



$$I(J^P) = 0(\frac{3}{2}^+) \text{ Status: } ****$$

The unambiguous discovery in both production and decay was by BARNES 64. The quantum numbers follow from the assignment of the particle to the baryon decuplet. DEUTSCHMANN 78 and BAUBILLIER 78 rule out  $J = 1/2$  and find consistency with  $J = 3/2$ . AUBERT, BE 06 finds from the decay angular distributions of  $\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Omega^- K^+$  and  $\Omega_c^0 \rightarrow \Omega^- K^+$  that  $J = 3/2$ ; this depends on the spins of the  $\Xi_c^0$  and  $\Omega_c^0$  being  $J = 1/2$ , their supposed values.

We have omitted some results that have been superseded by later experiments. See our earlier editions.

### $\Omega^-$ MASS

The fit assumes the  $\Omega^-$  and  $\bar{\Omega}^+$  masses are the same, and averages them together.

<u>VALUE (MeV)</u>	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
<b>1672.45 ± 0.29 OUR FIT</b>				
<b>1672.43 ± 0.32 OUR AVERAGE</b>				
1673 ± 1	100	HARTOUNI	85 SPEC	80–280 GeV $K_L^0 C$
1673.0 ± 0.8	41	BAUBILLIER	78 HBC	8.25 GeV/c $K^- p$
1671.7 ± 0.6	27	HEMINGWAY	78 HBC	4.2 GeV/c $K^- p$
1673.4 ± 1.7	4	<sup>1</sup> DIBIANCA	75 DBC	4.9 GeV/c $K^- d$
1673.3 ± 1.0	3	PALMER	68 HBC	$K^- p$ 4.6, 5 GeV/c
1671.8 ± 0.8	3	SCHULTZ	68 HBC	$K^- p$ 5.5 GeV/c
1674.2 ± 1.6	5	SCOTTER	68 HBC	$K^- p$ 6 GeV/c
1672.1 ± 1.0	1	<sup>2</sup> FRY	55 EMUL	
● ● ● We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. ● ● ●				
1671.43 ± 0.78	13	<sup>3</sup> DEUTSCH...	73 HBC	$K^- p$ 10 GeV/c
1671.9 ± 1.2	6	<sup>3</sup> SPETH	69 HBC	See DEUTSCHMANN 73
1673.0 ± 8.0	1	ABRAMS	64 HBC	$\rightarrow \Xi^- \pi^0$
1670.6 ± 1.0	1	<sup>2</sup> FRY	55B EMUL	
1615	1	<sup>4</sup> EISENBERG	54 EMUL	

<sup>1</sup> DIBIANCA 75 gives a mass for each event. We quote the average.

<sup>2</sup> The FRY 55 and FRY 55B events were identified as  $\Omega^-$  by ALVAREZ 73. The masses assume decay to  $\Lambda K^-$  at rest. For FRY 55B, decay from an atomic orbit could Doppler shift the  $K^-$  energy and the resulting  $\Omega^-$  mass by several MeV. This shift is negligible for FRY 55 because the  $\Omega$  decay is approximately perpendicular to its orbital velocity, as is known because the  $\Lambda$  strikes the nucleus (L. Alvarez, private communication 1973). We have calculated the error assuming that the orbital n is 4 or larger.

<sup>3</sup> Excluded from the average; the  $\Omega^-$  lifetimes measured by the experiments differ significantly from other measurements.

<sup>4</sup> The EISENBERG 54 mass was calculated for decay in flight. ALVAREZ 73 has shown that the  $\Omega$  interacted with an Ag nucleus to give  $K^- \Xi \text{Ag}$ .

## $\bar{\Omega}^+$ MASS

The fit assumes the  $\Omega^-$  and  $\bar{\Omega}^+$  masses are the same, and averages them together.

<u>VALUE (MeV)</u>	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
<b>1672.45 ± 0.29 OUR FIT</b>				
<b>1672.5 ± 0.7 OUR AVERAGE</b>				
1672 ± 1	72	HARTOUNI	85	SPEC 80–280 GeV $K_L^0 C$
1673.1 ± 1.0	1	FIRESTONE	71B	HBC 12 GeV/c $K^+ d$

$$(m_{\Omega^-} - m_{\bar{\Omega}^+}) / m_{\Omega^-}$$

A test of *CPT* invariance.

<u>VALUE</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
<b>(−1.44 ± 7.98) × 10<sup>−5</sup></b>	CHAN	98	E756 $p$ Be, 800 GeV

## $\Omega^-$ MEAN LIFE

Measurements with an error  $> 0.1 \times 10^{-10}$  s have been omitted. The fit assumes the  $\Omega^-$  and  $\bar{\Omega}^+$  mean lives are the same, and averages them together.

<u>VALUE (10<sup>−10</sup> s)</u>	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
<b>0.821 ± 0.011 OUR FIT</b>				
<b>0.821 ± 0.011 OUR AVERAGE</b>				
0.817 ± 0.013 ± 0.018	6934	CHAN	98	E756 $p$ Be, 800 GeV
0.811 ± 0.037	1096	LUK	88	SPEC $p$ Be 400 GeV
0.823 ± 0.013	12k	BOURQUIN	84	SPEC SPS hyperon beam
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
0.822 ± 0.028	2437	BOURQUIN	79B	SPEC See BOURQUIN 84

## $\bar{\Omega}^+$ MEAN LIFE

The fit assumes the  $\Omega^-$  and  $\bar{\Omega}^+$  mean lives are the same, and averages them together.

<u>VALUE (10<sup>−10</sup> s)</u>	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
<b>0.821 ± 0.011 OUR FIT</b>				
<b>0.823 ± 0.031 ± 0.022</b>	1801	CHAN	98	E756 $p$ Be, 800 GeV

$$(\tau_{\Omega^-} - \tau_{\bar{\Omega}^+}) / \tau_{\Omega^-}$$

A test of *CPT* invariance. Our calculation, from the averages in the preceding two data blocks.

<u>VALUE</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>
<b>0.00 ± 0.05 OUR ESTIMATE</b>	

## $\Omega^-$ MAGNETIC MOMENT

<u>VALUE (<math>\mu_N</math>)</u>	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
<b><math>-2.02 \pm 0.05</math> OUR AVERAGE</b>				
$-2.024 \pm 0.056$	235k	WALLACE	95 SPEC	$\Omega^-$ 300–550 GeV
$-1.94 \pm 0.17 \pm 0.14$	25k	DIEHL	91 SPEC	Spin-transfer production

## $\Omega^-$ DECAY MODES

Mode	Fraction ( $\Gamma_i/\Gamma$ )	Confidence level
$\Gamma_1 \quad \Lambda K^-$	$(67.8 \pm 0.7) \%$	
$\Gamma_2 \quad \Xi^0 \pi^-$	$(23.6 \pm 0.7) \%$	
$\Gamma_3 \quad \Xi^- \pi^0$	$(8.6 \pm 0.4) \%$	
$\Gamma_4 \quad \Xi^- \pi^+ \pi^-$	$(3.7^{+0.7}_{-0.6}) \times 10^{-4}$	
$\Gamma_5 \quad \Xi(1530)^0 \pi^-$	$< 7 \times 10^{-5}$	90%
$\Gamma_6 \quad \Xi^0 e^- \bar{\nu}_e$	$(5.6 \pm 2.8) \times 10^{-3}$	
$\Gamma_7 \quad \Xi^- \gamma$	$< 4.6 \times 10^{-4}$	90%
<b><math>\Delta S = 2</math> forbidden (<math>S_2</math>) modes</b>		
$\Gamma_8 \quad \Lambda \pi^-$	$S_2 \quad < 2.9 \times 10^{-6}$	90%

## $\Omega^-$ BRANCHING RATIOS

The BOURQUIN 84 values (which include results of BOURQUIN 79B, a separate experiment) are much more accurate than any other results, and so the other results have been omitted.

### $\Gamma(\Lambda K^-)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$ $\Gamma_1/\Gamma$

<u>VALUE</u>	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
<b><math>0.678 \pm 0.007</math></b>	14k	BOURQUIN 84	SPEC	SPS hyperon beam
● ● ● We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. ● ● ●				
$0.686 \pm 0.013$	1920	BOURQUIN 79B	SPEC	See BOURQUIN 84

### $\Gamma(\Xi^0 \pi^-)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$ $\Gamma_2/\Gamma$

<u>VALUE</u>	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
<b><math>0.236 \pm 0.007</math></b>	1947	BOURQUIN 84	SPEC	SPS hyperon beam
● ● ● We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. ● ● ●				
$0.234 \pm 0.013$	317	BOURQUIN 79B	SPEC	See BOURQUIN 84

### $\Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^0)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$ $\Gamma_3/\Gamma$

<u>VALUE</u>	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
<b><math>0.086 \pm 0.004</math></b>	759	BOURQUIN 84	SPEC	SPS hyperon beam
● ● ● We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. ● ● ●				
$0.080 \pm 0.008$	145	BOURQUIN 79B	SPEC	See BOURQUIN 84

$\Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+ \pi^-)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$   $\Gamma_4/\Gamma$

<u>VALUE (units <math>10^{-4}</math>)</u>	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
<b><math>3.74^{+0.67}_{-0.56}</math></b>	100	<sup>5</sup> KAMAEV	10	HYCP $p$ Cu, 800 GeV

• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •

4.3 $^{+3.4}_{-1.3}$	4	BOURQUIN	84	SPEC SPS hyperon beam
----------------------	---	----------	----	-----------------------

<sup>5</sup>This KAMAEV 10 value uses 76  $\Omega^- \rightarrow \Xi^- \pi^+ \pi^-$  and 24  $\bar{\Omega}^+ \rightarrow \Xi^+ \pi^- \pi^+$  decays. The  $\Omega^-$  and  $\bar{\Omega}^+$  branching fractions measurements are statistically equal. The errors given combine statistical and systematic contributions. The  $CP$  branching-fraction asymmetry,  $(\Omega^- - \bar{\Omega}^+)/\text{sum}$ , is  $+0.12 \pm 0.20$ .

$\Gamma(\Xi(1530)^0 \pi^-)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$   $\Gamma_5/\Gamma$

<u>VALUE (units <math>10^{-4}</math>)</u>	<u>CL%</u>	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
<b>&lt;0.7</b>	90		KAMAEV	10	HYCP $p$ Cu, 800 GeV

• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •

6.4 $^{+5.1}_{-2.0}$	4	<sup>6</sup> BOURQUIN	84	SPEC SPS hyperon beam
----------------------	---	-----------------------	----	-----------------------

<sup>6</sup>The same 4 events as in the previous mode, with the isospin factor to take into account  $\Xi(1530)^0 \rightarrow \Xi^0 \pi^0$  decays included. BOURQUIN 84 adopted a theoretical assumption that  $\Xi(1530)^0 \pi^-$  would dominate  $\Xi^- \pi^+ \pi^-$  decay.

$\Gamma(\Xi^0 e^- \bar{\nu}_e)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$   $\Gamma_6/\Gamma$

<u>VALUE (units <math>10^{-3}</math>)</u>	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
<b><math>5.6 \pm 2.8</math></b>	14	BOURQUIN	84	SPEC SPS hyperon beam

• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •

$\sim 10$	3	BOURQUIN	79B	SPEC See BOURQUIN 84
-----------	---	----------	-----	----------------------

$\Gamma(\Xi^- \gamma)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$   $\Gamma_7/\Gamma$

<u>VALUE (units <math>10^{-4}</math>)</u>	<u>CL%</u>	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
<b>&lt; 4.6</b>	90	0	ALBUQUERQ..94	E761	$\Omega^-$ 375 GeV

• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •

<22	90	9	BOURQUIN	84	SPEC SPS hyperon beam
<31	90	0	BOURQUIN	79B	SPEC See BOURQUIN 84

$\Gamma(\Lambda \pi^-)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$   $\Gamma_8/\Gamma$

$\Delta S=2$ . Forbidden in first-order weak interaction.

<u>VALUE (units <math>10^{-6}</math>)</u>	<u>CL%</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
<b>&lt; 2.9</b>	90	WHITE	05	HYCP $p$ Cu, 800 GeV

• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •

< 190	90	BOURQUIN	84	SPEC SPS hyperon beam
<1300	90	BOURQUIN	79B	SPEC See BOURQUIN 84

## $\Omega^-$ DECAY PARAMETERS

### $\alpha$ FOR $\Omega^- \rightarrow \Lambda K^-$

Some early results have been omitted.

<u>VALUE</u>	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
<b>0.0180±0.0024 OUR AVERAGE</b>				
+0.0207±0.0051±0.0081	960k	<sup>7</sup> CHEN	05 HYCP	$p$ Cu, 800 GeV
+0.0178±0.0019±0.0016	4.5M	<sup>7</sup> LU	05A HYCP	$p$ Cu, 800 GeV
● ● ● We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. ● ● ●				
-0.028 ±0.047	6953	CHAN	98 E756	$p$ Be, 800 GeV
-0.034 ±0.079	1743	LUK	88 SPEC	$p$ Be 400 GeV
-0.025 ±0.028	12k	BOURQUIN	84 SPEC	SPS hyperon beam

<sup>7</sup> The results of CHEN 05 and LU 05A are from different experimental runs.

### $\bar{\alpha}$ FOR $\bar{\Omega}^+ \rightarrow \bar{\Lambda} K^+$

<u>VALUE</u>	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
<b>-0.0181±0.0028±0.0026</b>				
1.89M	LU	06 HYCP		$p$ Cu, 800 GeV
● ● ● We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. ● ● ●				
+0.017 ±0.077	1823	CHAN	98 E756	$p$ Be, 800 GeV

### $(\alpha + \bar{\alpha})/(\alpha - \bar{\alpha})$ in $\Omega^- \rightarrow \Lambda K^-$ , $\bar{\Omega}^+ \rightarrow \bar{\Lambda} K^+$

Zero if  $CP$  is conserved.

<u>VALUE</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
<b>-0.016±0.092±0.089</b>	<sup>8</sup> LU	06 HYCP	$p$ Cu, 800 GeV

<sup>8</sup> This value uses the results of CHEN 05, LU 05A, and LU 06.

### $\alpha$ FOR $\Omega^- \rightarrow \Xi^0 \pi^-$

<u>VALUE</u>	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
<b>+0.09±0.14</b>	1630	BOURQUIN	84 SPEC	SPS hyperon beam

### $\alpha$ FOR $\Omega^- \rightarrow \Xi^- \pi^0$

<u>VALUE</u>	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
<b>+0.05±0.21</b>	614	BOURQUIN	84 SPEC	SPS hyperon beam

## $\Omega^-$ REFERENCES

We have omitted some papers that have been superseded by later experiments. See our earlier editions.

KAMAEV	10	PL B693 236	O. Kamaev <i>et al.</i>	(FNAL HyperCP Collab.)
AUBERT,BE	06	PRL 97 112001	B. Aubert <i>et al.</i>	(BABAR Collab.)
LU	06	PRL 96 242001	L.C. Lu <i>et al.</i>	(FNAL HyperCP Collab.)
CHEN	05	PR D71 051102	Y.C. Chen <i>et al.</i>	(FNAL HyperCP Collab.)
LU	05A	PL B617 11	L.C. Lu <i>et al.</i>	(FNAL HyperCP Collab.)
WHITE	05	PRL 94 101804	C.G. White <i>et al.</i>	(FNAL HyperCP Collab.)
CHAN	98	PR D58 072002	A.W. Chan <i>et al.</i>	(FNAL E756 Collab.)
WALLACE	95	PRL 74 3732	N.B. Wallace <i>et al.</i>	(MINN, ARIZ, MICH+)
ALBUQUERQ...	94	PR D50 R18	I.F. Albuquerque <i>et al.</i>	(FNAL E761 Collab.)
DIEHL	91	PRL 67 804	H.T. Diehl <i>et al.</i>	(RUTG, FNAL, MICH+)
LUK	88	PR D38 19	K.B. Luk <i>et al.</i>	(RUTG, WISC, MICH, MINN)
HARTOUNI	85	PRL 54 628	E.P. Hartouni <i>et al.</i>	(COLU, ILL, FNAL)
BOURQUIN	84	NP B241 1	M.H. Bourquin <i>et al.</i>	(BRIS, GEVA, HEIDP+)
Also		PL 87B 297	M.H. Bourquin <i>et al.</i>	(BRIS, GEVA, HEIDP+)
BOURQUIN	79B	PL 88B 192	M.H. Bourquin <i>et al.</i>	(BRIS, GEVA, HEIDP+)
BAUBILLIER	78	PL 78B 342	M. Baubillier <i>et al.</i>	(BIRM, CERN, GLAS+)

DEUTSCH...	78	PL 73B 96	M. Deuschmann <i>et al.</i>	(AACH3, BERL, CERN+) J
HEMINGWAY	78	NP B142 205	R.J. Hemingway <i>et al.</i>	(CERN, ZEEM, NIJM+)
DIBIANCA	75	NP B98 137	F.A. Dibianca, R.J. Endorf	(CMU)
ALVAREZ	73	PR D8 702	L.W. Alvarez	(LBL)
DEUTSCH...	73	NP B61 102	M. Deuschmann <i>et al.</i>	(ABCLV Collab.)
FIRESTONE	71B	PRL 26 410	I. Firestone <i>et al.</i>	(LRL)
SPETH	69	PL 29B 252	R. Speth <i>et al.</i>	(AACH, BERL, CERN, LOIC+)
PALMER	68	PL 26B 323	R.B. Palmer <i>et al.</i>	(BNL, SYRA)
SCHULTZ	68	PR 168 1509	P.F. Schultz <i>et al.</i>	(ILL, ANL, NWES+)
SCOTTER	68	PL 26B 474	D. Scotter <i>et al.</i>	(BIRM, GLAS, LOIC+)
ABRAMS	64	PRL 13 670	G.S. Abrams <i>et al.</i>	(UMD, NRL)
BARNES	64	PRL 12 204	V.E. Barnes <i>et al.</i>	(BNL)
FRY	55	PR 97 1189	W.F. Fry, J. Schneps, M.S. Swami	(WISC)
FRY	55B	NC 2 346	W.F. Fry, J. Schneps, M.S. Swami	(WISC)
EISENBERG	54	PR 96 541	Y. Eisenberg	(CORN)

---