Omega Hyperon Decays in the HyperCP Experiment and Measurement of the Branching Ratio for

$$\Omega^- \rightarrow \Xi^{*0}_{1530}\pi^-$$

Oleg Kamaev

Illinois Institute of Technology

for the HyperCP Collaboration

Joint Meeting of Pacific Region Particle Physics Communities

October 29 – November 03, Honolulu, HI

ILLINOIS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

HyperCP (FNAL E871) Collaboration

A. Chan, Y.C. Chen, C. Ho, P.K. Teng

Academia Sinica, Taiwan

W.S. Choong, Y. Fu, G. Gidal, P. Gu, T. Jones, K.B. Luk, B. Turko, P. Zyla

University of California at Berkeley and Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

C. James, J. Volk

Fermilab

J. Felix

University of Guanajuato, Mexico

R. Burnstein, A. Chakravorty, D. Kaplan, L. Lederman, W. Luebke, D. Rajaram, H. Rubin, N. Solomey, Y. Torun, C. White, S. White

Illinois Institute of Technology

N. Leros, J. P. Perroud

Universite de Lausanne

R.H. Gustafson, M. Longo, F. Lopez, H.K. Park

University of Michigan

C. M. Jenkins, K. Clark

University of South Alabama

C. Dukes, C. Durandet, T. Holmstrom, M. Huang, L.C. Lu, K. Nelson

University of Virginia

The HyperCP Experiment

Primary Goal:

Search for CP violation

in hyperon decays,

especially $\Xi \to \Lambda\pi \to p\pi\pi$.

Spectrometer featured:

- High-rate detectors & DAQ (100k evts/s);
- Alternating "+" & "–" running (with reversed B fields) to minimize systematics;
- Simple, low-bias triggers based on hodoscope coincidences.



The HyperCP Experiment

In 12 months of data taking in 1997–99, HyperCP recorded one of the largest data samples ever by a particle-physics experiment:

231 billion events, 29,401 tapes, and 119.5 TB of data

Reconstructed event samples.

	Reconstructed Events (10^6)		
Polarity:	−	+	Total
$\Xi \to \Lambda p \to p\pi\pi$	2032	458	2490
$\Omega \to \Lambda K \to pK\pi$	14	5	19
$K \to \pi\pi\pi$	164	391	555
$K_S \to \pi^+\pi^-$	693	2025	2718

Largest hyperon samples ever taken!

$\Omega \to \Lambda K \to p\pi K$



The HyperCP Experiment

In 12 months of data taking in 1997–99, HyperCP recorded one of the largest data samples ever by a particle-physics experiment:

231 billion events, 29,401 tapes, and 119.5 TB of data

Reconstructed event samples.

	Reconstructed Events (10^6)		
Polarity:	−	+	Total
$\Xi \to \Lambda p \to p\pi\pi$	2032	458	2490
$\Omega \to \Lambda K \to pK\pi$	14	5	19
$K \to \pi\pi\pi$	164	391	555
$K_S \to \pi^+\pi^-$	693	2025	2718

- $\alpha_\Omega = [2.07 \pm 0.51(stat) \pm 0.81(syst)] \times 10^{-2}$ based on 0.96×10^6 $\Omega^- \to \Lambda K^- \to p\pi^- K^-$ Chen et al., PRD 71, 051102 (2005)
- $\alpha_\Omega = [1.78 \pm 0.19(stat) \pm 0.16(syst)] \times 10^{-2}$ based on 4.5×10^6 $\Omega^- \to \Lambda K^- \to p\pi^- K^-$ (different data sample) Lu et al., PLB 617, 11 (2005)
- $\bar{\alpha}_\Omega = [-1.81 \pm 0.28(stat) \pm 0.26(syst)] \times 10^{-2}$ based on 1.89×10^6 $\bar{\Omega}^+ \to \bar{\Lambda} K^+ \to \bar{p}\pi^+ K^+$ Lu et al., PRL 96, 242001 (2006)

Large Ω sample $\Rightarrow$ precise α_Ω and $\bar{\alpha}_\Omega$ measurements, searches for P and CP violations

ILLINOIS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

The HyperCP Experiment

In 12 months of data taking in 1997–99, HyperCP recorded one of the largest data samples ever by a particle-physics experiment:

231 billion events, 29,401 tapes, and 119.5 TB of data

Reconstructed event samples.

	Reconstructed Events (10^6)		
Polarity:	−	+	Total
$\Xi \to \Lambda p \to p\pi\pi$	2032	458	2490
$\Omega \to \Lambda K \to pK\pi$	14	5	19
$K \to \pi\pi\pi$	164	391	555
$K_S \to \pi^+\pi^-$	693	2025	2718

- $\alpha_\Omega = [2.07 \pm 0.51(stat) \pm 0.81(syst)] \times 10^{-2}$
  based on 0.96×10^6 $\Omega^- \to \Lambda K^- \to p\pi^- K^-$
  Chen et al., PRD 71, 051102 (2005)
- $\alpha_\Omega = [1.78 \pm 0.19(stat) \pm 0.16(syst)] \times 10^{-2}$
  based on 4.5×10^6 $\Omega^- \to \Lambda K^- \to p\pi^- K^-$
  (different data sample)
  Lu et al., PLB 617, 11 (2005)
- $\bar{\alpha}_\Omega = [-1.81 \pm 0.28(stat) \pm 0.26(syst)] \times 10^{-2}$
  based on 1.89×10^6 $\bar{\Omega}^+ \to \bar{\Lambda} K^+ \to \bar{p}\pi^+ K^+$
  Lu et al., PRL 96, 242001 (2006)

No evidence of CP violation!

$$A_\Omega \equiv \frac{\alpha_\Omega + \bar{\alpha}_\Omega}{\alpha_\Omega - \bar{\alpha}_\Omega} = [-1.6 \pm 9.2(stat) \pm 8.6(syst) \pm 2.2] \times 10^{-2}$$

The HyperCP Experiment

In 12 months of data taking in 1997–99, HyperCP recorded one of the largest data samples ever by a particle-physics experiment:

231 billion events, 29,401 tapes, and 119.5 TB of data

Reconstructed event samples.

Reconstructed Events (10^6)			
Polarity:	−	+	Total
$\Xi \to \Lambda p \to p\pi\pi$	2032	458	2490
$\Omega \to \Lambda K \to pK\pi$	14	5	19
$K \to \pi\pi\pi$	164	391	555
$K_S \to \pi^+\pi^-$	693	2025	2718

Large Ω sample $\Rightarrow$ Searches for rare hyperon decays

Searches and studies for:

- $\Delta S=2$: $\Omega^- \to \Lambda\pi^- \to p\pi^-\pi^-$
- $\Omega^- \to \Xi^{*0}_{1530}\pi^-$ (this talk!)
- $\Omega^- \to \Xi^-\pi^+\pi^-$
- FCNC decays:

  $\Omega^- \to \Xi^-\mu^+\mu^-$

  $\Omega^- \to \Xi^-e^+e^-$

As well as antiparticle modes.

Search for ΔS=2 Nonleptonic Decays

C.G. White *et al.* (HyperCP collaboration)

Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 101804 (2005)

A sensitive search for the rare decays $\Omega^- \to \Lambda\pi^-$ and $\Xi^0 \to p\pi^-$ has been performed using data from the 1997 run of the HyperCP (Fermilab E871) experiment. Limits on other such processes do not exclude the possibility of observable rates for $|\Delta S| = 2$ nonleptonic hyperon decays, provided the decays occur through parity-odd operators. We obtain the branching-fraction limits $\mathcal{B}(\Omega^- \to \Lambda\pi^-) < 2.9 \times 10^{-6}$ and $\mathcal{B}(\Xi^0 \to p\pi^-) < 8.2 \times 10^{-6}$, both at 90% confidence level.

- Allowed in SM through second-order weak interactions, branching ratio $\sim 10^{-17}$;
- Any observation at current levels of sensitivity would suggest new physics;
- Analyzed data set containing $\sim 3\cdot10^6$ $\Omega^- \to \Lambda K^- \to p\pi^- K^-$ decays;
- No events observed, upper limits established.



$\Omega^- \to \Xi^{*0}(1530)\pi^-$ Motivations

Theoretical Predictions:

- Finjord and Gaillard, PRD 22, 778 (1980): $BR(\Omega^- \to \Xi^{*0}_{1530}\pi^-) = 3/1070 \simeq 28\times10^{-4}$
- Duplancic et al., PRD 70, 077506 (2004): $BR(\Omega^- \to \Xi^{*0}_{1530}\pi^-) \simeq 8.58\times10^{-4}$ (Skyrme)
- Both models assume a cascade decay $\Omega^- \to \Xi^{*0}_{1530}\pi^- \to \Xi^-\pi^+\pi^-$

  and hence $BR(\Omega^- \to \Xi^-\pi^+\pi^-) = 2/3 \cdot BR(\Omega^- \to \Xi^{*0}_{1530}\pi^-)$

"The $\Omega^- \to \Xi^*(1530)\pi^-$ decays are expected to dominate the $\Xi^-\pi^+\pi^-$ decay modes.
Assuming that the 4 events are $\Omega^- \to \Xi^{*0}_{1530}\pi^-$ events, we deduce using a branching ratio of 2/3 for $\Xi^{*0}_{1530} \to \Xi^-\pi^+$:
$\Gamma(\Omega^- \to \Xi^{*0}_{1530}\pi^-)/\Gamma(\Omega^- \to all) = (6.4\,^{+5.1}_{-2.0})\times10^{-4}$"

Experimental Results:

- The current PDG branching ratios are:

  $BR(\Omega^- \to \Xi^-\pi^+\pi^-) = (4.3\,^{+3.4}_{-1.3})\times10^{-4}$

  $BR(\Omega^- \to \Xi^{*0}_{1530}\pi^-) = (6.4\,^{+5.1}_{-2.0})\times10^{-4}$

  Both measurements were done by M. Bourquin *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. B 241, 1 (1984) and are based on the same four observed events.
- N. Solomey (HyperCP, 137 events): $BR(\Omega^- \to \Xi^-\pi^+\pi^-) = (3.56 \pm 0.33(stat))\times10^{-4}$

  Without numerical estimation of the resonance decay channel contribution.

Decays of Interest

Signal Modes:

- $\Omega^- \to \Xi^{*0}_{1530}\pi^-$ 5 tracks, includes subsequent decays $\Xi^{*0}_{1530} \to \Xi^-\pi^+, \Xi^- \to \Lambda\pi^-, \Lambda \to p\pi^-$
- $\Omega^- \to \Xi^-\pi^+\pi^-$ 5 tracks, includes subsequent decays $\Xi^- \to \Lambda\pi^-, \Lambda \to p\pi^-$

Normalizing Mode:

- $\Omega^- \to \Lambda K^-$ 5 tracks, includes subsequent decays

$$K^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^-, \Lambda \to p\pi^-$$

Final state for all modes is $p\pi^+\pi^-\pi^-\pi^-$

Schematic topology of the signal mode:



Monte Carlo Simulation

$\Omega^- \to \Xi_{1530}^{*0}\pi^-$ decay, with subsequent $\Xi_{1530}^{*0} \to \Xi^-\pi^+$:

- both decays were generated with uniform phase space;
- Ξ_{1530}^{*0} mass was generated with Breit-Wigner distribution $p(m) = A\frac{\Gamma/2}{(m-m_0)^2+(\Gamma/2)^2}$,

  where $m_0 = 1.5318$ GeV, Γ=9.1 MeV (PDG values).

p.d.f. of MC generated Ξ_{1530}^{*0} mass



$\Omega^- \to \Xi^-\pi^+\pi^-$ decay:

- was generated uniformly in phase space;
- subsequent decays $\Xi^- \to \Lambda\pi^-, \Lambda \to p\pi^-$ were generated with PDG decay-asymmetry parameters.

$\Omega^- \to \Lambda K^-$ decay, as well as subsequent decays $K^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^-, \Lambda \to p\pi^-$, were generated with PDG decay-asymmetry parameters.

Reconstruction and Event Selection

Event Reconstruction:

- Track with the highest momentum is assigned to be proton;
- Other tracks' tagging based on the track combination that gives reconstructed invariant mass closest to the PDG value.

$\Omega^- \to \Xi^{*0}_{1530}\pi^-$ and $\Omega^- \to \Xi^-\pi^+\pi^-$ Selection Criteria:

- 3 negative and 2 positive tracks;
- Reconstructed invariant masses of particles are within 3σ of corresponding PDG values;
- Total momentum between 135 and 220 GeV/c;
- All decay vertices inside the decay volume and vertex topology consistent with the decay;
- Tracks form good vertices;
- Reasonable $\chi^2/ndof$ from fitting decay topology to upstream segments;
- Reconstructed Ω^- track within the aperture of the collimator;
- Reconstructed Ω^- track originates from the target;
- No muon hodoscope hits.

Selection Criteria for the normalizing mode $\Omega^- \to \Lambda K^-$ are similiar.

Normalizing Mode Data and MC

MC was tuned to get a reasonable match with the data.

Selected variables for Ω. Dots with error bars – data, solid line – MC.



$\Omega^- \to \Lambda K^-$,
includes
$K^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^-$,
$\Lambda \to p\pi^-$

Signal Mode Data and MC

MC was tuned to get a reasonable match with the data.

Selected variables for Ω. Dots with error bars – data, solid line – MC.



$\Omega^- \rightarrow \Xi^- \pi^+ \pi^-$, includes

$\Xi^- \rightarrow \Lambda \pi^-$,

$\Lambda \rightarrow p \pi^-$

How to calculate Branching Ratios?

$$BR(\Omega^- \to \Xi^{*0}_{1530}\pi^-) = \frac{N_{\Omega^-\to\Xi^{*0}_{1530}\pi^-}}{N_{\Omega^-\to\Lambda K^-}} \cdot \frac{A_{\Omega^-\to\Lambda K^-}}{A_{\Omega^-\to\Xi^{*0}_{1530}\pi^-}} \cdot \frac{BR_{\Omega^-\to\Lambda K^-}\cdot BR_{K^-\to\pi^+\pi^-\pi^-}}{BR_{\Xi^{*0}_{1530}\to\Xi^-\pi^+}\cdot BR_{\Xi^-\to\Lambda\pi^-}}$$

$$BR(\Omega^- \to \Xi^-\pi^+\pi^-) = \frac{N_{\Omega^-\to\Xi^-\pi^+\pi^-}}{N_{\Omega^-\to\Lambda K^-}} \cdot \frac{A_{\Omega^-\to\Lambda K^-}}{A_{\Omega^-\to\Xi^-\pi^+\pi^-}} \cdot \frac{BR_{\Omega^-\to\Lambda K^-}\cdot BR_{K^-\to\pi^+\pi^-\pi^-}}{BR_{\Xi^-\to\Lambda\pi^-}}$$

$$N_{\Omega^-\to\Xi^{*0}_{1530}\pi^-} = p_{res}\cdot N_{signal}$$

$$N_{\Omega^-\to\Xi^-\pi^+\pi^-} = p_{3b}\cdot N_{signal}$$

Acceptances:

$$A_{\Omega^-\to\Xi^{*0}_{1530}\pi^-} = 1.20\times10^{-2}$$

$$A_{\Omega^-\to\Xi^-\pi^+\pi^-} = 5.16\times10^{-3}$$

$$A_{\Omega^-\to\Lambda K^-} = 2.80\times10^{-4}$$

Branching ratio values:

$$BR_{\Omega^-\to\Lambda K^-} = 6.78\times10^{-1}$$

$$BR_{\Xi^-\to\Lambda\pi^-} = 9.99\times10^{-1}$$

$$BR_{\Xi^{*0}_{1530}\to\Xi^-\pi^+} = 2/3$$

$$BR_{K^-\to\pi^+\pi^-\pi^-} = 5.59\times10^{-2}$$

How to calculate Branching Ratios?

$$BR(\Omega^- \to \Xi^{*0}_{1530}\pi^-) = \frac{N_{\Omega^-\to\Xi^{*0}_{1530}\pi^-}}{N_{\Omega^-\to\Lambda K^-}} \cdot \frac{A_{\Omega^-\to\Lambda K^-}}{A_{\Omega^-\to\Xi^{*0}_{1530}\pi^-}} \cdot \frac{BR_{\Omega^-\to\Lambda K^-} \cdot BR_{K^-\to\pi^+\pi^-\pi^-}}{BR_{\Xi^{*0}_{1530}\to\Xi^-\pi^+} \cdot BR_{\Xi^-\to\Lambda\pi^-}}$$

$$BR(\Omega^- \to \Xi^-\pi^+\pi^-) = \frac{N_{\Omega^-\to\Xi^-\pi^+\pi^-}}{N_{\Omega^-\to\Lambda K^-}} \cdot \frac{A_{\Omega^-\to\Lambda K^-}}{A_{\Omega^-\to\Xi^-\pi^+\pi^-}} \cdot \frac{BR_{\Omega^-\to\Lambda K^-} \cdot BR_{K^-\to\pi^+\pi^-\pi^-}}{BR_{\Xi^-\to\Lambda\pi^-}}$$

$$N_{\Omega^-\to\Xi^{*0}_{1530}\pi^-} = p_{res} \cdot N_{signal}$$

$$N_{\Omega^-\to\Xi^-\pi^+\pi^-} = p_{3b} \cdot N_{signal}$$

Proportionality coefficients (p_{res} and p_{3b}) can be found by fitting data to the combination of resonance and 3-body MCs in:

- Dalitz plot (2D histogram)

or using the best variable to distinguish between resonance and 3-body mode

- Xi(1530) invariant mass distribution (1D histogram).

Which fitting method to use?

Want to perform precise measurements, which includes parameter determination from fitting, but we have low statistics in both, normalizing and signal, modes. Moreover, we want to do Dalitz plot analysis (two-dimensional) with only 58 signal events!

Use Unbinned Generalized LogLikelihood Fitting Method:

Suppose that: $f(x;\vec{p})$ - fit function, where $\vec{p}$ - vector of fit parameters.

Integral over fit range is $N(\vec{p}) = \int_{x_1}^{x_2} f(x;\vec{p})dx.$

Likelihood is $L(\vec{p}) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{f(x_i;\vec{p})}{N(\vec{p})}$, where n - total # of observed events.

Now we add probability for observing n events, when the number of observed events is Poisson with mean $N(\vec{p})$.

Generalized Likelihood is $L(\vec{p}) = \frac{N^n(\vec{p})e^{-N(\vec{p})}}{n!} \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{f(x_i;\vec{p})}{N(\vec{p})}.$

After algebra and removing terms that don't affect location of minimum:

$-\ln L(\vec{p}) = \int_{x_1}^{x_2} f(x;\vec{p})dx - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \ln f(x_i;\vec{p})$ --- We minimize this in MINUIT.

(see A.G. Frodesen *et al.*, "Probability and Statistics in Particle Physics.")

Unbinned Likelihood Fitting

Normalizing Mode Data, 311 events.

Gaussian plus constant fit (blue) to reconstructed invariant Omega mass. Histogram is for visualization only.



MINUIT:

FCN= -816.5196 FROM MINOS STATUS=SUCCESSFUL 226 CALLS 601 TOTAL

EDM= 0.60E-13 STRATEGY= 2 ERROR MATRIX ACCURATE

EXT PARAMETER			PARABOLIC	MINOS ERRORS	
NO.	NAME	VALUE	ERROR	NEGATIVE	POSITIVE
1	# signal	303.48	17.472	-17.141	17.808
2	mean (MeV)	1672.4	0.10000	-0.10012	0.10007
3	sigma (MeV)	1.7141	0.76748E-01	-0.74278E-01	0.79470E-01
4	# bkg	7.5161	3.0028	-2.6708	3.4609
5	5	1620.0	constant		
6	6	1720.0	constant		

ERR DEF= 0.500

Unbinned Likelihood Fitting

Signal Mode Data, 81 events.

Gaussian plus constant fit (blue) to reconstructed invariant Omega mass. Histogram is for visualization only.



MINUIT:

FCN= -12.84356 FROM MINOS STATUS=SUCCESSFUL 234 CALLS 1103 TOTAL

EDM= 0.22E-13 STRATEGY= 2 ERROR MATRIX ACCURATE

EXT PARAMETER			PARABOLIC	MINOS ERRORS	
NO.	NAME	VALUE	ERROR	NEGATIVE	POSITIVE
1	# signal	55.170	7.6352	-7.3077	7.9714
2	mean (MeV)	1672.2	0.24538	-0.24632	0.24642
3	sigma (MeV)	1.7421	0.17316	-0.16120	0.18765
4	# bkg	25.830	5.3096	-5.0148	5.7620
5	5	1650.0	constant		
6	6	1730.0	constant		

ERR DEF= 0.500

Xi(1530): Unbinned Likelihood Fitting

Fitting data to the combination of resonance and 3-body MCs to find proportionality coefficients (p_{res} and p_{3b}).

Apply Unbinned Generalized LogLikelihood Fit.

Fit function: $f(m_{\Xi^-\pi^+}; p_{res}, p_{3b}) = N_{signal} \cdot \left(p_{res} \cdot \frac{f_{res}(m_{\Xi^-\pi^+})}{N_{MC(res)}} + p_{3b} \cdot \frac{f_{3b}(m_{\Xi^-\pi^+})}{N_{MC(3b)}} \right)$,

where $f_{res}(m_{\Xi^-\pi^+})$ and $f_{3b}(m_{\Xi^-\pi^+})$ are functional forms of the corresponding MCs,

$N_{MC(res)}$, $N_{MC(3b)}$ - total number of events in MCs.

$-\ln L(p_{res}, p_{3b}) = N_{signal} \cdot (p_{res} + p_{3b}) - \sum_{i=1}^{N_{signal}} \ln f(m_i; p_{res}, p_{3b})$ --- function to minimize.

$f_{res}(m_{\Xi^-\pi^+})$ and $f_{3b}(m_{\Xi^-\pi^+})$ can be found by smoothing histograms from MCs.

ILLINOIS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Histogram Smoothing

Blue – analytical function that was found by smoothing corresponding histograms.

$$f_{res}\left(m_{\Xi^-\pi^+}\right)$$



$$f_{3b}\left(m_{\Xi^-\pi^+}\right)$$



Xi(1530): Unbinned Likelihood Fitting

Signal Mode Data (dots with error bars), 58 events.

Red – resonance mode MC; Pink – 3-body uniform mode MC;

Histograms are for visualization purposes only.

Blue – MINUIT fit with central value of proportionality coefficients (solid) and with value±error (dashed).



MINUIT:

FCN= 78.01224 FROM MINOS STATUS=SUCCESSFUL 56 CALLS 225 TOTAL

EDM= 0.88E-17 STRATEGY= 2 ERROR MATRIX ACCURATE

EXT PARAMETER			PARABOLIC	MINOS ERRORS	
NO.	NAME	VALUE	ERROR	NEGATIVE	POSITIVE
1	3-body	1.11074	0.18408	-0.17618	0.19210
2	resonance	-0.11074	0.11326	-0.10693	0.11996

ERR DEF= 0.500

Dalitz plot

Big blue dots – data, 58 events; Small black dots – Monte Carlo.

Monte Carlo for $\Omega^- \to \Xi^{*0}_{1530}\pi^-$



Monte Carlo for $\Omega^- \to \Xi^-\pi^+\pi^-$



Dalitz plot: Unbinned Likelihood Fitting

Fitting data to the combination of resonance and 3-body MCs to find proportionality coefficients (p_{res} and p_{3b}).

Apply Unbinned Generalized LogLikelihood Fit.

Fit function:

$$f\left(m_{\Xi^-\pi^+}, m_{\pi^-\pi^+}; p_{res}, p_{3b}\right) = N_{signal} \cdot \left(p_{res} \cdot \frac{f_{res}\left(m_{\Xi^-\pi^+}, m_{\pi^-\pi^+}\right)}{N_{MC(res)}} + p_{3b} \cdot \frac{f_{3b}\left(m_{\Xi^-\pi^+}, m_{\pi^-\pi^+}\right)}{N_{MC(3b)}} \right),$$

where $f_{res}\left(m_{\Xi^-\pi^+}, m_{\pi^-\pi^+}\right)$ and $f_{3b}\left(m_{\Xi^-\pi^+}, m_{\pi^-\pi^+}\right)$ are functional forms of the corresponding MCs, $N_{MC(res)}, N_{MC(3b)}$ - total number of events in MCs.

$$-\ln L\left(p_{res}, p_{3b}\right) = N_{signal} \cdot \left(p_{res} + p_{3b}\right) - \sum_{i=1}^{N_{signal}} \ln f\left(\left(m_{\Xi^-\pi^+}, m_{\pi^-\pi^+}\right)_i; p_{res}, p_{3b}\right)$$ --- function to minimize.

$f_{res}\left(m_{\Xi^-\pi^+}, m_{\pi^-\pi^+}\right)$ and $f_{3b}\left(m_{\Xi^-\pi^+}, m_{\pi^-\pi^+}\right)$ can be found by smoothing histograms from MCs.

Dalitz plot: Histogram Smoothing

Resonance mode:

histogram, 70 X 76 bins



$f_{res}\left(m_{\Xi^-\pi^+}, m_{\pi^-\pi^+}\right)$



3-body mode:

histogram, 70 X 76 bins



$f_{3b}\left(m_{\Xi^-\pi^+}, m_{\pi^-\pi^+}\right)$



ILLINOIS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Dalitz plot: Unbinned Likelihood Fitting

MINUIT:

FCN= 269.3999 FROM MINOS STATUS=SUCCESSFUL 56 CALLS 248 TOTAL

EDM= 0.35E-14 STRATEGY= 2 ERROR MATRIX ACCURATE

EXT PARAMETER			PARABOLIC	MINOS ERRORS	
NO.	NAME	VALUE	ERROR	NEGATIVE	POSITIVE
1	3-body	1.07879	0.18052	-0.17278	0.18877
2	resonance	-0.07879	0.11255	-0.10658	0.11925

ERR DEF= 0.500

PARAMETER CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS

NO.	GLOBAL	1	2
1	0.68952	1.000	-0.690
2	0.68952	-0.690	1.000

Both methods give statistically consistent results!

	Xi(1530) fitting	Dalitz plot fitting
p_{3b}	1.11±0.18	1.08±0.18
p_{res}	-0.11±0.11	-0.08±0.11

Branching Ratio and Upper Limit Calculation

$BR(\Omega^- \to \Xi^{*0}_{1530}\pi^-) = \left(-1.91 \pm 2.74(stat)\right)\times 10^{-5}$ (consistent with zero)

- Statistical errors are from # of events and fitting parameters uncertainties;
- Systematic errors are under study and expected to be $\sim(10-20)\%$;
- Statistical uncertainty by far dominates over systematics.

Neglecting systematics, with only statistical error, we estimate:

$BR(\Omega^- \to \Xi^{*0}_{1530}\pi^-) < 3.5\times 10^{-5}$ at 90% C.L.,

which is ~ 2 orders of magnitude < than prediction.

We numerically solve

$$\int_0^b e^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{x-\mu}{\sigma}\right)^2} dx = 0.9\cdot\int_0^\infty e^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{x-\mu}{\sigma}\right)^2} dx \Longrightarrow$$

where b - unknown upper limit

(blue line on the right plot).

(see L. Lyons "Statistics for nuclear and particle physicists")



Summary

- HyperCP recorded largest hyperon samples ever taken;
- Parity violation in $\Omega^{\mp} \to \Lambda(\bar{\Lambda})K^{\mp}$ observed;
- No evidence of CP violation in $\Omega^{\mp} \to \Lambda(\bar{\Lambda})K^{\mp}$ decays;
- $\Delta S=2$ results are consistent with theoretical predictions at current levels of sensitivity;
- First actual measurement of $BR(\Omega^{-} \to \Xi^{*0}_{1530}\pi^{-})$ performed:
  - △ 1999 data of HyperCP analyzed;
  - △ With ~ 14 times the number of previously observed $\Omega^{-} \to \Xi^{-}\pi^{+}\pi^{-}$ events, we measured the contribution from the resonance decay channel $\Omega^{-} \to \Xi^{*0}_{1530}\pi^{-}$;
  - △ No resonance mode decays observed;
  - △ Preliminary: $BR(\Omega^{-} \to \Xi^{*0}_{1530}\pi^{-}) < 3.5\times10^{-5}$ at 90% C.L.

Backup Slides

Backup Slides

Feynman Diagrams

$$\Omega^- \rightarrow \Xi^{*0}_{1530}\pi^-$$

s	u	d
s	s	$\bar{u}$
s	s	

⇒





$$\Xi^{*0}_{1530} \rightarrow \Xi^-\pi^+$$

u	d	u
s	s	$\bar{d}$
s	s	

⇒





$$\Omega^- \rightarrow \Xi^-\pi^+\pi^-$$

s	d	u	d
s	s	$\bar{d}$	$\bar{u}$
s	s		

⇒





Unbinned Likelihood Fitting

Number of normalizing and signal events:

	fit g+p0 (large scale)		fit g+p0 (+/-3sigma window)		bkg. from+/-25si. till +/-5si.	fit g+p1 (large scale)	
	# of events	error	# of events	error	# of events	# of events	error
normalizing	303.5	17.5	294.6	19.4	303.4		
signal	55.2	7.6	58.0	7.6	54.7	56.1	7.6

additional crosscheck

We also performed fitting in +/- 3 sigma range of the Omega mass and used "background per sigma" method to get number of normalizing and signal events. Our choice is highlighted by green.

ILLINOIS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Xi(1530): Unbinned Likelihood Fitting

Contour of –lnL.

```
Y-AXIS: PARAMETER   2: resonance
  0.1060       22        222*     33       4
  0.8626E-01   2           22      33
  0.6656E-01   2            222     33
  0.4686E-01   2            * 22     33
  0.2716E-01   2            *  22     33
  0.7464E-02  -2----11111-----22----33-
 -0.1224E-01   2     1    111     22     33
 -0.3194E-01   22    1      11     22     3
 -0.5164E-01    2    1      *11     22    3
 -0.7134E-01    22  11      * 11     2
 -0.9104E-01 3   22   1    00   11    22
 -0.1107       33**2**11**000**11***22**
 -0.1304        33 22   11   00    11    22
 -0.1501       4  33 22   11 *      1     2
 -0.1698       44  33 22   111      1     22
 -0.1895       544433 222   111     1      2
 -0.2092       44 44333 22 * 11111         2
 -0.2289       444444433 222
 -0.2486       33444334333 222
 -0.2683       3333322334333 222
 -0.2880        33322222333333 2222
 -0.3077       23332200211222333  222222
 -0.3274       100322000100222333
               I            I            I
           0.7426                     1.479
                          1.111
       X-AXIS: PARAMETER  1: 3-body     ONE COLUMN=  0.2945E-01
FUNCTION VALUES: F(I)=    78.01     +  0.5000     *I**2
```

PARAMETER CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS

NO.	GLOBAL	1	2
1	0.70666	1.000	-0.707
2	0.70666	-0.707	1.000

Conclusion:

1. We have a well-defined minimum;
2. Parameters are negatively correlated with each other.

Xi(1530): Unbinned Likelihood Fitting



Plot of –lnL as a function of p_{res} with p_{3b} fixed at minimum.

Conclusion:

We have a well-defined local minimum.

But it's a stable solution!

Dalitz plot: Unbinned Likelihood Fitting

Contour of –lnL.

```
Y-AXIS: PARAMETER   2: resonance
  0.1365      22      222*    33     4
  0.1169      2         222    33
  0.9736E-01  2          *22    33
  0.7779E-01  2          * 22    33
  0.5822E-01  2          *  22    33
  0.3864E-01  2     1111 *   22    33
  0.1907E-01  2    11  111    22    33
 -0.5021E-03 -22---1-----11----22----3
 -0.2008E-01   2   1     *111   22
 -0.3965E-01   22  11    *  1    22
 -0.5922E-01 3  2   1   00  11    22
 -0.7879E-01 33*22**11**000**11****2**
 -0.9837E-01  3  22  11  00   11   22
 -0.1179      33  22  11 *     1    22
 -0.1375     4 333 22  111     1     2
 -0.1571     444 33 22   11    1     2
 -0.1767     5544 33 222 *111111
 -0.1962     145444333 222
 -0.2158     0004 44 33  22
 -0.2354     000000444333*2222
 -0.2550       00 000244333  222
 -0.2745           000444333  2222222
 -0.2941             0000033333
             I           I           I
         0.7178                    1.440
                      1.079
      X-AXIS: PARAMETER  1: 3-body     ONE COLUMN=  0.2888E-01
FUNCTION VALUES: F(I)=   269.4     +  0.5000     *I**2
```

Conclusion:

1. We have a well-defined minimum;
2. Parameters are negatively correlated with each other.

Dalitz plot: Unbinned Likelihood Fitting

-lnL



p_{res}

Plot of –lnL as a function of p_{res} with p_{3b} fixed at minimum.

Conclusion:

We have a well-defined local minimum.

But it's a stable solution!

Pi(+)Pi(-): Unbinned Likelihood Fitting

Signal Mode Data (dots with error bars), 58 events.

Red – resonance mode MC; Green – 3-body uniform mode MC;

Histograms are for visualization purposes only.

Blue – MINUIT fit with negative and positive boundaries (dashed)



MINUIT:

FCN= 94.93940 FROM MINOS STATUS=SUCCESSFUL 59 CALLS 187 TOTAL

EDM= 0.17E-13 STRATEGY= 2 ERROR MATRIX ACCURATE

EXT PARAMETER			PARABOLIC	MINOS ERRORS	
NO.	NAME	VALUE	ERROR	NEGATIVE	POSITIVE
1	3-body	0.47209	0.22328	-0.20803	0.23880
2	resonance	0.52791	0.22542	-0.22496	0.22700

ERR DEF= 0.500

This is just for completeness. Obviously this variable is not a bright "signature" of the resonance mode.

Xi(1530): different region fitting

Xi(1530) mass range	original	1.48-1.535	1.49-1.535	1.495-1.54	1.485-1.53
# signal events	58	58	58	57	55
color code	blue	light blue	red	green	purple
fit. par., 3-body	1.11074	1.11837	1.20055	1.29634	1.11464
fit. par., 3-body error	0.18408	0.18572	0.19638	0.21123	0.20572
fit. par., res.	-0.11074	-0.10811	-0.14275	-0.18110	0.04466
fit. par., res. error	0.11326	0.11516	0.11475	0.11525	0.19980

Dots with error bars – signal data, 58 events;

Solid line – resonance mode MC;

Dashed line – 3-body MC;

Histograms are for visualization only.

Color lines are explained in the table above.



Conclusion: Our fitting parameters are stable even if we change fitting region, but do not throw away events.