1}{2}^- \) and \( \frac{5}{2}^- \) is investigated, employing an instanton-induced quark-antiquark pair creation model, which precludes transitions between \( s^3 \) and \( s^5 \bar{s} \) configurations. Models with hyperfine interactions between quarks of three different kinds, namely, one-gluon-exchange, Goldstone-boson-exchange (GBE) and an instanton-induced interaction (INS) are called OGE, GBE and INS models, respectively. Numerical results show that the instanton-induced pair creation causes strong mixing between the three- and five-quark configurations with spin 3/2, and that this mixing decreases the energy of the lowest spin 3/2 states in all three different hyperfine interaction models to \( \sim 1750 \pm 50 \text{ MeV} \). On the other hand, transition couplings between \( s^3 \) and \( s^5 \bar{s} \) states with spin 1/2 caused by instanton-induced \( q\bar{q} \) creation are very small and the resulting mixing of three- and five-quark configurations in the OGE and INS models is negligible, while the mixing of the spin 1/2 states in GBE model is not, but effects of this mixing on energies of mixed states are also very small. Accordingly, the lowest \( Ω \) states with negative parity in all three hyperfine interactions models have spin 3/2.

PACS numbers: 12.39.-x, 14.20.Jn, 14.20.Pt

I. INTRODUCTION

Recently, we have studied the spectrum of low-lying \( s^3Q\bar{Q} \) (where \( Q\bar{Q} = q\bar{q}, s\bar{s} \)) for light and strange quark-antiquark pairs, respectively) configurations with negative parity within an extended constituent quark model with three different kinds of hyperfine interactions, namely, one-gluon-exchange (OGE), Goldstone-boson-exchange (GBE) and instanton-induced interactions (INS) [1]. Experimental data about Ω resonances is still very poor [2], only four Ω states were found [3–5, 8], one being the ground state \( Ω(1672) \), and all the other three states may also have positive parity [2]. A comparison of calculated results to experimental data is therefore not very conclusive. Compared to the predictions of the masses of negative parity states in traditional three-quark models, the lowest energy of \( s^3Q\bar{Q} \) negative parity states is expected to be \( \sim 180 \text{ MeV} \) lower [1]. This indicates that if we consider Ω resonances as mixtures of three- and five-quark Fock components, then the latter must be relevant for the properties of negative parity Ω resonances.

In the present paper, we shall study the mixing of \( s^3 \) and \( s^5 \bar{Q} \) configurations, which involves the investigation of transitions between three- and five-quark Fock states. For such transitions, the key ingredient is the \( Q\bar{Q} \) creation mechanism. Most widely accepted is the \( ^3P_0 \) model [8], which has been successfully applied to the decays of mesons and baryons [9, 10], and this was also employed to analyse the sea flavor content of the ground states of the \( SU(3) \) octet baryons [11, 12], as well as of the spin and electromagnetic properties of baryons [13, 14]. In the \( ^3P_0 \) model, the \( Q\bar{Q} \) pair is created with the quantum numbers of the QCD vacuum \( 0^{++} \), which corresponds to \( ^3P_0 \). There are also some other pair creation models, for instance, string-breaking models [15, 16], in which the lines of color flux between quarks collapse into a string, the pair is created when the string breaks and the created pair has as quantum numbers either \( ^3P_0 \) or \( ^3S_1 \) [16]. In Ref. [17], the \( Q\bar{Q} \) pair creation induced by a quark confinement interaction was employed to investigate mixing between three- and five-quark Fock components in the nucleon and the Roper resonance; in this case the created \( Q\bar{Q} \) also possesses the quantum numbers \( ^3P_0 \).

In case of the low-lying \( s^3Q\bar{Q} \) configurations with negative parity, all the quarks and antiquarks are supposed to be relative \( s \)-waves, and therefore the traditional \( ^3P_0 \) pair creation mechanism can not contribute. Accordingly we here employ an instanton-induced interaction [18–21] for the pair creation mechanism, since this interaction also can lead to the creation of \( Q\bar{Q} \) pairs with quantum numbers \( ^3S_1 \) and \( ^3P_0 \). The instanton-induced interaction has been used to describe the decays of (pseudo)scalar mesons [22].

The present paper is organised as follows. In Section II we present our theoretical framework, which includes explicit forms of the instanton-induced quark-antiquark pair creation mechanism. Numerical results for the spectrum of the states under study and the mixing of three-
and five-quark configurations in our model are shown in Section IV. Finally, Section V contains a brief conclusion.

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In the present model, to study mixing of the three- and five-quark configurations, we describe the negative parity Ω states by the Hamiltonian

\begin{equation}
H = \begin{pmatrix}
H_3 & V_{Ω₃+Ω₅} \\
V_{Ω₃+Ω₅} & H_5
\end{pmatrix},
\end{equation}

where \(H_3\) is the Hamiltonian for a three-quark system and \(H_5\) for a five-quark system, and \(V_{Ω₃+Ω₅}\) denotes the transition coupling between three- and five-quark systems. Note that in principle the number of three and five quark configurations can exceed two. Since the diagonal terms of (1), the Hamiltonian

\[ V_{Ω₃+Ω₅} \]

will be explicitly discussed in Sec II B.

In [1] the quark confinement potential was taken to be as a sum of the kinetic energy and the quark confinement mass of the \(i\)th quark. Therefore we here adopt another quark-antiquark pair creation mechanism. The most commonly accepted mechanism for quark-antiquark pair creation from a quark (antiquark) and take \(V_0^{(N=3)}\) to be the tentative value which reproduces the mass of the ground state Ω(1672), we find \(\langle H_3⟩_{\Omega} = \langle H_3⟩_{\Omega} = 1887\) MeV in the INS model.

Explicit matrix elements for \(\frac{1}{2}^-\) and \(\frac{3}{2}^-\) of the submatrix \(H_5\) in [1] were already listed in Ref. [1]. In both cases \(⟨H₅⟩_{\frac{1}{2}^-} = ⟨H₅⟩_{\frac{3}{2}^-}⟩\) are \(4 \times 4\) matrices. Here we just employ the results obtained within the OGE, INS and GBE models of Ref. [1].

B. Non-diagonal terms of Hamiltonian

The non-diagonal term \(V_{Ω₃+Ω₅}\) in the Hamiltonian matrix describing the transition coupling between three- and five-quark configurations depends on the explicit quark-antiquark pair creation mechanism. The most commonly accepted mechanism for quark-antiquark pair creation is the \(3\bar{P}_0\) model. In this model the created quark-antiquark pair is in its first orbitally excited state, i.e. the \(QQ\) pair has the quantum numbers \(3\bar{P}_0\). But in the present case all quarks and antiquarks in the studied five-quark configurations are assumed to be in their ground s-wave states and accordingly \(3\bar{P}_0\) mechanism does not contribute to the coupling between s and \(s^3\) \(QQ\) states considered here.

Therefore we here adopt another quark-antiquark pair creation mechanism based on a non-relativistic reduction of the amplitudes found from the instanton-induced interaction. This interaction was first proposed by ’t Hooft and developed by Shifman et. al. [19], then Petri et. al. applied it to the nuclear structure. Explicitly, the instanton-induced interaction vertex for a quark-antiquark
as shown in Fig. I (a (b)), can be written in terms of normal ordered products of creation and annihilation operators as

\[ H_q := -\frac{3}{16} g_i \epsilon_{ikl} \epsilon_{imm} q_{+}^\dagger q_{k+} (\gamma_0 \otimes \gamma_0 + \gamma_0 \gamma_5 \otimes \gamma_0 \gamma_5) (\mathcal{P}_6^C + 2 \mathcal{P}_3^C) q_m + q_{n-}, \]

(5)

\[ H_{\bar{q}} := -\frac{3}{16} g_i \epsilon_{ikl} \epsilon_{imm} \bar{q}_{+}^\dagger \bar{q}_{k-} (\gamma_0 \otimes \gamma_0 + \gamma_0 \gamma_5 \otimes \gamma_0 \gamma_5) (\mathcal{P}_6^C + 2 \mathcal{P}_3^C) q_m - q_{n-}. \]

(6)

Here \( H_q \) represents the pair creation from a quark, and \( H_{\bar{q}} \) from an antiquark, \( g_i \) denotes strength of the instanton-induced interaction, which has been discussed in [1]. \( \mathcal{P}_6^C \) and \( \mathcal{P}_3^C \) are projectors operators on color 6 and 3 states, respectively, which are defined as

\[ \mathcal{P}_3^C = \frac{1}{2} (\mathbb{I} d - \Pi_{1,2}^C) ; \mathcal{P}_6^C = \frac{1}{2} (\mathbb{I} d + \Pi_{1,2}^C), \]

(7)

where \( \mathbb{I} d \) denotes the identity, and \( \Pi_{1,2}^C \) is the permutation operator of two particles in color space. Finally, \( \epsilon_{ikl} \) is the completely antisymmetric tensor acting on flavor space. This precludes the creation of a quark-antiquark pair whose flavor is the same as the quark \( n \) or \( l \). Consequently, in the present case, the instanton-induced interaction does not mix \( s^3 \) and \( s^3 \bar{s} \) configurations. Note that the creation operator itself has only one free parameter \( g_i \), which should be the same as that for instanton-induced hyperfine interactions between quarks [1], therefore, no additional parameter is introduced here.

It is obvious that \( H_q \) in Eq. (5) is the appropriate interaction vertex we need for the present discussion in this paper. The normal ordering in (3) leads to two contributions: If \( q_m \) has negative energy then \( q_n \) is an annihilation field operator and therefore

\[ :q_{+}^\dagger q_{k+} q_m - q_{n-}:+ = q_{+}^\dagger q_{k+} q_m - q_{n-}. \]

(8)

If on the other hand \( q_m \) is the annihilation field operator, then

\[ :q_{+}^\dagger q_{k+} q_m + q_{n-}:+ = -q_{+}^\dagger q_{k+} q_m - q_{n-} + q_{+}^\dagger q_{k+} q_m - q_{n-}. \]

(9)

Thus the sign does not change if we simultaneously interchange

\[ k \leftrightarrow l \quad m \leftrightarrow n. \]

(10)

Therefore one obtains

\[ H_q = -\frac{3}{64} g_i \epsilon_{ikl} \epsilon_{imm} \sum_{t=1}^{4} \sum_{\beta=0}^{3} h_{\beta}^t (k, l, m, n) \mathcal{D}_t (\xi_{\beta}^t \sigma \beta \xi_{\eta}) . \]

(11)

In addition, because of the total antisymmetry of the states, one can eliminate the color projectors by replacing them by projectors in spin space. After a non-relativistic reduction the quark-antiquark creation from a quark by the instanton-induced interaction can be compactly written as

\[ H_q = -\frac{3}{64} g_i \epsilon_{ikl} \epsilon_{imm} \sum_{t=1}^{4} \sum_{\beta=0}^{3} h_{\beta}^t (k, l, m, n) \mathcal{D}_t (\xi_{\beta}^t \sigma \beta \xi_{\eta}) . \]

(12)

where \( \xi_{\beta} \) and \( \eta_{\beta} \) represent quark and antiquark Pauli spinors. The coefficients \( h_{\beta}^t \) depend on the quark masses and are given by

\[ h_{0}^t (k, l, m, n) = \frac{4}{m} - \frac{1}{m_i}, \quad h_{3}^t (k, l, m, n) = -\frac{1}{m_i}, \]

\[ h_{2}^t (k, l, m, n) = \frac{6}{m_i} - \frac{1}{m_k}, \quad h_{3}^t (k, l, m, n) = -\frac{1}{m_k}, \]

\[ h_{1}^t (k, l, m, n) = -\frac{7}{m_k}, \quad h_{3}^t (k, l, m, n) = -\frac{1}{m_k}. \]

(13)

where \( \mathcal{D}_t = \sigma_{\alpha} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{\beta}} \) acting on the quark \( t \) in Eq. (12). For instance, for \( t = 3 \), \( \mathcal{D}_3 (\xi_{\beta}^t \sigma \beta \xi_{\eta})(\xi_{\beta}^t \sigma \beta \xi_{\eta}) = (\xi_{\beta}^t \sigma \beta \xi_{\eta})(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{\beta}} \xi_{\beta}^t \sigma \beta \xi_{\eta}). \) Note that here we defined \( \sigma_0 \) as the identity in spin space. From Eq. (12), one finds that the created \( qq \) in the instanton-induced pair creation model can have any of the quantum numbers \( s^3 \), \( 1P_1, 1P_1, 1P_1, 3S_0 \) and \( 3S_1 \). In the case of \( s^3 \rightarrow s^3 \bar{q}q \) states with negative parity considered here only the latter two contribute.

The calculation of the transition of \( s^3 \rightarrow s^3 \bar{q}q \) then involves the overlap between the residual three strange quarks in the \( s^3 \bar{q}q \) configuration after \( qq \) annihilation and the initial \( s^3 \) configuration, as shown in Fig. I (c). Taking into account the overlap factors and the overall symmetry, the transition coupling \( V_{\bar{q}q} \) in [1] reads

\[ V_{\bar{q}q} = \frac{9}{16} g_i \epsilon_{ikl} \epsilon_{imm} \sum_{t=1}^{4} \sum_{\beta=0}^{3} C_F C_S C_C C_O h_{\beta}^t (k, l, m, n) \mathcal{D}_t (\xi_{\beta}^t \sigma \beta \xi_{\eta}) \]

(14)

where \( C_F, C_S, C_C \) and \( C_O \) are operators for the calculation of the corresponding flavor, spin, color and orbital overlap factors, respectively.
III. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In the present treatment the matrix elements of transition coupling operator \( [\hat{H}] \) depend on two parameters, namely the instanton-induced interaction strength \( g' \) and the oscillator parameter \( \omega_5 \) for the \( s^3q\bar{q} \) configurations, if we adopt the constituent mass of the strange quark and the oscillator parameter \( \omega_5 \) for the three-quark configuration as the empirical values from [4]. Notice that \( \omega_5 \) is from the orbital overlap factor. In Sec. IIIA we present the numerical results obtained by taking \( g' \) and \( \omega_5 \) as constant as previously used in [1]. The dependence of the numerical results on the parameters is the subject of Sec. IIIB.

A. Numerical results with fixed parameters

In Refs. [1, 33], the empirical value for the strength of the instanton-induced interactions between light and strange quarks was found to be \( g' \approx 33.3 \text{ MeV} \). On the other hand, if we take the quark confinement parameters equal, \( i.e. \ C(\mathit{N=3}) = C(\mathit{N=5}) \), we find a relation between the oscillator parameters of three- and five-quark configurations: \( \omega_5 = \sqrt{5/6}\omega_3 \) and, correspondingly, \( \omega_5 \approx 196 \text{ MeV} \), as shown in [1]. We denote the three-quark configurations with quantum numbers \( \frac{1}{2}^- \) and \( \frac{3}{2}^- \) as \( |3, \frac{1}{2}^- \rangle \) and \( |3, \frac{3}{2}^- \rangle \), respectively. With the notation

\[
|5, \frac{1}{2}^- \rangle_1 = |s^3q([4]X[211]C[31]F_S|31|F[22]|s) \otimes \bar{q} \rangle, \\
|5, \frac{1}{2}^- \rangle_2 = |s^3q([4]X[211]C[31]F_S|31|F[31]|s) \otimes \bar{q} \rangle, \\
|5, \frac{1}{2}^- \rangle_3 = |s^3q([4]X[211]C[31]F_S|31|F[31]|s) \otimes \bar{q} \rangle, \\
|5, \frac{1}{2}^- \rangle_4 = |s^4([4]X[211]C[31]F_S|31|F[31]|s) \otimes \bar{S} \rangle, \\
\]

for the five-quark configurations with spin \( 1/2 \), and

\[
|5, \frac{3}{2}^- \rangle_1 = |s^3q([4]X[211]C[31]F_S|31|F[31]|s) \otimes \bar{q} \rangle, \\
|5, \frac{3}{2}^- \rangle_2 = |s^3q([4]X[211]C[31]F_S|31|F[4]|s) \otimes \bar{q} \rangle, \\
|5, \frac{3}{2}^- \rangle_3 = |s^3q([4]X[211]C[31]F_S|31|F[31]|s) \otimes \bar{q} \rangle, \\
|5, \frac{3}{2}^- \rangle_4 = |s^4([4]X[211]C[31]F_S|31|F[31]|s) \otimes \bar{S} \rangle, \\
\]

for the five-quark configurations with spin \( 3/2 \), the matrix elements of the Hamiltonian \( [\hat{H}] \) in both cases are listed in Appendix A. Note that the nonzero off-diagonal matrix elements in the sub-matrices \( H_2 \) are caused by hyperfine interactions between quarks in the five-quark configurations, as explicitly discussed in [1]. Diagonalization of Eqs. (A1) to (A6) leads to the numerical results shown in Table II. In this table, we have ordered the states according to the energy eigenvalue: The upper panel of the table shows energies of the states with spin \( 1/2 \), and the corresponding probability amplitudes of the three- and five-quark configurations in these states, and the lower panel shows those for the states with spin \( 3/2 \).

From the upper panel of Table II we conclude that in the OGE and INS hyperfine interaction models the mixing between three- and five-quark configurations with spin \( 1/2 \) is very small, and even can be negligible. Accordingly the resulting energies are very close to those obtained in [1], in which the effects of mixing between \( s^3 \) and \( s^3q\bar{q} \) were not included. The mixing between three- and five-quark \( \Omega \) configurations obtained within the GBE hyperfine interaction model is not so small that can be negligible: For instance, in the state with energy 1991 MeV, there is a 81% three-quark component and 19% five-quark components. But also in this case the resulting energies are very close those obtained in [1].

In fact, absolute values of the transition matrix elements of \( V_{35} \) in the configurations with spin-parity \( \frac{1}{2}^- \) are less than 20 MeV, as shown in Eqs. (A1) to (A6), which are tiny compared to the diagonal matrix elements of the Hamiltonian matrix \( [\hat{H}] \). These tiny transition coupling matrix elements lead to tiny mixing between three- and five-quark configurations with spin \( 1/2 \) in the OGE and INS models. However, in the GBE model the situation is different: The mixing depends not only on the couplings between the configurations, but also on the differences between the diagonal matrix elements. In the GBE model, as we can see in Eq. (A5), the diagonal matrix element of the third five-quark configuration is close to that of the three-quark configuration, the difference between the former and latter is only 19 MeV. Therefore the mixing of this five-quark configuration with the three-quark configuration is not as small as that in the OGE and INS models. On the other hand, because the diagonal energies of these configurations are close to each other, while matrix elements of the non-diagonal transition coupling are small, nevertheless the resulting energies are very close to those without mixing between three- and five-quark configurations.

In case of the configurations with spin-parity \( \frac{3}{2}^- \), as shown in the lower panel of Table II mixing between three- and five-quark \( \Omega \) configurations in all the three hyperfine interaction models are very strong. Accordingly, the resulting energies differ substantially from those without mixing between three- and five-quark configurations. The strongest mixing is obtained within the GBE model, namely the state with energy 2166 MeV: in this state, there is approximately 50% three-quark component and 50% five-quark components. A very interesting result is that the lowest states in all three models have energies lying in a narrow region around 1750 ± 25 MeV. This energy is significantly lower than the energies of the lowest states with spin-parity \( \frac{1}{2}^- \) in all three models.

Absolute values of the transition matrix elements of \( V_{35} \) in the configurations with spin-parity \( \frac{3}{2}^- \) are in the range of 100 ± 20 MeV, which is much larger than the
TABLE I: Energies and the corresponding probability amplitudes of three- and five-quark configurations for the obtained Ω states in three different kinds of hyperfine interaction models. The upper and lower panels are for states with quantum numbers $\frac{1}{2}^-$ and $\frac{3}{2}^-$, respectively, and for each panel, the first row shows the energies in MeV, others show the probability amplitudes.

|       | OGE   | INS   | GBE   |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| $\frac{1}{2}^-$ | 2018  | 2149  | 2453  |
| $\frac{3}{2}^-$ | 2656  | 2679  |
| $\frac{3}{2}^-$ | 59  | 0.0577  |
| $\frac{5}{2}^-$ | 0.0727  |
| $\frac{5}{2}^-$ | 0.6220  |
| $\frac{5}{2}^-$ | 0.0022  |
| $\frac{5}{2}^-$ | 0.0000  |
| $\frac{5}{2}^-$ | 0.0000  |

20 MeV couplings of configurations with spin-parity $\frac{1}{2}^-$ and accordingly the mixing is much stronger than in the $\frac{1}{2}^-$ case. In addition, the larger non-diagonal terms lead to larger differences between the energies with and without mixing of three- and five-quark configurations. As we have discussed in [1], if we ignore the mixing between three- and five-quark configurations, the lowest state in the OGE model has spin 3/2, but in the other two hyperfine interaction models, the lowest states have spin 1/2. If we take into account the transition couplings between three- and five-quark configurations, the lowest states in all three models have spin 3/2. Here, the lowest state in the OGE model resulted partly by mixing between different five-quark configurations caused by the OGE hyperfine interactions between quarks, and partly by mixing between three- and five-quark configurations caused by the instanton-induced $q\bar{q}$ pair creation. In the other two model the lowest state is due to the action of the instanton-induced pair creation.

For both the $\frac{1}{2}^-$ and $\frac{2}{2}^-$ states, one may notice in Table I that there is at least one state that does not mix to other states in the OGE and GBE models: These are the states $[5, \frac{1}{2}^-]_4$ and $[5, \frac{3}{2}^-]_4$, i.e. the five-quark configurations with $s\bar{s}$. As we discussed in Sec. III B the instanton-induced pair creation interaction does not lead to mixing between $s^3$ and $s^3\bar{s}$ configurations. Therefore, in the OGE and GBE models, the state with the strange quark-antiquark pair decouples from the others. However, in the INS model, because of the hyperfine interactions between quarks, there is no pure state with $s\bar{s}$ [1], i.e. the INS hyperfine interactions between quarks leads to mixing between the $s^3\bar{s}$ and the $s^3\bar{q}q$ configurations. In the GBE model, there is another configuration that does not mix with the others, namely the state $[5, \frac{1}{2}^-]_2$. This is because on the one hand the GBE hyperfine interactions between quarks cannot mix this configuration with the other five-quark states, and on the other hand the matrix element of the transition coupling $V_{35}$ between the three-quark configuration and the $[5, \frac{1}{2}^-]_2$ state vanishes, as shown in Eq. (A3). In contrast, in the OGE and INS models, although the transition coupling matrix elements between three- and five-quark configurations vanish, the configuration $[5, \frac{1}{2}^-]_2$ does mix with other five-quark configurations, as we can see in Eqs. (A1) and (A3), so there is no pure state $[5, \frac{1}{2}^-]_2$ in the OGE and INS hyperfine interaction models.

B. Dependence of numerical results on parameters

In Sec. III A we have shown the numerical results for a judicious choice of parameters. We still have to investigate whether the results are sensitive to the interaction parameters and on the value of the oscillator parameter $\omega_5$, which was just taken to be a tentative value in Sec. III A. Here we discuss the dependence of the energies on these parameters. Since the mixing between three- and five-quark configurations with spin-parity quantum numbers $\frac{1}{2}^-$ was found to be very small, we refrain from a discussion on the parameter dependence in this case.

Although the value for the instanton-induced interaction strength $g'$ is an empirical one, it is the most important parameter determining the transition between three- and five-quark configurations. Here we vary it by $\pm 20\%$ to demonstrate the dependence of the energies on its value in Fig. 2. The figures from left to right are the numerical results for states with spin-parity $\frac{1}{2}^-$ obtained within the OGE, INS and the GBE models. As is evident from Fig. 2 the energies do not change much in the OGE and GBE models within a range of $\pm 40$ MeV. But in the INS model, the results show some more sensitivity to the coupling $g'$, mainly because the hyperfine interac-
FIG. 2: (Color online) Energies of negative-parity $\Omega$ resonances with spin $3/2$ as function of the instanton-induced interaction strength $g'$. The figures from left to right are the numerical results obtained within the OGE, INS and GBE models, respectively.

FIG. 3: (Color online) Energies of negative-parity $\Omega$ resonances with spin $3/2$ as function of $R_{35}$. The figures from left to right are the numerical results obtained within the OGE, INS and GBE models, respectively.

The dependence of the energies of states with spin-parity $3/2^-$ on $R_{35}$ are shown in...
Fig. 3 As in Fig. 2 the figures from left to right are the numerical results obtained within OGE, INS and GBE models.

One should notice that here we only want to show the dependence of the mixing effects caused by transition couplings on the parameters, so we do not consider the variation of the diagonal terms in Eqs. (A1) to (A6) with \( \omega_5 \). As we can see in Fig. 3 the numerical results are somewhat sensitive to \( R_{35} \) in all three interaction models, the variation of the energies amount up to 160 MeV. The energies of the lowest states in the three models first decrease and then increase with increasing values for \( R_{35} \) and lie within the range \( \sim 1750 \pm 50 \) MeV. The energies of the other states just increase with \( R_{35} \), with the exception of the blue-dash-dotted lines in the OGE and GBE models, which represent the energy of the fourth five-quark configuration in these two models, which does not mix with any others states in the OGE and GBE models, so the energies of this state are independent of \( R_{35} \).

IV. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we investigated the influence of the mixing of \( s^3 \) and \( s^3QQ \) \( \Omega \) configurations on the energies of negative parity \( \Omega \) states with quantum numbers \( \frac{1}{2}^- \) and \( \frac{3}{2}^- \). For the hyperfine interactions between quarks we investigated three alternatives: the OGE, INS and GBE models. The \( QQ \) pair creation is taken to be caused by the instanton-induced interaction. This mechanism has the selection rule that it precludes \( s\bar{s} \) creation from a strange quark. In other words, the instanton-induced interaction does not lead to mixing between \( s^3 \) and \( s^3\bar{s} \) configurations.

The matrix elements of the instanton-induced transition coupling in the spin 1/2 configurations are small, leading to negligible mixing between three- and five-quark configurations with spin 1/2 in the OGE and INS hyperfine interaction models. In the GBE model, the spin 1/2 state with strongest mixing is composed of \( \sim 81\% \) three-quark and \( \sim 19\% \) five-quark components mainly due an almost degeneracy of the corresponding unperturbed three- and five-quark configurations. Although the mixing of three- and five-quark configurations with spin 1/2 in the GBE model is not small, the resulting energies are nevertheless very close those without mixing between \( s^3 \) and \( s^3\bar{q}\bar{q} \), since the transition coupling matrix elements are so small.

In the case of configurations with quantum numbers \( \frac{3}{2}^- \), the matrix elements of the instanton-induced transition coupling are much larger and the resulting mixing between three- and five-quark configurations is very strong. For instance, the spin 3/2 state with the strongest mixing is composed of \( \sim 50\% \) three-quark and \( \sim 50\% \) five-quark components.

The strong mixing between three- and five-quark configurations with spin 3/2 decreases the energy of the lowest state appreciably in all the three hyperfine interaction models: The lowest states with spin 3/2 have an energy \( \sim 1750 \pm 50 \) MeV, which is lower than energies of all the spin 1/2 states obtained in the three different interaction models. This is different from the results of previous models without considering the mixing between three- and five-quark configurations, which predicted the lowest \( \Omega \) excitation state to be of spin 1/2. To summarize: In all interaction models the lowest states are found to be those with spin 3/2 and lie at \( \sim 1750 \pm 50 \) MeV. The lowest states differ in the three models: Their major components are five-quark configurations (\( \sim 75\% \) and \( \sim 64\% \), respectively) in the OGE and GBE models, whereas in the INS model, the lowest state is mainly composed of the three-quark component (\( \sim 70\% \)).

Very recently, BESII Collaboration at Beijing Electron Positron Collider (BEPC) reported an interesting result that \( \psi(2S) \rightarrow \Omega\bar{\Omega} \) was observed with a branch fraction of \((5 \pm 2) \times 10^{-5}[40]\). Now with the upgraded BEPC, i.e., BEPCII, BESIII Collaboration [41] is going to take billions of \( \psi(2S) \) events, which is two orders of magnitude higher that what BESII experiment got. If the lowest \( \Omega \) resonance lies at \( \sim 1750 \pm 50 \) MeV, then it may be observed from \( \psi(2S) \rightarrow \Omega\Omega^\ast \) decays. Once an \( \Omega^\ast \) resonance is observed, its spin-parity quantum numbers can be obtained by a partial wave analysis as demonstrated for the \( N^\ast \) case in [42, 43]. Then the most interesting result in the present paper that the lowest \( \Omega \) resonance with negative parity should have spin 3/2 can be examined. However, it seems to be difficult to distinguish the three different hyperfine interaction models, since the predicted masses of the lowest state in the three models are very close to each other, and the most significant difference between the three models is that the predicted probabilities of five-quark components are obviously different, but it is not easy to be examined by the present experimental measurements.
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Appendix A: Matrix elements of the Hamiltonian

The matrix elements of Hamiltonian (1) in the configurations with quantum numbers \( \frac{1}{2}^- \) and \( \frac{3}{2}^- \) read (numbers in units of MeV)
\begin{equation}
\langle H_{OE}^{GGE} \rangle_{1/2} = \begin{pmatrix}
2020.0 & 0 & -18.5 & -13.1 & 0 \\
0 & 2235.0 & -139.6 & 10.8 & 0 \\
-18.5 & -149.6 & 2365.4 & -25.6 & 0 \\
-13.1 & 10.8 & -25.6 & 2373.7 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2654.7
\end{pmatrix}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\langle H_{OE}^{GGE} \rangle_{3/2} = \begin{pmatrix}
2020.0 & 115.8 & -124.5 & 81.9 & 0 \\
115.8 & 2223.4 & 328.9 & 6.6 & 0 \\
-124.5 & 328.9 & 2095.0 & -68.0 & 0 \\
81.9 & 6.6 & -68.0 & 2333.7 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2517.1
\end{pmatrix}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\langle H_{NS}^{INS} \rangle_{1/2} = \begin{pmatrix}
1887.0 & 0 & -18.5 & -13.1 & 0 \\
0 & 1928.0 & -121.5 & -30.4 & -33.3 \\
-18.5 & -121.5 & 1908.8 & 30.4 & 33.3 \\
-13.1 & -30.4 & 30.4 & 2230.3 & 47.1 \\
0 & -33.3 & 33.3 & 47.1 & 2411.0
\end{pmatrix}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\langle H_{NS}^{INS} \rangle_{3/2} = \begin{pmatrix}
1887.0 & 115.8 & -124.5 & 81.9 & 0 \\
115.8 & 2052.0 & -113.3 & -60.7 & -66.7 \\
-124.5 & -113.3 & 2250.0 & 191.9 & 210.8 \\
81.9 & -60.7 & 191.9 & 2159.0 & 188.5 \\
0 & -66.7 & 210.8 & 188.5 & 2411.0
\end{pmatrix}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\langle H_{BE}^{GBE} \rangle_{1/2} = \begin{pmatrix}
1991.0 & 0 & -18.5 & -13.1 & 0 \\
0 & 1833.6 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
-18.5 & 0 & 1896.6 & -16.2 & 0 \\
-13.1 & 0 & -16.2 & 2010.0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2161.6
\end{pmatrix}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\langle H_{BE}^{GBE} \rangle_{3/2} = \begin{pmatrix}
1991.0 & 115.8 & -124.5 & 81.9 & 0 \\
115.8 & 1896.6 & 0 & -16.2 & 0 \\
-124.5 & 0 & 1990.2 & 0 & 0 \\
81.9 & -16.2 & 0 & 2010.0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2161.6
\end{pmatrix}
\end{equation}
A 10, 395 (2001).
[28] W. H. Blask, U. Bohn, M. G. Huber, B. C. Metsch and H. R. Petry, Z. Phys. A 337, 327 (1990).
[29] E. Klempt, B. C. Metsch, C. R. Munz and H. R. Petry, Phys. Lett. B 361, 160 (1995).
[30] M. Koll, R. Ricken, D. Merten, B. C. Metsch and H. R. Petry, Eur. Phys. J. A 9, 73 (2000).
[31] K. -T. Chao, N. Isgur and G. Karl, Phys. Rev. D 23, 155 (1981).
[32] M. Pervin and W. Roberts, Phys. Rev. C 77, 025202 (2008).
[33] S. G. Yuan, K. W. Wei, J. He, H. S. Xu and B. S. Zou, Eur. Phys. J. A 48, 61 (2012).
[34] C. S. An, B. Saghai, S. G. Yuan and J. He, Phys. Rev. C 81, 045203 (2010).
[35] C. S. An and B. Saghai, Phys. Rev. C 84, 045204 (2011).
[36] Q. B. Li and D. O. Riska, Phys. Rev. C 73, 035201 (2006).
[37] Q. B. Li and D. O. Riska, Phys. Rev. C 74, 015202 (2006).
[38] C. Helminen and D. O. Riska, Nucl. Phys. A 699, 624 (2002).
[39] Y. Oh, Phys. Rev. D 75, 074002 (2007).
[40] M. Ablikim et al. [BES Collaboration], Chin. Phys. C 36, 1040 (2012).
[41] D. M. Asner, T. Barnes, J. M. Bian, I. I. Bigi, N. Brambilla, I. R. Boyko, V. Bytev and K. T. Chao et al., Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 24, S1 (2009).
[42] M. Ablikim et al. [BES Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. 97, 062001 (2006).
[43] M. Ablikim et al. [BESIII Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. 110, 022001 (2013)