

Measurement of the Spin of the Ω^- Hyperon

B. Aubert,¹ R. Barate,¹ M. Bona,¹ D. Boutigny,¹ F. Couderc,¹ Y. Karyotakis,¹ J. P. Lees,¹ V. Poireau,¹ V. Tisserand,¹ A. Zghiche,¹ E. Grauges,² A. Palano,³ J. C. Chen,⁴ N. D. Qi,⁴ G. Rong,⁴ P. Wang,⁴ Y. S. Zhu,⁴ G. Eigen,⁵ I. Ofte,⁵ B. Stugu,⁵ G. S. Abrams,⁶ M. Battaglia,⁶ D. N. Brown,⁶ J. Button-Shafer,⁶ R. N. Cahn,⁶ E. Charles,⁶ M. S. Gill,⁶ Y. Groysman,⁶ R. G. Jacobsen,⁶ J. A. Kadyk,⁶ L. T. Kerth,⁶ Yu. G. Kolomensky,⁶ G. Kukartsev,⁶ G. Lynch,⁶ L. M. Mir,⁶ P. J. Oddone,⁶ T. J. Orimoto,⁶ M. Pripstein,⁶ N. A. Roe,⁶ M. T. Ronan,⁶ W. A. Wenzel,⁶ P. del Amo Sanchez,⁷ M. Barrett,⁷ K. E. Ford,⁷ T. J. Harrison,⁷ A. J. Hart,⁷ C. M. Hawkes,⁷ S. E. Morgan,⁷ A. T. Watson,⁷ K. Goetzen,⁸ T. Held,⁸ H. Koch,⁸ B. Lewandowski,⁸ M. Pelizaeus,⁸ K. Peters,⁸ T. Schroeder,⁸ M. Steinke,⁸ J. T. Boyd,⁹ J. P. Burke,⁹ W. N. Cottingham,⁹ D. Walker,⁹ T. Cuhadar-Donszelmann,¹⁰ B. G. Fulson,¹⁰ C. Hearty,¹⁰ N. S. Knecht,¹⁰ T. S. Mattison,¹⁰ J. A. McKenna,¹⁰ A. Khan,¹¹ P. Kyberd,¹¹ M. Saleem,¹¹ D. J. Sherwood,¹¹ L. Teodorescu,¹¹ V. E. Blinov,¹² A. D. Bukin,¹² V. P. Druzhinin,¹² V. B. Golubev,¹² A. P. Onuchin,¹² S. I. Serednyakov,¹² Yu. I. Skovpen,¹² E. P. Solodov,¹² K. Yu. Todyshev,¹² D. S. Best,¹³ M. Bondioli,¹³ M. Bruinsma,¹³ M. Chao,¹³ S. Curry,¹³ I. Eschrich,¹³ D. Kirkby,¹³ A. J. Lankford,¹³ P. Lund,¹³ M. Mandelkern,¹³ R. K. Mommsen,¹³ W. Roethel,¹³ D. P. Stoker,¹³ S. Abachi,¹⁴ C. Buchanan,¹⁴ S. D. Foulkes,¹⁵ J. W. Gary,¹⁵ O. Long,¹⁵ B. C. Shen,¹⁵ K. Wang,¹⁵ L. Zhang,¹⁵ H. K. Hadavand,¹⁶ E. J. Hill,¹⁶ H. P. Paar,¹⁶ S. Rahatlou,¹⁶ V. Sharma,¹⁶ J. W. Berryhill,¹⁷ C. Campagnari,¹⁷ A. Cunha,¹⁷ B. Dahmes,¹⁷ T. M. Hong,¹⁷ D. Kovalskyi,¹⁷ J. D. Richman,¹⁷ T. W. Beck,¹⁸ A. M. Eisner,¹⁸ C. J. Flacco,¹⁸ C. A. Heusch,¹⁸ J. Kroseberg,¹⁸ W. S. Lockman,¹⁸ G. Nesom,¹⁸ T. Schalk,¹⁸ B. A. Schumm,¹⁸ A. Seiden,¹⁸ P. Spradlin,¹⁸ D. C. Williams,¹⁸ M. G. Wilson,¹⁸ J. Albert,¹⁹ E. Chen,¹⁹ A. Dvoretzkii,¹⁹ F. Fang,¹⁹ D. G. Hitlin,¹⁹ I. Narsky,¹⁹ T. Piatenko,¹⁹ F. C. Porter,¹⁹ A. Ryd,¹⁹ A. Samuel,¹⁹ G. Mancinelli,²⁰ B. T. Meadows,²⁰ M. D. Sokoloff,²⁰ F. Blanc,²¹ P. C. Bloom,²¹ S. Chen,²¹ W. T. Ford,²¹ J. F. Hirschauer,²¹ A. Kreisel,²¹ U. Nauenberg,²¹ A. Olivas,²¹ W. O. Ruddick,²¹ J. G. Smith,²¹ K. A. Ulmer,²¹ S. R. Wagner,²¹ J. Zhang,²¹ A. Chen,²² E. A. Eckhart,²² A. Soffer,²² W. H. Toki,²² R. J. Wilson,²² F. Winklmeier,²² Q. Zeng,²² D. D. Altenburg,²³ E. Feltresi,²³ A. Hauke,²³ H. Jasper,²³ A. Petzold,²³ B. Spaan,²³ T. Brandt,²⁴ V. Klose,²⁴ H. M. Lacker,²⁴ W. F. Mader,²⁴ R. Nogowski,²⁴ J. Schubert,²⁴ K. R. Schubert,²⁴ R. Schwierz,²⁴ J. E. Sundermann,²⁴ A. Volk,²⁴ D. Bernard,²⁵ G. R. Bonneaud,²⁵ P. Grenier,^{25,*} E. Latour,²⁵ Ch. Thiebaut,²⁵ M. Verderi,²⁵ D. J. Bard,²⁶ P. J. Clark,²⁶ W. Gradl,²⁶ F. Muheim,²⁶ S. Playfer,²⁶ A. I. Robertson,²⁶ Y. Xie,²⁶ M. Andreotti,²⁷ D. Bettoni,²⁷ C. Bozzi,²⁷ R. Calabrese,²⁷ G. Cibinetto,²⁷ E. Luppi,²⁷ M. Negrini,²⁷ A. Petrella,²⁷ L. Piemontese,²⁷ E. Prencipe,²⁷ F. Anulli,²⁸ R. Baldini-Ferrolì,²⁸ A. Calcaterra,²⁸ R. de Sangro,²⁸ G. Finocchiaro,²⁸ S. Pacetti,²⁸ P. Patteri,²⁸ I. M. Peruzzi,^{28,†} M. Piccolo,²⁸ M. Rama,²⁸ A. Zallo,²⁸ A. Buzzo,²⁹ R. Capra,²⁹ R. Contri,²⁹ M. Lo Vetere,²⁹ M. M. Macri,²⁹ M. R. Monge,²⁹ S. Passaggio,²⁹ C. Patrignani,²⁹ E. Robutti,²⁹ A. Santroni,²⁹ S. Tosi,²⁹ G. Brandenburg,³⁰ K. S. Chaisanguanthum,³⁰ M. Morii,³⁰ J. Wu,³⁰ R. S. Dubitzky,³¹ J. Marks,³¹ S. Schenk,³¹ U. Uwer,³¹ W. Bhimji,³² D. A. Bowerman,³² P. D. Dauncey,³² U. Egede,³² R. L. Flack,³² J. A. Nash,³² M. B. Nikolich,³² W. Panduro Vazquez,³² X. Chai,³³ M. J. Charles,³³ U. Mallik,³³ N. T. Meyer,³³ V. Ziegler,³³ J. Cochran,³⁴ H. B. Crawley,³⁴ L. Dong,³⁴ V. Eyges,³⁴ W. T. Meyer,³⁴ S. Prell,³⁴ E. I. Rosenberg,³⁴ A. E. Rubin,³⁴ A. V. Gritsan,³⁵ M. Fritsch,³⁶ G. Schott,³⁶ N. Arnaud,³⁷ M. Davier,³⁷ G. Grosdidier,³⁷ A. Höcker,³⁷ F. Le Diberder,³⁷ V. Lepeltier,³⁷ A. M. Lutz,³⁷ A. Oyanguren,³⁷ S. Pruvot,³⁷ S. Rodier,³⁷ P. Roudeau,³⁷ M. H. Schune,³⁷ A. Stocchi,³⁷ W. F. Wang,³⁷ G. Wormser,³⁷ C. H. Cheng,³⁸ D. J. Lange,³⁸ D. M. Wright,³⁸ C. A. Chavez,³⁹ I. J. Forster,³⁹ J. R. Fry,³⁹ E. Gabathuler,³⁹ R. Gamet,³⁹ K. A. George,³⁹ D. E. Hutchcroft,³⁹ D. J. Payne,³⁹ K. C. Schofield,³⁹ C. Touramanis,³⁹ A. J. Bevan,⁴⁰ F. Di Lodovico,⁴⁰ W. Menges,⁴⁰ R. Sacco,⁴⁰ G. Cowan,⁴¹ H. U. Flaecher,⁴¹ D. A. Hopkins,⁴¹ P. S. Jackson,⁴¹ T. R. McMahon,⁴¹ S. Ricciardi,⁴¹ F. Salvatore,⁴¹ A. C. Wren,⁴¹ D. N. Brown,⁴² C. L. Davis,⁴² J. Allison,⁴³ N. R. Barlow,⁴³ R. J. Barlow,⁴³ Y. M. Chia,⁴³ C. L. Edgar,⁴³ G. D. Lafferty,⁴³ M. T. Naisbit,⁴³ J. C. Williams,⁴³ J. I. Yi,⁴³ C. Chen,⁴⁴ W. D. Hulsbergen,⁴⁴ A. Jawahery,⁴⁴ C. K. Lae,⁴⁴ D. A. Roberts,⁴⁴ G. Simi,⁴⁴ G. Blaylock,⁴⁵ C. Dallapiccola,⁴⁵ S. S. Hertzbach,⁴⁵ X. Li,⁴⁵ T. B. Moore,⁴⁵ S. Saremi,⁴⁵ H. Staengle,⁴⁵ R. Cowan,⁴⁶ G. Sciolla,⁴⁶ S. J. Sekula,⁴⁶ M. Spitznagel,⁴⁶ F. Taylor,⁴⁶ R. K. Yamamoto,⁴⁶ H. Kim,⁴⁷ P. M. Patel,⁴⁷ S. H. Robertson,⁴⁷ A. Lazzaro,⁴⁸ V. Lombardo,⁴⁸ F. Palombo,⁴⁸ J. M. Bauer,⁴⁹ L. Cremaldi,⁴⁹ V. Eschenburg,⁴⁹ R. Godang,⁴⁹ R. Kroeger,⁴⁹ D. A. Sanders,⁴⁹ D. J. Summers,⁴⁹ H. W. Zhao,⁴⁹ S. Brunet,⁵⁰ D. Côté,⁵⁰ P. Taras,⁵⁰ F. B. Viaud,⁵⁰ H. Nicholson,⁵¹ N. Cavallo,^{52,‡} G. De Nardo,⁵² F. Fabozzi,^{52,‡} C. Gatto,⁵² L. Lista,⁵² D. Monorchio,⁵² P. Paolucci,⁵² D. Piccolo,⁵² C. Sciacca,⁵² M. Baak,⁵³ G. Raven,⁵³ H. L. Snoek,⁵³ C. P. Jessop,⁵⁴ J. M. LoSecco,⁵⁴ T. Allmendinger,⁵⁵ G. Benelli,⁵⁵ K. K. Gan,⁵⁵ K. Honscheid,⁵⁵ D. Hufnagel,⁵⁵ P. D. Jackson,⁵⁵ H. Kagan,⁵⁵ R. Kass,⁵⁵ A. M. Rahimi,⁵⁵ R. Ter-Antonyan,⁵⁵ Q. K. Wong,⁵⁵ N. L. Blount,⁵⁶ J. Brau,⁵⁶ R. Frey,⁵⁶ O. Igonkina,⁵⁶ M. Lu,⁵⁶ C. T. Potter,⁵⁶ R. Rahmat,⁵⁶ N. B. Sinev,⁵⁶ D. Strom,⁵⁶ J. Strube,⁵⁶ E. Torrence,⁵⁶ F. Galeazzi,⁵⁷ A. Gaz,⁵⁷ M. Margoni,⁵⁷ M. Morandin,⁵⁷ A. Pompili,⁵⁷ M. Posocco,⁵⁷

M. Rotondo,⁵⁷ F. Simonetto,⁵⁷ R. Stroili,⁵⁷ C. Voci,⁵⁷ M. Benayoun,⁵⁸ J. Chauveau,⁵⁸ P. David,⁵⁸ L. Del Buono,⁵⁸ Ch. de la Vaissière,⁵⁸ O. Hamon,⁵⁸ B. L. Hartfiel,⁵⁸ M. J. J. John,⁵⁸ J. Malcèlès,⁵⁸ J. Ocariz,⁵⁸ L. Roos,⁵⁸ G. Therin,⁵⁸ P. K. Behera,⁵⁹ L. Gladney,⁵⁹ J. Panetta,⁵⁹ M. Biasini,⁶⁰ R. Covarelli,⁶⁰ C. Angelini,⁶¹ G. Batignani,⁶¹ S. Bettarini,⁶¹ F. Bucci,⁶¹ G. Calderini,⁶¹ M. Carpinelli,⁶¹ R. Cenci,⁶¹ F. Forti,⁶¹ M. A. Giorgi,⁶¹ A. Lusiani,⁶¹ G. Marchiori,⁶¹ M. A. Mazur,⁶¹ M. Morganti,⁶¹ N. Neri,⁶¹ G. Rizzo,⁶¹ J. J. Walsh,⁶¹ M. Haire,⁶² D. Judd,⁶² D. E. Wagoner,⁶² J. Biesiada,⁶³ N. Danielson,⁶³ P. Elmer,⁶³ Y. P. Lau,⁶³ C. Lu,⁶³ J. Olsen,⁶³ A. J. S. Smith,⁶³ A. V. Telnov,⁶³ F. Bellini,⁶⁴ G. Cavoto,⁶⁴ A. D'Orazio,⁶⁴ D. del Re,⁶⁴ E. Di Marco,⁶⁴ R. Faccini,⁶⁴ F. Ferrarotto,⁶⁴ F. Ferroni,⁶⁴ M. Gaspero,⁶⁴ L. Li Gioi,⁶⁴ M. A. Mazzoni,⁶⁴ S. Morganti,⁶⁴ G. Piredda,⁶⁴ F. Polci,⁶⁴ F. Safai Tehrani,⁶⁴ C. Voena,⁶⁴ M. Ebert,⁶⁵ H. Schröder,⁶⁵ R. Waldi,⁶⁵ T. Adye,⁶⁶ N. De Groot,⁶⁶ B. Franek,⁶⁶ E. O. Olaiya,⁶⁶ F. F. Wilson,⁶⁶ S. Emery,⁶⁷ A. Gaidot,⁶⁷ S. F. Ganzhur,⁶⁷ G. Hamel de Monchenault,⁶⁷ W. Kozanecki,⁶⁷ M. Legendre,⁶⁷ G. Vasseur,⁶⁷ Ch. Yèche,⁶⁷ M. Zito,⁶⁷ X. R. Chen,⁶⁸ H. Liu,⁶⁸ W. Park,⁶⁸ M. V. Purohit,⁶⁸ J. R. Wilson,⁶⁸ M. T. Allen,⁶⁹ D. Aston,⁶⁹ R. Bartoldus,⁶⁹ P. Bechtle,⁶⁹ N. Berger,⁶⁹ R. Claus,⁶⁹ J. P. Coleman,⁶⁹ M. R. Convery,⁶⁹ M. Cristinziani,⁶⁹ J. C. Dingfelder,⁶⁹ J. Dorfan,⁶⁹ G. P. Dubois-Felsmann,⁶⁹ D. Dujmic,⁶⁹ W. Dunwoodie,⁶⁹ R. C. Field,⁶⁹ T. Glanzman,⁶⁹ S. J. Gowdy,⁶⁹ M. T. Graham,⁶⁹ V. Halyo,⁶⁹ C. Hast,⁶⁹ T. Hryn'ova,⁶⁹ W. R. Innes,⁶⁹ M. H. Kelsey,⁶⁹ P. Kim,⁶⁹ D. W. G. S. Leith,⁶⁹ S. Li,⁶⁹ S. Luitz,⁶⁹ V. Luth,⁶⁹ H. L. Lynch,⁶⁹ D. B. MacFarlane,⁶⁹ H. Marsiske,⁶⁹ R. Messner,⁶⁹ D. R. Muller,⁶⁹ C. P. O'Grady,⁶⁹ V. E. Ozcan,⁶⁹ A. Perazzo,⁶⁹ M. Perl,⁶⁹ T. Pulliam,⁶⁹ B. N. Ratcliff,⁶⁹ A. Roodman,⁶⁹ A. A. Salnikov,⁶⁹ R. H. Schindler,⁶⁹ J. Schwiening,⁶⁹ A. Snyder,⁶⁹ J. Stelzer,⁶⁹ D. Su,⁶⁹ M. K. Sullivan,⁶⁹ K. Suzuki,⁶⁹ S. K. Swain,⁶⁹ J. M. Thompson,⁶⁹ J. Va'vra,⁶⁹ N. van Bakel,⁶⁹ M. Weaver,⁶⁹ A. J. R. Weinstein,⁶⁹ W. J. Wisniewski,⁶⁹ M. Wittgen,⁶⁹ D. H. Wright,⁶⁹ A. K. Yarritu,⁶⁹ K. Yi,⁶⁹ C. C. Young,⁶⁹ P. R. Burchat,⁷⁰ A. J. Edwards,⁷⁰ S. A. Majewski,⁷⁰ B. A. Petersen,⁷⁰ C. Roat,⁷⁰ L. Wilden,⁷⁰ S. Ahmed,⁷¹ M. S. Alam,⁷¹ R. Bula,⁷¹ J. A. Ernst,⁷¹ V. Jain,⁷¹ B. Pan,⁷¹ M. A. Saeed,⁷¹ F. R. Wappler,⁷¹ S. B. Zain,⁷¹ W. Bugg,⁷² M. Krishnamurthy,⁷² S. M. Spanier,⁷² R. Eckmann,⁷³ J. L. Ritchie,⁷³ A. Satpathy,⁷³ C. J. Schilling,⁷³ R. F. Schwitters,⁷³ J. M. Izen,⁷⁴ X. C. Lou,⁷⁴ S. Ye,⁷⁴ F. Bianchi,⁷⁵ F. Gallo,⁷⁵ D. Gamba,⁷⁵ M. Bomben,⁷⁶ L. Bosisio,⁷⁶ C. Cartaro,⁷⁶ F. Cossutti,⁷⁶ G. Della Ricca,⁷⁶ S. Dittongo,⁷⁶ L. Lanceri,⁷⁶ L. Vitale,⁷⁶ V. Azzolini,⁷⁷ F. Martinez-Vidal,⁷⁷ Sw. Banerjee,⁷⁸ B. Bhuyan,⁷⁸ C. M. Brown,⁷⁸ D. Fortin,⁷⁸ K. Hamano,⁷⁸ R. Kowalewski,⁷⁸ I. M. Nugent,⁷⁸ J. M. Roney,⁷⁸ R. J. Sobie,⁷⁸ J. J. Back,⁷⁹ P. F. Harrison,⁷⁹ T. E. Latham,⁷⁹ G. B. Mohanty,⁷⁹ M. Pappagallo,⁷⁹ H. R. Band,⁸⁰ X. Chen,⁸⁰ B. Cheng,⁸⁰ S. Dasu,⁸⁰ M. Datta,⁸⁰ K. T. Flood,⁸⁰ J. J. Hollar,⁸⁰ P. E. Kutter,⁸⁰ B. Mellado,⁸⁰ A. Mihalys,⁸⁰ Y. Pan,⁸⁰ M. Pierini,⁸⁰ R. Prepost,⁸⁰ S. L. Wu,⁸⁰ Z. Yu,⁸⁰ and H. Neal⁸¹

(BABAR Collaboration)

¹Laboratoire de Physique des Particules, F-74941 Annecy-le-Vieux, France

²Facultat de Física, Departament ECM, Universitat de Barcelona, E-08028 Barcelona, Spain

³Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, Università di Bari, I-70126 Bari, Italy

⁴Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing 100039, China

⁵Institute of Physics, University of Bergen, N-5007 Bergen, Norway

⁶Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory and University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, California 94720, USA

⁷University of Birmingham, Birmingham B15 2TT, United Kingdom

⁸Institut für Experimentalphysik I, Ruhr Universität Bochum, D-44780 Bochum, Germany

⁹University of Bristol, Bristol BS8 1TL, United Kingdom

¹⁰University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada V6T 1Z1

¹¹Brunel University, Uxbridge, Middlesex UB8 3PH, United Kingdom

¹²Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, Novosibirsk 630090, Russia

¹³University of California at Irvine, Irvine, California 92697, USA

¹⁴University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California 90024, USA

¹⁵University of California at Riverside, Riverside, California 92521, USA

¹⁶University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, California 92093, USA

¹⁷University of California at Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, California 93106, USA

¹⁸Institute for Particle Physics, University of California at Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz, California 95064, USA

¹⁹California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California 91125, USA

²⁰University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio 45221, USA

²¹University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80309, USA

²²Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado 80523, USA

²³Institut für Physik, Universität Dortmund, D-44221 Dortmund, Germany

²⁴Institut für Kern- und Teilchenphysik, Technische Universität Dresden, D-01062 Dresden, Germany

²⁵Laboratoire Leprince-Ringuet, Ecole Polytechnique, F-91128 Palaiseau, France

- ²⁶University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH9 3JZ, United Kingdom
- ²⁷Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, Università di Ferrara, I-44100 Ferrara, Italy
- ²⁸Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati dell'INFN, I-00044 Frascati, Italy
- ²⁹Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, Università di Genova, I-16146 Genova, Italy
- ³⁰Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, USA
- ³¹Physikalisches Institut, Universität Heidelberg, Philosophenweg 12, D-69120 Heidelberg, Germany
- ³²Imperial College London, London SW7 2AZ, United Kingdom
- ³³University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52242, USA
- ³⁴Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011-3160, USA
- ³⁵Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland 21218, USA
- ³⁶Institut für Experimentelle Kernphysik, Universität Karlsruhe, D-76021 Karlsruhe, Germany
- ³⁷Laboratoire de l'Accélérateur Linéaire, IN2P3-CNRS et Université Paris-Sud 11, Centre Scientifique d'Orsay, BP 34, F-91898 Orsay Cedex, France
- ³⁸Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California 94550, USA
- ³⁹University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 7ZE, United Kingdom
- ⁴⁰Queen Mary, University of London, London E1 4NS, United Kingdom
- ⁴¹Royal Holloway and Bedford New College, University of London, Egham, Surrey TW20 0EX, United Kingdom
- ⁴²University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky 40292, USA
- ⁴³University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PL, United Kingdom
- ⁴⁴University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, USA
- ⁴⁵University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts 01003, USA
- ⁴⁶Laboratory for Nuclear Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, USA
- ⁴⁷McGill University, Montréal, Québec, Canada H3A 2T8
- ⁴⁸Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, Università di Milano, I-20133 Milano, Italy
- ⁴⁹University of Mississippi, University, Mississippi 38677, USA
- ⁵⁰Physique des Particules, Université de Montréal, Montréal, Québec, Canada H3C 3J7
- ⁵¹Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Massachusetts 01075, USA
- ⁵²Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche and INFN, Università di Napoli Federico II, I-80126 Napoli, Italy
- ⁵³NIKHEF, National Institute for Nuclear Physics and High Energy Physics, NL-1009 DB Amsterdam, The Netherlands
- ⁵⁴University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana 46556, USA
- ⁵⁵The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210, USA
- ⁵⁶University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403, USA
- ⁵⁷Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, Università di Padova, I-35131 Padova, Italy
- ⁵⁸Laboratoire de Physique Nucléaire et de Hautes Energies, Universités Paris VI et VII, F-75252 Paris, France
- ⁵⁹University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104, USA
- ⁶⁰Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, Università di Perugia, I-06100 Perugia, Italy
- ⁶¹Dipartimento di Fisica, Scuola Normale Superiore and INFN, Università di Pisa, I-56127 Pisa, Italy
- ⁶²Prairie View A&M University, Prairie View, Texas 77446, USA
- ⁶³Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08544, USA
- ⁶⁴Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, Università di Roma La Sapienza, I-00185 Roma, Italy
- ⁶⁵Universität Rostock, D-18051 Rostock, Germany
- ⁶⁶Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Chilton, Didcot, Oxon OX11 0QX, United Kingdom
- ⁶⁷DSM/Dapnia, CEA/Saclay, F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France
- ⁶⁸University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina 29208, USA
- ⁶⁹Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, Stanford, California 94309, USA
- ⁷⁰Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305-4060, USA
- ⁷¹State University of New York, Albany, New York 12222, USA
- ⁷²University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee 37996, USA
- ⁷³University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712, USA
- ⁷⁴University of Texas at Dallas, Richardson, Texas 75083, USA
- ⁷⁵Dipartimento di Fisica Sperimentale and INFN, Università di Torino, I-10125 Torino, Italy
- ⁷⁶Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, Università di Trieste, I-34127 Trieste, Italy
- ⁷⁷IFIC, Universitat de Valencia-CSIC, E-46071 Valencia, Spain
- ⁷⁸University of Victoria, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada V8W 3P6
- ⁷⁹Department of Physics, University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, United Kingdom
- ⁸⁰University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706, USA
- ⁸¹Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut 06511, USA

(Received 16 June 2006; published 12 September 2006)

A measurement of the spin of the Ω^- hyperon produced through the exclusive process $\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Omega^- K^+$ is presented using a total integrated luminosity of 116 fb^{-1} recorded with the BABAR detector at the e^+e^-

asymmetric-energy B factory at SLAC. Under the assumption that the Ξ_c^0 has spin $1/2$, the angular distribution of the Λ from $\Omega^- \rightarrow \Lambda K^-$ decay is inconsistent with all half-integer Ω^- spin values other than $3/2$. Lower statistics data for the process $\Omega_c^0 \rightarrow \Omega^- \pi^+$ from a 230 fb^{-1} sample are also found to be consistent with Ω^- spin $3/2$. If the Ξ_c^0 spin were $3/2$, an Ω^- spin of $5/2$ could not be excluded.

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.97.112001

PACS numbers: 14.20.Jn, 13.30.Eg

The $SU(3)$ classification scheme predicted [1] the existence of the Ω^- hyperon, an isosinglet with hypercharge $Y = -2$ and strangeness $S = -3$, as a member of the $J^P = 3/2^+$ ground state baryon decuplet. Such a particle was observed subsequently with the predicted mass in a bubble chamber experiment [2]. In previous attempts to confirm the spin of the Ω^- [3–5], $K^- p$ interactions in a liquid hydrogen bubble chamber were studied. In each case only a small Ω^- data sample was obtained, and the Ω^- production mechanism was not well understood. As a result, these experiments succeeded only in establishing that the Ω^- spin is greater than $1/2$.

In this Letter, measurements of the Ω^- spin are obtained using Ω^- samples [6] from the decay of Ξ_c^0 and Ω_c^0 charm baryons inclusively produced in e^+e^- collisions at center-of-mass energies 10.58 and 10.54 GeV. The primary Ω^- sample is obtained from the decay sequence $\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Omega^- K^+$, with $\Omega^- \rightarrow \Lambda K^-$, while a much smaller sample resulting from $\Omega_c^0 \rightarrow \Omega^- \pi^+$, with $\Omega^- \rightarrow \Lambda K^-$, is used for corroboration. It is assumed that each charm baryon type has spin $1/2$ and, as a result of its inclusive production, that it is described by a diagonal spin projection density matrix. The analysis does not require that the diagonal matrix elements be equal.

The helicity formalism [7,8] is applied in order to examine the implications of various Ω^- spin hypotheses for the angular distribution of the Λ from Ω^- decay. By choosing the quantization axis along the direction of the Ω^- in the charm baryon rest frame, the Ω^- inherits the spin projection of the charm baryon, since any orbital angular momentum in the charm baryon decay has no projection in this direction. It follows that, regardless of the spin J of the Ω^- , the density matrix describing the Ω^- sample is diagonal, with nonzero values only for the $\pm 1/2$ spin projection elements; i.e., the helicity λ_i of the Ω^- can take only the values $\pm 1/2$. Since the Λ and K^- in the final state have spin values $1/2$ and 0 , respectively, the net final state helicity λ_f also can take only the values $\pm 1/2$. The helicity angle θ_h is then defined as the angle between the direction of the Λ in the rest frame of the Ω^- and the quantization axis (Fig. 1).

The probability for the Λ to be produced with Euler angles $(\phi, \theta_h, 0)$ with respect to the quantization axis is given by the square of the amplitude ψ , characterizing the decay of an Ω^- with total angular momentum J and helicity λ_i to a 2-body system with net helicity λ_f ,

$$\psi = A_{\lambda_f}^J D_{\lambda_i \lambda_f}^{J*}(\phi, \theta_h, 0), \quad (1)$$

where the transition matrix element $A_{\lambda_f}^J$ represents the coupling of the Ω^- to the final state, $D_{\lambda_i \lambda_f}^J$ is an element of the Wigner rotation matrix [9], and the $*$ denotes complex conjugation; $A_{\lambda_f}^J$ does not depend on λ_i because of rotational invariance (Wigner-Eckart theorem [10]). The angular distribution of the Λ is then given by the total intensity,

$$I \propto \sum_{\lambda_i, \lambda_f} \rho_{ii} |A_{\lambda_f}^J D_{\lambda_i \lambda_f}^{J*}(\phi, \theta_h, 0)|^2, \quad (2)$$

where the ρ_{ii} ($i = \pm 1/2$) are the diagonal density matrix elements inherited from the charm baryon, and the sum is over all initial and final helicity states.

Using this expression, the Λ angular distribution integrated over ϕ is obtained for spin hypotheses $J_\Omega = 1/2, 3/2$, and $5/2$, respectively, as follows:

$$dN/d \cos \theta_h \propto 1 + \beta \cos \theta_h, \quad (3)$$

$$dN/d \cos \theta_h \propto 1 + 3 \cos^2 \theta_h + \beta \cos \theta_h (5 - 9 \cos^2 \theta_h), \quad (4)$$

$$dN/d \cos \theta_h \propto 1 - 2 \cos^2 \theta_h + 5 \cos^4 \theta_h + \beta \cos \theta_h (5 - 26 \cos^2 \theta_h + 25 \cos^4 \theta_h), \quad (5)$$



a) All decay products in the Ξ_c^0 rest-frame.b) All decay products in the Ω^- rest-frame; in this frame, $\vec{\Omega}_1^- \rightarrow \vec{\Omega}_2^- = \vec{0}$, $\vec{\Lambda}_1 \rightarrow \vec{\Lambda}_2$, $\vec{K}_1^- \rightarrow \vec{K}_2^-$.

FIG. 1. Schematic definition of the helicity angle θ_h in the decay chain $\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Omega^- K^+$, $\Omega^- \rightarrow \Lambda K^-$; as shown in (b) θ_h is the angle between the Λ direction in the Ω^- rest frame and the Ω^- direction in the Ξ_c^0 rest frame (the quantization axis).

where the coefficient of the asymmetric term

$$\beta = \left[\frac{\rho_{1/2\ 1/2} - \rho_{-1/2\ -1/2}}{\rho_{1/2\ 1/2} + \rho_{-1/2\ -1/2}} \right] \left[\frac{|A_{1/2}^J|^2 - |A_{-1/2}^J|^2}{|A_{1/2}^J|^2 + |A_{-1/2}^J|^2} \right]$$

may be nonzero as a consequence of parity violation in charm baryon and Ω^- weak decay. Equations (3) and (4) are the distributions considered in connection with the discovery of the $\Delta(1232)$ resonance [11], generalized to account for parity violation.

The data samples used for this analysis were collected with the *BABAR* detector at the PEP-II asymmetric-energy e^+e^- collider and correspond to a total integrated luminosity of 116 and 230 fb^{-1} for the $\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Omega^- K^+$ and $\Omega_c^0 \rightarrow \Omega^- \pi^+$ samples, respectively. The detector is described in detail elsewhere [12]. The selection of Ξ_c^0 and Ω_c^0 candidates requires the intermediate reconstruction of events consistent with $\Omega^- \rightarrow \Lambda K^-$ and $\Lambda \rightarrow p \pi^-$. Particle identification selectors for the proton and the kaons, based on specific energy loss (dE/dx) and Cherenkov angle measurements, have been used [12]. Each intermediate state candidate is required to have its invariant mass within a $\pm 3\sigma$ mass window centered on the fitted peak position of the relevant distribution, where σ is the mass resolution obtained from the fit. In all cases, the fitted peak mass is consistent with the expected value [13]. The intermediate state invariant mass is then constrained to its nominal value [13].

Since the hyperons are long-lived, the signal-to-background ratio is improved by imposing vertex displacement criteria. The distance between the $\Omega^- K^+$ or $\Omega^- \pi^+$ vertex and the Ω^- decay vertex, when projected onto the plane perpendicular to the collision axis, must exceed 1.5 mm in the Ω^- direction. The distance between the Ω^- and Λ decay vertices is required to exceed 1.5 mm in the direction of the Λ momentum vector. In order to further enhance signal-to-background ratio, a selection criterion is imposed on the center-of-mass momentum p^* of the charm baryon: $p^* > 1.8 \text{ GeV}/c$ for Ξ_c^0 and $p^* > 2.5 \text{ GeV}/c$ for Ω_c^0 candidates. In addition, a minimum laboratory momentum requirement of 200 MeV/c is imposed on the π^+ daughter of the Ω_c^0 in order to reduce the combinatorial background level due to soft pions. The invariant mass spectra of Ξ_c^0 and Ω_c^0 candidates in data are shown before efficiency correction in Figs. 2(a) and 2(b), respectively. The signal yields ($770 \pm 33 \Xi_c^0$ and $159 \pm 17 \Omega_c^0$ candidates) are obtained from fits with a double Gaussian (Ξ_c^0) or single Gaussian (Ω_c^0) signal function and a linear background function. The corresponding selection efficiencies obtained from Monte Carlo simulations are 14.7% and 15.8%, respectively.

For the Ω^- sample resulting from Ξ_c^0 decay, the uncorrected $\cos\theta_h(\Lambda)$ distribution is obtained by means of an unbinned maximum likelihood fit to the $\Omega^- K^+$ invariant mass spectrum corresponding to each of ten equal intervals of $\cos\theta_h(\Lambda)$ in the range -1 to 1 . In each interval the Ξ_c^0




FIG. 2. The uncorrected $\Omega^- K^+$ (a) and $\Omega^- \pi^+$ (b) invariant mass spectra in data. The curves result from the fits described in the text.

signal function shape is fixed to that obtained from the fit shown in Fig. 2(a). The Ξ_c^0 reconstruction efficiency in each interval of $\cos\theta_h(\Lambda)$ is obtained from Monte Carlo simulation, and the resulting efficiency-corrected distribution is shown in Fig. 3. The measured efficiency varies linearly from 14.0% at $\cos\theta_h(\Lambda) = -1$ to 15.3% at $\cos\theta_h(\Lambda) = +1$, and so the shape of the angular distribution is changed only slightly by the correction procedure. The dashed curve corresponds to a fit of the $J_\Omega = 3/2$ parametrization of Eq. (4) and yields $\beta = 0.04 \pm 0.06$. The forward-backward asymmetry $A = (F - B)/(F + B)$ of the efficiency-corrected $\cos\theta_h(\Lambda)$ distribution of Fig. 3, where B (F) represents the number of signal events satisfying $\cos\theta_h(\Lambda) \leq 0$ (≥ 0), is $+0.001 \pm 0.019$. This and the fitted value of β indicate that the data show no significant asymmetry, and so we set $\beta = 0$ in subsequent fits. The solid curve represents the fit to the data with $\beta = 0$; the fit information relevant to Eq. (4) is indicated in Table I.

The efficiency-corrected $\cos\theta_h(\Lambda)$ distribution with fits corresponding to Eqs. (3) and (5) with $\beta = 0$ is shown in Fig. 4. The dotted line represents the expected distribution for $J_\Omega = 1/2$, while the dashed curve corresponds to $J_\Omega = 5/2$. The corresponding values of fit confidence level (C.L.) are extremely small (Table I). For $J_\Omega \geq 7/2$, the




FIG. 3. The efficiency-corrected $\cos\theta_h(\Lambda)$ distribution for $\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Omega^- K^+$ data. The dashed curve shows the $J_\Omega = 3/2$ fit using Eq. (4), in which β allows for possible asymmetry. The solid curve represents the corresponding fit with $\beta = 0$.

predicted angular distribution increases even more steeply for $|\cos\theta_h| \sim 1$ than for $J_\Omega = 5/2$ and exhibits $(2J_\Omega - 2)$ turning points. The relevant fit C.L. values are even smaller than that for $J_\Omega = 5/2$, and so $J_\Omega \geq 7/2$ can be excluded at C.L. greater than 99%.

These fit results were checked using the sample of Ω^- hyperons obtained from Ω_c baryon decays. The Ω_c baryon is presumed to belong to the **6** representation of an $SU(3)$ $J^P = 1/2^+$ multiplet [13], so that the Ω^- decay angular distribution should again be proportional to $(1 + 3\cos^2\theta_h)$. After efficiency correction, the angular distribution shown in Fig. 5 is found to be consistent with $J_{\Omega^-} = 3/2$ with β again set to zero. The fit to the corrected distribution has C.L. 0.69, and so is in very good agreement with the results obtained from Ξ_c^0 decay. The fit for β yields $\beta = 0.4 \pm 0.2$, and the value of the forward-backward asymmetry is $+0.013 \pm 0.058$.

The implications for the spin of the Ω^- if the spin of the Ξ_c^0 is assumed to be $3/2$ are now considered. For $J_\Omega = 1/2$, the predicted decay angular distribution is again given by Eq. (3), and so this possibility can be ruled out.

If asymmetric contributions are ignored, the Ω^- angular distribution for spin values $3/2$ and $5/2$ are determined by the values of the quantities $x = \rho_{3/2\ 3/2} + \rho_{-3/2\ -3/2}$ and $(1 - x) = \rho_{1/2\ 1/2} + \rho_{-1/2\ -1/2}$. For $J_\Omega = 3/2$, $x = 0$ would yield a distribution given by Eq. (4) with $\beta = 0$,




FIG. 4. The efficiency-corrected $\cos\theta_h(\Lambda)$ distribution for $\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Omega^- K^+$ data. The dotted line represents the expected distribution for $J_\Omega = 1/2$, while the dashed curve corresponds to $J_\Omega = 5/2$. In each case, $\beta = 0$.

in excellent agreement with the data. However, for inclusive Ξ_c^0 production with the Ω^- direction in the Ξ_c^0 rest frame as quantization axis, it would seem more reasonable to expect the spin projection states to be populated equally. This would yield $x = 0.5$, and would result in an isotropic Ω^- decay distribution, in clear disagreement with the observed behavior.

A consequence of such a Ξ_c^0 density matrix configuration would be that there should be no preferred direction in the decay to $\Omega^- K^+$ in the Ξ_c^0 rest frame. This hypothesis has been tested in the present analysis by measuring the Ξ_c^0 polarization with respect to its production-plane normal; there is no evidence for such polarization. In addition, the spherical harmonic (Y_L^M) moments of the Ξ_c^0 decay angular distribution for $L \leq 6$ and $M \leq 6$ have been compared to those obtained from simulation in which the Ξ_c^0 decay is isotropic; no significant difference was found. It is therefore reasonable to infer that the combination $J_{\Xi_c} = 3/2$ and $J_\Omega = 3/2$ is disfavored.

For $J_\Omega = 5/2$ the situation is quite different. The decay angular distribution is then

$$dN/d\cos\theta_h \propto 10\cos^4\theta_h - 4\cos^2\theta_h + 2 - x(25\cos^4\theta_h - 18\cos^2\theta_h + 1). \quad (6)$$

TABLE I. The $\cos\theta_h$ angular distribution fit C.L. values corresponding to the Ω^- spin hypotheses $1/2$, $3/2$, and $5/2$ for $\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Omega^- K^+$ data assuming $J_{\Xi_c} = 1/2$; NDF denotes the number of degrees of freedom.

J_Ω	Fit χ^2/NDF	Fit C.L.	Comment
1/2	100.4/9	1×10^{-17}	Figure 4, dotted line
3/2	6.5/9	0.69 ($\beta = 0$)	Figure 3, solid curve
3/2	6.1/8	0.64 ($\beta \neq 0$)	Figure 3, dashed curve
5/2	47.6/9	3×10^{-7}	Figure 4, dashed curve




FIG. 5. The efficiency-corrected $\cos\theta_h(\Lambda)$ distribution in data for $\Omega_c^0 \rightarrow \Omega^- \pi^+$ events. The curve corresponds to $J_{\Omega_c} = 1/2$ and $J_{\Omega^-} = 3/2$ with $\beta = 0$.

In this case, $x = 0.5$ gives

$$dN/d\cos\theta_h \propto -5\cos^4\theta_h + 10\cos^2\theta_h + 3, \quad (7)$$

which has a minimum at $\cos\theta_h = 0$, maxima at $\cos\theta_h = \pm 1$, and fits the observed angular distribution with C.L. 0.44. If x is allowed to vary, the best fit to the data has $x = 0.4$, which corresponds to

$$dN/d\cos\theta_h \propto 1 + 2\cos^2\theta_h; \quad (8)$$

the quartic term is thus cancelled, and fit C.L. 0.53 is obtained.

It follows from this discussion that for $J_{\Xi_c} = 3/2$, the hypothesis $J_{\Omega} = 1/2$ is ruled out, and $J_{\Omega} = 3/2$ may reasonably be considered disfavored; however, $J_{\Omega} = 5/2$ is entirely acceptable. For this reason, it has been emphasized that the determination that the Ω^- has spin $3/2$ is entirely contingent upon the assumption that the spin of the Ξ_c^0 (and of the Ω_c^0) is $1/2$.

In conclusion, the angular distributions of the decay products of the Ω^- baryon resulting from Ξ_c^0 and Ω_c^0 decays are well described by a function $\propto (1 + 3\cos^2\theta_h)$. These observations are consistent with spin assignments $1/2$ for the Ξ_c^0 and the Ω_c^0 , and $3/2$ for the Ω^- . Values of $1/2$ and greater than $3/2$ for the spin of the Ω^- yield C.L.

values significantly less than 1% when spin $1/2$ is assumed for the parent charm baryon.

We are grateful for the excellent luminosity and machine conditions provided by our PEP-II colleagues, and for the substantial dedicated effort from the computing organizations that support *BABAR*. The collaborating institutions wish to thank SLAC for its support and kind hospitality. This work is supported by DOE and NSF (USA), NSERC (Canada), IHEP (China), CEA and CNRS-IN2P3 (France), BMBF and DFG (Germany), INFN (Italy), FOM (The Netherlands), NFR (Norway), MIST (Russia), and PPARC (United Kingdom). Individuals have received support from CONACyT (Mexico), A. P. Sloan Foundation, Research Corporation, and Alexander von Humboldt Foundation.

*Also at Laboratoire de Physique Corpusculaire, Clermont-Ferrand, France.

†Also with Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Perugia, Perugia, Italy.

‡Also with Università della Basilicata, Potenza, Italy.

- [1] M. Gell-Mann, in *Proceedings of the International Conference on High-Energy Physics* (CERN, Geneva, 1962), p. 805.
- [2] V. E. Barnes *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **12**, 204 (1964).
- [3] M. Deutschmann *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **73B**, 96 (1978).
- [4] M. Baubillier *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **78B**, 342 (1978).
- [5] R. J. Hemingway *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B142**, 205 (1978).
- [6] The use of charge conjugate states is implied throughout.
- [7] M. Jacob and G. C. Wick, Ann. Phys. (Paris) **7**, 404 (1959).
- [8] S. U. Chung, CERN Yellow Report No. CERN 71-8, 1971.
- [9] E. Wigner, *Gruppentheories* (Freidrich Vieweg und Sohn, Braunschweig, 1931); *Group Theory* (Academic Press, New York, 1959).
- [10] E. Wigner, Z. Phys. **43**, 624 (1927); C. Eckart, Rev. Mod. Phys. **2**, 305 (1930).
- [11] H. L. Anderson, E. Fermi, E. A. Land, and D. E. Nagle, Phys. Rev. **85**, 936 (1952).
- [12] B. Aubert *et al.* (*BABAR* Collaboration), Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **479**, 1 (2002).
- [13] S. Eidelman *et al.* (Particle Data Group), Phys. Lett. B **592**, 1 (2004).