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## Motivation I

$>$ Two-body SCS decays $\Omega_{\mathrm{c}}^{0} \rightarrow \Xi^{-} \pi^{+}$and $\Omega_{c}^{0} \rightarrow \Omega^{-} K^{+}$not yet observed
$>$ Results from Belle: Evidence of $\Omega_{\mathrm{c}}^{0} \rightarrow \Xi^{-} \pi^{+}(4.5 \sigma)$ and upper limit of $\Omega_{c}^{0} \rightarrow \Omega^{-} K^{+}$
> The BFs are crucial to test the theoretical models

- Wide range of theoretical predictions for $\Xi^{-} \pi^{+}\left(1.96 \times 10^{-3} \sim 1.04 \times 10^{-1}\right)$
- No prediction is available for $\Omega^{-} K^{+}$(until our result submitted to arXiv)
- Possibility to test factorizable and nonfactorizable contributions



W-emission: factorizable contribution



W-exchange: non-factorizable contribution

## Motivation II

## PDG2023

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\Lambda_{c}^{+}$MASS | $2286.46 \pm 0.14 \mathrm{Mev}$ |
| $\Xi_{c}^{+}$MASS | $2467.71 \pm 0.23 \mathrm{mev}^{\prime}(S=1.3)$ |
| $\Xi_{c}^{0}$ MASS | $2470.44 \pm 0.28$ mev ( $\mathrm{s}=1.2)$ |
| $\Omega_{c}^{0}$ MASS | $2695.2+1.7 \mathrm{MeV}(\mathrm{S}=1.3)$ |



> Single arm spectrometer, $25 \%$ of $b \bar{b}$ pairs produced in the acceptance
$>$ Designed to study heavy hadron decays, high rapidity $(2<\eta<5)$ and low $p_{\mathrm{T}}$
$>$ Excellent vertexing, tracking, momentum resolution and particle identification

## Strategy and dataset

$>$ Normalization mode $\Omega_{\mathrm{c}}^{0} \rightarrow \Omega^{-} \pi^{+}$used

- Same decay topology and high yield
$>\frac{\mathcal{B}\left(\Omega_{c}^{0} \rightarrow \Omega^{-} K^{+}\right)}{\mathcal{B}\left(\Omega_{c}^{0} \rightarrow \Omega^{-} \pi^{+}\right)}=\frac{N_{\Omega_{c}^{0} \rightarrow \Omega^{-} K^{+}}}{N_{\Omega_{c}^{0} \rightarrow \Omega^{-} \pi^{+}}} \frac{\epsilon_{\Omega_{c}^{0} \rightarrow \Omega^{-} \pi^{+}}}{\epsilon_{\Omega_{c}^{0} \rightarrow \Omega^{-} K^{+}}}, \frac{\mathcal{B}\left(\Omega_{c}^{0} \rightarrow \Xi^{-} \pi^{+}\right)}{\mathcal{B}\left(\Omega_{c}^{0} \rightarrow \Omega^{-} \pi^{+}\right)}=\frac{N_{\Omega_{c}^{0} \rightarrow \Xi^{-} \pi^{+}}}{N_{\Omega_{c}^{0} \rightarrow \Omega^{-} \pi^{+}}} \frac{\epsilon_{\Omega_{c}^{0} \rightarrow \Omega^{-} \pi^{+}}}{\epsilon_{\Omega_{c}^{0} \rightarrow \Xi^{-} \pi^{+}}} \frac{\mathcal{B}\left(\Omega^{-} \rightarrow \Lambda K^{-}\right)}{\mathcal{B}\left(\Xi^{-} \rightarrow \Lambda \pi^{-}\right)}$
- Yields $\rightarrow$ Invariant mass fits
- Efficiencies $\rightarrow$ Calculate using simulation
- Branching fractions $\rightarrow$ PDG

| $\mathcal{B}\left(\Xi^{-} \rightarrow \Lambda \pi^{-}\right)$ | $(67.8 \pm 0.7) \%$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| $\mathcal{B}\left(\Omega^{-} \rightarrow \Lambda K^{-}\right)$ | $(99.887 \pm 0.035) \%$ |

$>$ Perform analysis based on Run II 2016-2018 dataset ( $5.4 \mathrm{fb}^{-1}$ )
$>$ Simulation samples are used to optimize selections and estimate the efficiencies

## Selection and efficiency

$>$ Cut-based selection requirements are performed on the final-state charged tracks, $\Lambda$, $\Xi^{-} / \Omega^{-}$ and $\Omega_{\mathrm{c}}^{0}$ to suppress combinatorial backgrounds
$>$ A kinematic fit of the decay chain constrains the $\Omega_{\mathrm{c}}^{0}$ to originate from PV , and the $\Xi^{-} / \Omega^{-}$and $\Lambda$ to have their known masses
> Efficiencies obtained after applying selections and simulation corrections


- Extended unbinned maximum likelihood fits are performed to full dataset
$>$ Signal is modelled by a Johnson $S_{U}$ distribution and a Gaussian function, the tail and fraction of Johnson $S_{U}$ are fixed from simulation sample
- Background is modelled by an Exponential function



| Decay mode | $\Omega_{c}^{0} \rightarrow \Omega^{-} K^{+}$ | $\Omega_{c}^{0} \rightarrow \Xi^{-} \pi^{+}$ | $\Omega_{c}^{0} \rightarrow \Omega^{-} \pi^{+}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Signal yield | $425 \pm 35$ | $2780 \pm 150$ | $9330 \pm 110$ |



## Systematic uncertainty

$>$ The total uncertainty is determined from the sum of all contributions in quadrature

Table 1: Systematic uncertainties for the $\Omega_{c}^{0}$ mass measurement.

| Source | Uncertainty $[\mathrm{MeV}]$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Momentum scale calibration | 0.27 |
| Energy loss correction | 0.03 |
| Fit model | 0.01 |
| Total | 0.27 |
| External input masses | 0.30 |

Table 2: Systematic uncertainties (in percent) for the BF ratio measurement.

| Source | $\mathcal{B}\left(\Omega^{-} K^{+}\right) / \mathcal{B}\left(\Omega^{-} \pi^{+}\right)$ | $\mathcal{B}\left(\Xi^{-} \pi^{+}\right) / \mathcal{B}\left(\Omega^{-} \pi^{+}\right)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Tracking efficiency | 1.78 | 1.78 |
| PID efficiency | 3.37 | 0.62 |
| Trigger efficiency | 1.26 | 0.69 |
| Fit model | 0.16 | 0.54 |
| Decay model | 3.59 | 1.32 |
| Lifetimes of $\Omega^{-}$and $\Xi^{-}$ | - | 0.59 |
| Simulation sample size | 0.07 | 0.08 |
| Reweight strategy | 2.82 | 0.52 |
| Mass resolution | 2.35 | 0.97 |
| Total | 6.51 | 2.76 |
| External input BFs | - | 1.04 |

## Results

$>$ The BF ratios of $\Omega_{c}^{0} \rightarrow \Omega^{-} K^{+}$and $\Omega_{c}^{0} \rightarrow \Xi^{-} \pi^{+}$are measured to be

- $\frac{\mathcal{B}\left(\Omega_{c}^{0} \rightarrow \Omega^{-} K^{+}\right)}{\mathcal{B}\left(\Omega_{c}^{0} \rightarrow \Omega^{-} \pi^{+}\right)}=0.0608 \pm 0.0051$ (stat) $\pm 0.0039$ (syst)
- $\frac{\mathcal{B}\left(\Omega_{c}^{0} \rightarrow \Xi^{-} \pi^{+}\right)}{\mathcal{B}\left(\Omega_{c}^{0} \rightarrow \Omega^{-} \pi^{+}\right)}=0.1581 \pm 0.0087$ (stat) $\pm 0.0044$ (syst) $\pm 0.0016$ (ext)
$>$ Using $\Omega_{c}^{0} \rightarrow \Omega^{-} \pi^{+}$decay, the $\Omega_{c}^{0}$ mass is measured to be
- $m\left(\Omega_{c}^{0}\right)=2695.28 \pm 0.07$ (stat) $\pm 0.27$ (syst) $\pm 0.30$ (ext) $\left[\mathrm{MeV} / c^{2}\right]$
$>$ Using LHCb Run II dataset (2016-2018, $5.4 \mathrm{fb}^{-1}$ )
$>$ The first observation of the $\Omega_{c}^{0} \rightarrow \Omega^{-} K^{+}$and $\Omega_{c}^{0} \rightarrow \Xi^{-} \pi^{+}$SCS decays is reported

| BF ratios | This work | CA model | LFQM | Naive estimation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\frac{\mathcal{B}\left(\Omega_{c}^{0} \rightarrow \Omega^{-} K^{+}\right)}{\mathcal{B}\left(\Omega_{c}^{0} \rightarrow \Omega^{-} \pi^{+}\right)}$ | $0.0608 \pm 0.0064$ | - | - | 0.0467 |
| $\frac{B}{\mathcal{B}\left(\Omega_{c}^{0} \rightarrow \Xi^{-} \pi^{+}\right)}$ | $0.1581 \pm 0.0099$ | 0.1038 | 0.0345 | - |
| $\mathcal{B}\left(\Omega_{c}^{0} \rightarrow \Omega^{-} \pi^{+}\right)$ |  |  |  |  |

> The non-factorizable contributions are necessary to accurately calculate the BFs
$>$ Provides fresh inputs to understand the non-perturbative effects in models based on QCD.

## Summary II

> The precision of $\Omega_{c}^{0}$ mass improved by four times

- $m\left(\Omega_{c}^{0}\right)=2695.28 \pm 0.07$ (stat) $\pm 0.27$ (syst) $\pm 0.30$ (ext) $\left[\mathrm{MeV} / c^{2}\right]$
- This $\Omega_{c}^{0}$ mass measurement provides a strict constraint on various theoretical models
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