

March, 2003

Hadronic Charmed Meson Decays Involving Tensor Mesons

Hai-Yang Cheng

Institute of Physics, Academia Sinica
Taipei, Taiwan 115, Republic of China

Abstract

Charmed meson decays into a pseudoscalar meson P and a tensor meson T are studied. The charm to tensor meson transition form factors are evaluated in the Isgur-Scora-Grinstein-Wise (ISGW) quark model. It is shown that the Cabibbo-allowed decay $D_s^+ \rightarrow f_2(1270)^+ \pi^0$ is dominated by the W^- -annihilation contribution and has the largest branching ratio in $D \rightarrow TP$ decays. We argue that the Cabibbo-suppressed mode $D^+ \rightarrow f_2(1270)^+ \pi^0$ should be suppressed by one order of magnitude relative to $D_s^+ \rightarrow f_2(1270)^+ \pi^0$. When the finite width effect of the tensor resonances is taken into account, the decay rate of $D \rightarrow TP$ is generally enhanced by a factor of 2–3. Except for $D_s^+ \rightarrow f_2(1270)^+ \pi^0$, the predicted branching ratios of $D \rightarrow TP$ decays are in general too small by one to two orders of magnitude compared to experiment. However, it is very unlikely that the $D \rightarrow T$ transition form factors can be enhanced by a factor of 3–5 within the ISGW quark model to account for the discrepancy between theory and experiment. As many of the current data are still preliminary and lack sufficient statistical significance, more accurate measurements are needed to pin down the issue.

I. INTRODUCTION

Cabibbo-allowed and Cabibbo-suppressed two-body hadronic D decays into a pseudoscalar meson P and a tensor meson T have been studied in [1] and [2], respectively. In both studies, the charm to tensor meson transition form factors are calculated using the ISGW (Isgur-Scora-Grinstein-Wise) quark model [3]. The calculated branching ratios are of order 10^{-5} – 10^{-7} . Recently, the Cabibbo-allowed mode $D_s^+ \rightarrow f_2(1270)^+ \pi^0$ and the Cabibbo-suppressed one $D^+ \rightarrow f_2(1270)^+ \pi^0$ both have been measured by E791 at the level of 10^{-3} [4]. More recently, FOCUS [5] and BaBar [6] have also reported some new measurements of $D \rightarrow TP$ decays. Though their results are still preliminary and many of them do not have enough statistical significance (see Table I below), the branching ratios are typically of order 10^{-3} . Therefore, it appears that there exists a large discrepancy between theory and experiment. It is thus important to understand the origin of discrepancy.

In the present work, several improvements over the previous work [1,2] are made. First, the charm to tensor meson transition form factors will be calculated in the improved version of the ISGW model [7]. The updated version of this quark model gives a more realistic description of the form-factor momentum dependence, especially at small q^2 . Second, the tensor meson has a width typically of order 100–200 MeV [8]. The finite width effect, which is very crucial to account for the decays such as $D \rightarrow K_2(1430)\bar{K}$ and $D \rightarrow f_2^0(1525)\bar{K}$ that appear to be prohibited by kinematics at first sight, is carefully examined. Third, it is known that weak annihilation (W -exchange or W -annihilation) in charm decays can receive sizable contributions from nearby resonances through inelastic π -state interactions (see e.g. [9]). Hence, it is important to take into account weak annihilation contributions.

This work is organized as follows. In Sec. II we summarize the current experimental measurements of $D \rightarrow TP$ decays. We discuss the various physical properties of the tensor mesons in Sec. III, for example, the decay constants and the form factors and then analyze the $D \rightarrow TP$ decays in Sec. IV based on the generalized factorization approach in conjunction with π -state interactions. Conclusions are presented in Sec. V.

II. EXPERIMENTAL STATUS

It is known that three-body decays of heavy mesons provide a rich laboratory for studying the intermediate state resonances. The Dalitz plot analysis is a very useful technique for this purpose. We are interested in $D \rightarrow TP$ decays extracted from the three-body decays of charmed mesons. Besides the earlier measurements by ARGUS [10] and E687 [11], some recent results are available from E791 [4], CLEO [12], FOCUS [5] and BaBar [6]. The $J^P = 2^+$ tensor mesons that have been studied in hadronic charm decays include $f_2(1270)$, $a_2(1320)$ and $K_2(1430)$. The results of various experiments are summarized in Table I where the product of $B(D \rightarrow TP)$ and $B(T \rightarrow P_1 P_2)$ is shown. In order to extract the branching ratios for the two-body decays $D \rightarrow TP$, we need to know the branching fractions of the strong decays of the tensor mesons [8]:

$$\begin{aligned}
B(f_2(1270) \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-) &= (84^{+2.4}_{-1.3})\% ; & B(f_2(1270) \rightarrow K^+ \bar{K}^-) &= (4.6 \pm 0.5)\% ; \\
B(a_2(1320) \rightarrow K^+ \bar{K}^-) &= (4.9 \pm 0.8)\% ; & B(K_2(1430) \rightarrow K^+ \pi^-) &= (49.9 \pm 1.2)\% :
\end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

It is evident that most of the listed $D \rightarrow TP$ decays in Table I have branching ratios of order 10^{-3} , even though some of them are Cabibbo suppressed. Note that the results from FOCUS and BaBar are still preliminary. Indeed, many of them have not yet sufficient statistical significance.

Note that at first sight it appears that the decay $D \rightarrow \bar{K}_2(1430)K$ is kinematically not allowed as the $K_2(1430)$ mass lies outside of the phase space for the decay. Nevertheless, it is physically allowed as $K_2(1430)$ has a decay width of order 100 MeV [8]. Likewise, the decay $D^0 \rightarrow f_2^0(1525)\bar{K}^0$ is also allowed.

TABLE I. Experimental branching ratios of various $D \rightarrow TP$ decays measured by ARGUS, E687, E791, CLEO, FOCUS and BaBar. For simplicity and convenience, we have dropped the mass identification for $f_2(1270)$, $a_2(1320)$ and $K_2(1430)$.

Collaboration	$B(D \rightarrow TP)$	$B(T \rightarrow P_1 P_2)$	$B(D \rightarrow TP)$
E791	$B(D^+ \rightarrow f_2^+ \pi^-)B(f_2 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-) = (6.0 \pm 1.1) \cdot 10^{-4}$		$B(D^+ \rightarrow f_2^+ \pi^-) = (1.1 \pm 0.2) \cdot 10^{-3}$
FOCUS	$B(D^+ \rightarrow f_2^+ \pi^-)B(f_2 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-) = (3.8 \pm 0.8) \cdot 10^{-5}$		$B(D^+ \rightarrow f_2^+ \pi^-) = (6.8 \pm 1.4) \cdot 10^{-4}$
FOCUS	$B(D^+ \rightarrow f_2^+ \pi^-)B(f_2 \rightarrow K^+ K^-) = (7.0 \pm 1.9) \cdot 10^{-5}$		$B(D^+ \rightarrow f_2^+ \pi^-) = (3.1 \pm 0.9) \cdot 10^{-3}$
E791	$B(D_s^+ \rightarrow f_2^+ \pi^-)B(f_2 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-) = (2.0 \pm 0.7) \cdot 10^{-3}$		$B(D_s^+ \rightarrow f_2^+ \pi^-) = (3.5 \pm 1.2) \cdot 10^{-3}$
FOCUS	$B(D_s^+ \rightarrow f_2^+ \pi^-)B(f_2 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-) = (1.0 \pm 0.3) \cdot 10^{-3}$		$B(D_s^+ \rightarrow f_2^+ \pi^-) = (1.8 \pm 0.5) \cdot 10^{-3}$
ARGUS, E687	$B(D^0 \rightarrow f_2^0 \bar{K}^0)B(f_2 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-) = (3.2 \pm 0.9) \cdot 10^{-3}$		$B(D^0 \rightarrow f_2^0 \bar{K}^0) = (4.5 \pm 1.7) \cdot 10^{-3}$
CLEO	$B(D^0 \rightarrow f_2^0 \bar{K}^0)B(f_2 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-) = (1.6^{+2.4}_{-1.3}) \cdot 10^{-3}$		$B(D^0 \rightarrow f_2^0 \bar{K}^0) = (2.8^{+4.3}_{-2.3}) \cdot 10^{-3}$
FOCUS	$B(D_s^+ \rightarrow f_2^0 K^+)B(f_2 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-) = (2.0 \pm 1.3) \cdot 10^{-4}$		$B(D_s^+ \rightarrow f_2^0 K^+) = (3.5 \pm 2.3) \cdot 10^{-4}$
BaBar	$B(D^0 \rightarrow a_2^+ \pi^-)B(a_2 \rightarrow K^0 K^+) = (3.5 \pm 2.1) \cdot 10^{-5}$		$B(D^0 \rightarrow a_2^+ \pi^-) = (7.0 \pm 4.3) \cdot 10^{-4}$
E791	$B(D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}_2^0 \pi^+)B(\bar{K}_2^0 \rightarrow K^+ \pi^-) = (4.6 \pm 2.0) \cdot 10^{-4}$		$B(D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}_2^0 \pi^+) = (1.4 \pm 0.6) \cdot 10^{-3}$
CLEO	$B(D^0 \rightarrow K_2^+ \pi^-)B(K_2^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 \pi^+) = (6.5^{+4.2}_{-2.2}) \cdot 10^{-4}$		$B(D^0 \rightarrow K_2^+ \pi^-) = (2.0^{+1.3}_{-0.7}) \cdot 10^{-3}$
BaBar	$B(D^0 \rightarrow K_2^+ K^-)B(K_2^+ \rightarrow K^0 \pi^+) = (6.8 \pm 4.2) \cdot 10^{-4}$		$B(D^0 \rightarrow K_2^+ K^-) = (2.0 \pm 1.3) \cdot 10^{-3}$
BaBar	$B(D^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}_2^0 K^0)B(\bar{K}_2^0 \rightarrow K^+ \pi^-) = (6.6 \pm 2.7) \cdot 10^{-4}$		$B(D^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}_2^0 K^0) = (2.0 \pm 0.8) \cdot 10^{-3}$

III. PHYSICAL PROPERTIES OF SCALAR MESONS

The observed $J^P = 2^+$ tensor mesons $f_2(1270)$, $f_2^0(1525)$, $a_2(1320)$ and $K_2(1430)$ form an $SU(3)1^3P_2$ nonet. The qq content for isodoublet and isovector tensor resonances are obvious. Just as the π^0 mixing in the pseudoscalar case, the isoscalar tensor states $f_2(1270)$ and $f_2^0(1525)$ also have a mixing and their wave functions are defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
f_2(1270) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(f_2^u + f_2^d)\cos\theta + f_2^s\sin\theta ; \\
f_2^0(1525) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(f_2^u + f_2^d)\sin\theta - f_2^s\cos\theta ;
\end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

with f_2^q qq. Since θ is the dominant decay mode of $f_2(1270)$, whereas $f_2^0(1525)$ decays predominantly into $K\bar{K}$ (see Particle Data Group [8]), it is obvious that this mixing angle

should be small. More precisely, it is found $\rho = 7:8$ [8,13]. Therefore, $f_2(1270)$ is primarily an $(uu + dd) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ state, while $f_2^0(1525)$ is dominantly ss .

The polarization tensor ϵ of a 3P_2 tensor meson with $J^{PC} = 2^{++}$ satisfies the relations

$$\epsilon_{\mu\nu} = \epsilon_{\nu\mu}; \quad \epsilon_{\mu\mu} = 0; \quad p_\mu \epsilon_{\mu\nu} = p_\nu \epsilon_{\mu\mu} = 0: \quad (3.2)$$

Therefore,

$$h(V \rightarrow A) \langle T(\epsilon; p) | i = a \epsilon_{\mu\nu} p_\mu + b \epsilon_{\mu\mu} p_\nu = 0; \quad (3.3)$$

and hence the decay constant of the tensor meson vanishes; that is, the tensor meson cannot be produced from the $V \rightarrow A$ current.

As for the form factors, the $D \rightarrow P$ transition is defined by [14]

$$\langle P(p) | V_\mu | D(p_D) \rangle = p_{D\mu} + p_\mu \frac{m_D^2 - m_P^2}{q^2} q_\nu F_1^{DP}(q^2) + \frac{m_D^2 - m_P^2}{q^2} q_\mu F_0^{DP}(q^2); \quad (3.4)$$

where $q = (p_D - p)$, while the general expression for the $D \rightarrow T$ transition has the form [3]

$$\langle T(p_T) | j(V \rightarrow A) | D(p_D) \rangle = i h(q^2) \epsilon_{\mu\nu} p_{D\mu} (p_D + p_T)_\nu (p_D - p_T)_\mu + k(q^2) \epsilon_{\mu\nu} p_{D\mu} \\ + b_+(q^2) \epsilon_{\mu\nu} p_{D\mu} p_{D\nu} (p_D + p_T)_\mu + b_-(q^2) \epsilon_{\mu\nu} p_{D\mu} p_{D\nu} (p_D - p_T)_\mu : \quad (3.5)$$

The form factors k , b_+ and b_- can be calculated in the ISGW quark model [3] and its improved version, the ISGW 2 model [7]. In general, the form factors evaluated in the ISGW model are reliable only at $q^2 = q_m^2 = (m_D - m_T)^2$, the maximum momentum transfer. The reason is that the form factor q^2 dependence in the ISGW model is proportional to $\exp[-(q_m^2 - q^2)]$ and hence the form factor decreases exponentially as a function of $(q_m^2 - q^2)$. This has been improved in the ISGW 2 model in which the form factor has a more realistic behavior at large $(q_m^2 - q^2)$ which is expressed in terms of a certain polynomial term.

The calculated $D \rightarrow T$ form factors are listed in Table II. The form factor $h(q^2)$ is not shown there as it does not contribute to the factorizable $D \rightarrow TP$ amplitudes. It is convenient to express the form factors for $(D \rightarrow D_s^+) : f_2(1270)$ and $(D \rightarrow D_s^+) : f_2^0(1525)$ in terms of $D \rightarrow f_2^n$ with n standing for the light non-strange quark (i.e. $D \rightarrow f_2^u$ for $n = u$ and $D \rightarrow f_2^d$ for $n = d$) and $D_s \rightarrow f_2^s$ transition form factors. Note that $D \rightarrow f_2^s$ and $D_s \rightarrow f_2^n$ are prohibited. In the calculations of $D \rightarrow T$ form factors we follow [13] to use the masses: $m_{f_2^u} = 1.32 \text{ GeV}$ and $m_{f_2^s} = 1.55 \text{ GeV}$.

Two remarks are in order. (i) The magnitude of the form factors for the $D_s \rightarrow f_2^s$ transition is larger than that for $D \rightarrow f_2^n$ owing to the larger constituent s quark mass than the u and d quarks. That is, $SU(3)$ symmetry breaking in $D \rightarrow f_2^n$ and $D_s \rightarrow f_2^s$ is sizable. (ii) The difference between ISGW and ISGW 2 model predictions for form factors at $q^2 = 0$ is not significant for the charm case, though form factors in the ISGW model fall more rapidly at small q^2 . However, the difference will be dramatic for the $B \rightarrow T$ case as noticed in [15]. For example, the $B \rightarrow a_2$ and $B \rightarrow f_2(1370)$ form factors at $q^2 = m_D^2$ obtained in the ISGW 2 model are about 2–6 times larger than that in the ISGW model. This is because the region covered from zero recoil to small q^2 in B decays is much bigger than that in D decays.

TABLE II. The form factors at $q^2 = m^2$ calculated in the ISGW 2 model, where k is dimensionless and b_+ and b_- are in units of GeV^{-2} . Shown in parentheses are the results obtained in the ISGW model.

Transition	k	b_+	b_-
$D \rightarrow f_2^n$	0.59 (0.51)	0.050 (0.083)	0.061
$D_s^+ \rightarrow f_2^s$	1.10 (1.02)	0.077 (0.120)	0.098
$D \rightarrow a_2(1320)$	0.59 (0.51)	0.050 (0.083)	0.061
$D \rightarrow K_2(1430)$	0.71 (0.58)	0.060 (0.098)	0.069

IV. $D \rightarrow TP$ DECAYS AND FACTORIZATION

We will study the $D \rightarrow TP$ decays (T : tensor meson, P : pseudoscalar meson) within the framework of generalized factorization in which the hadronic decay amplitude is expressed in terms of factorizable contributions multiplied by the universal (i.e. process independent) effective parameters a_i that are renormalization scale and scheme independent. More precisely, the weak Hamiltonian has the form

$$H_e = \frac{G_F}{2} V_{cq_1} V_{uq_2} [a_1 (uq_2)(q_1c) + a_2 (q_1q_2)(uc) + \text{h.c.}] \quad (4.1)$$

with $(q_1q_2) = q_1(1 - \gamma_5)q_2$. For hadronic charm decays, we shall use $a_1 = 1.15$ and $a_2 = 0.55$. Since the decay constant of tensor mesons vanishes, the factorizable amplitude of $D \rightarrow TP$ always has the expression

$$A(D \rightarrow TP) = i \frac{G_F}{2} V_{cq_1} V_{uq_2} f_P [p_D p_D^h (m_P^2) + b_+ (m_P^2)(m_D^2 - m_T^2) + b_- (m_P^2)m_P^2] \\ \times p_D p_D^i M(D \rightarrow TP); \quad (4.2)$$

where use has been made of Eq. (3.5). The decay rate is given by

$$\Gamma(D \rightarrow TP) = \frac{k_T^5}{12 m_T^2} \frac{m_D^2}{m_T^2} |M(D \rightarrow TP)|^2; \quad (4.3)$$

where k_T is the center-of-mass momentum of the tensor meson in the rest frame of the charmed meson.

In terms of the topological amplitudes [16]: T , the color-allowed external W -emission tree diagram; C , the color-suppressed internal W -emission diagram; E , the W -exchange diagram; A , the W -annihilation diagram, the topological quark-diagram amplitudes of various $D \rightarrow TP$ decays are shown in Table III. There exist also penguin diagrams. However, the penguin contributions are negligible owing to the good approximation $V_{ud}V_{cd} \approx V_{us}V_{cs}$ and the smallness of $V_{ub}V_{cb}$. For $D \rightarrow TP$ and $D \rightarrow PT$ decays, one can have two different external W -emission and internal W -emission diagrams, depending on whether the emission particle is a tensor meson or a pseudoscalar one. We thus denote the prime amplitudes T^0 and C^0

The importance of the weak annihilation contribution (W -exchange or W -annihilation) in charm decays has been noticed long before (see e.g. [16,9]). Even if the short-distance weak annihilation amplitude is helicity suppressed, it does receive long-distance contributions from nearby resonance via inelastic final-state interactions from the leading tree or color-suppressed amplitude. As a consequence, weak annihilation has a sizable magnitude comparable to the color-suppressed internal W -emission with a large phase relative to the tree amplitude. A quark-diagram analysis of the Cabibbo-allowed $D \rightarrow PP$ decays yields [20]

$$A = T \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \approx 0.39 e^{i65^\circ} ; \quad E = T \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \approx 0.63 e^{i115^\circ} : \quad (4.7)$$

We see that the ratio of $A = T \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ in $D \rightarrow TP$ and $D \rightarrow PP$ decays is similar.

TABLE III. Quark-diagram amplitudes and branching ratios for various $D \rightarrow TP$ decays with and without the long-distance weak annihilation terms induced from final-state interactions. The W -annihilation amplitude A is fixed by fitting to the data of $D_s^+ \rightarrow f_2(1270)^+ \pi^0$ [see Eq. (4.6)]. The W -exchange amplitude E is assumed to have the expression of Eq. (4.8) for the purpose of illustration. Experimental results are taken from Table I and from [8]. The finite width effect of the tensor resonances has been taken into account in theoretical calculations.

Decay	Amplitude	B_{naive}	B_{FSI}	B_{expt}
$D^+ \rightarrow f_2(1270)^+ \pi^0$	$V_{cd}V_{ud}(T + C + 2A) \cos \frac{\phi}{2}$	$2.9 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$2.2 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$(0.9 \text{--} 0.1) \cdot 10^{-3}$
$D^0 \rightarrow f_2(1270)\bar{K}^0$	$V_{cs}V_{ud}(C + E) \cos \frac{\phi}{2}$	$1.0 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$2.5 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$(4.5 \text{--} 1.7) \cdot 10^{-3}$
$D_s^+ \rightarrow f_2(1270)^+ \pi^0$	$V_{cs}V_{ud}(T \sin \phi + 2A \cos \frac{\phi}{2})$	$6.6 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$2.1 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$(2.1 \text{--} 0.5) \cdot 10^{-3}$
$D_s^+ \rightarrow f_2(1270)K^+$	$V_{cs}V_{us}[T \sin \phi + C^0 \sin \frac{\phi}{2} + A(\sin \phi + \cos \frac{\phi}{2})]$	$5.2 \cdot 10^{-6}$	$4.9 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$(3.5 \text{--} 2.3) \cdot 10^{-4}$
$D^+ \rightarrow f_2^0(1525)^+ \pi^0$	$V_{cd}V_{ud}(T + C + 2A) \sin \frac{\phi}{2}$	$1.4 \cdot 10^{-6}$	$3.7 \cdot 10^{-6}$	
$D^0 \rightarrow f_2^0(1525)\bar{K}^0$	$V_{cs}V_{ud}(C + E) \sin \frac{\phi}{2}$	$2.5 \cdot 10^{-7}$	$6.0 \cdot 10^{-7}$	
$D_s^+ \rightarrow f_2^0(1525)^+ \pi^0$	$V_{cs}V_{ud}(T \cos \phi - 2A \sin \frac{\phi}{2})$	$1.6 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$1.5 \cdot 10^{-4}$	
$D_s^+ \rightarrow f_2^0(1525)K^+$	$V_{cs}V_{us}[T \cos \phi + C^0 \cos \frac{\phi}{2} + A(\cos \phi - \sin \frac{\phi}{2})]$	$4.9 \cdot 10^{-6}$	$7.5 \cdot 10^{-6}$	
$D^+ \rightarrow a_2^+(1320)\bar{K}^0$	$V_{cs}V_{ud}(T^0 + C)$	$1.3 \cdot 10^{-6}$	$1.3 \cdot 10^{-6}$	$< 3 \cdot 10^{-3}$
$D^0 \rightarrow a_2^+(1320)K$	$V_{cs}V_{ud}(T^0 + E)$	0	$8.9 \cdot 10^{-8}$	$< 2 \cdot 10^{-3}$
$D^+ \rightarrow a_2(1320)^+ \pi^0$	$V_{cd}V_{ud}(T + E)$	$5.7 \cdot 10^{-6}$	$6.1 \cdot 10^{-6}$	$(7.0 \text{--} 4.3) \cdot 10^{-4}$
$D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}_2^0(1430)^+ \pi^0$	$V_{cs}V_{ud}(T + C^0)$	$2.6 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$2.6 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$(1.4 \text{--} 0.6) \cdot 10^{-3}$
$D^0 \rightarrow K_2^+(1430)^+ \pi^0$	$V_{cs}V_{ud}(T + E)$	$1.0 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$1.1 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$(2.0^{+1.3}_{-0.7}) \cdot 10^{-3}$
$D^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}_2^0(1430)^0 \pi^0$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}V_{cs}V_{ud}(C^0 + E)$	0	$1.3 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$< 3.4 \cdot 10^{-3}$
$D^+ \rightarrow K_2^+(1430)K$	$V_{cs}V_{us}(T^0 + E)$	0	$1.3 \cdot 10^{-6}$	$(2.0 \text{--} 1.3) \cdot 10^{-3}$
$D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}_2^0(1430)K^0$	$V_{cs}V_{us}(E_d) + V_{cd}V_{ud}(E_s)$	0	10^{-8}	$(2.0 \text{--} 0.8) \cdot 10^{-3}$

Using the W -annihilation term inferred from $D_s^+ \rightarrow f_2^+ \pi^0$, we can fix the decay rates of

$D^+ \rightarrow f_2^+ K^+$ and $D_s^+ \rightarrow f_2^+ K^+$. Note that the predicted branching ratio for $D^+ \rightarrow f_2^+ K^+$ is smaller than experiment by a factor of 4. Indeed, it is difficult to understand why the measured branching ratio of this mode is of the same order as $D_s^+ \rightarrow f_2^+ (1270)^+$ even though the former is Cabibbo-suppressed.

$D \rightarrow f_2^0(1525) K$ decays are suppressed relative to $f_2(1270) K$ due to the phase space suppression. Contrary to $D_s^+ \rightarrow f_2^+ (1270)^+$, the decay $D_s^+ \rightarrow f_2^0(1525)^+ K$ is dominated by the external W -emission and hence it has the largest rate among $D \rightarrow f_2^0 K$ decays.

For $D \rightarrow a_2(1320) K$ decays, both $a_2^+ \bar{K}^0$ and $a_2^+ K^-$ are small since the factorizable external W -emission vanishes owing to the vanishing a_2 decay constant. The decay $D^0 \rightarrow a_2(1320)^+ K^-$ is of order 10^{-5} at most.

For $D \rightarrow \bar{K}_2^0$ decays, it is found that the decay $D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}_2^0 K^+$ is at most of order 10^{-4} as noted in passing and it does not receive any weak annihilation contributions. Furthermore, the unknown W -exchange amplitude cannot be extracted from $D^0 \rightarrow K_2^-(1430)^+$ or $D^0 \rightarrow f_2(1270) \bar{K}^0$ or $D^0 \rightarrow a_2(1320)^+ K^-$ by fitting them to the data. It will require the unreasonable condition $|F_j| > |T_j|$. For the purpose of illustration of the W -exchange effect, we shall assume

$$E = T_j : T_P = 0.5 e^{i100} : \quad (4.8)$$

A. Finite width effects

The decay $D \rightarrow K_2(1430) \bar{K}$ is physically allowed even though $K_2(1430)$ mass lies outside of the phase space for the decay. The point is that $K_2(1430)$ has a decay width of order 100 MeV [8] and hence it is necessary to take into account the finite width effect. Likewise, the decay $D^0 \rightarrow f_2^0(1525) \bar{K}^0$ which is outside of phase space also can occur.

The measured decay widths of various tensor mesons are given by [8]

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{f_2(1270)} &= 185_{-26}^{+34} \text{ MeV}; & \Gamma_{f_2^0(1525)} &= 76 \text{ MeV}; & \Gamma_{a_2(1320)} &= 107 \text{ MeV}; \\ \Gamma_{K_2^-(1430)} &= 98_{-5}^{+27} \text{ MeV}; & \Gamma_{K_2^0(1430)} &= 109 \text{ MeV}; \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

To take into account the finite width effect of the tensor resonances, we employ the factorization relation to define the $D \rightarrow TP$ decay rate

$$\langle D \rightarrow TP | P_1 P_2 P \rangle = \langle D \rightarrow TP | B(T \rightarrow P_1 P_2) \rangle; \quad (4.10)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \langle D \rightarrow TP | P_1 P_2 P \rangle &= \frac{1}{2m_D} \int \frac{d^3 q}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{d^3 q'}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{d^3 q''}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} [\gamma_5 \not{P}_1 \not{P}_2 \not{P}] \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} [\gamma_5 \not{P}_1 \not{P}_2 \not{P}] \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} [\gamma_5 \not{P}_1 \not{P}_2 \not{P}] \\ &\quad \frac{1}{(q^2 - m_T^2)^2 + (\frac{1}{2} (q^2 - m_T^2))^2} g_{TP_1 P_2}^2 \frac{1}{8} \frac{(q^2 - m_1^2)(q^2 - m_2^2)}{q^2}; \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

where $\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} [\gamma_5 \not{P}_1 \not{P}_2 \not{P}]$ is the usual triangular function $(a; b; c) = a^2 + b^2 + c^2 - 2ab - 2ac - 2bc$, m_1 (m_2) is the mass of P_1 (P_2), $g_{TP_1 P_2}$ is the strong coupling to be defined below, and the "running" or

"coming" width $\Gamma_{12}(q^2)$ is a function of the invariant mass $m_{12} = \sqrt{q^2}$ of the $P_1 P_2$ system and it has the expression [21]

$$\Gamma_{12}(q^2) = \Gamma \frac{m_T}{m_{12}} \frac{p^0(q^2)}{p^0(m_T^2)}^{1/5} \frac{9 + 3R^2 p^0(m_T^2) + R^4 p^0(m_T^2)}{9 + 3R^2 p^0(q^2) + R^4 p^0(q^2)}; \quad (4.12)$$

with $p^0(q^2) = \sqrt{q^2 - m_1^2 - m_2^2} = \sqrt{q^2 - m_T^2}$. We shall follow [12] to take R , the "radius" of the meson, to be 1.5 GeV^{-1} . From the measured decay width of the tensor meson, one can determine the strong coupling $g_{TP_1 P_2}$ via

$$\langle T | P_1 P_2 \rangle = \frac{g_{TP_1 P_2}^2 m_T}{15} \frac{p_c}{m_T}^{1/5}; \quad (4.13)$$

where p_c is the c.m. momentum of P_1 and P_2 in the rest frame of the tensor meson.

Note that in the narrow width approximation, one can show that the factorization relation (4.10) holds. When the decay width is not negligible we will use Eq. (4.11) to evaluate the three-body decay $D \rightarrow TP \rightarrow P_1 P_2 P$ and employ Eq. (4.10) to define the decay rate of $D \rightarrow TP$. To evaluate the decay rate of $D \rightarrow TP \rightarrow P_1 P_2 P$, we will assume that $g_{TP_1 P_2}$ is insensitive to the q^2 dependence when the resonance is on its mass shell. Numerically it is found that when the finite decay width of the tensor meson is taken into account, the decay rate of $D \rightarrow TP$ is generally enhanced by a factor of 2–3. The results of the calculated branching ratios shown in Table III have included finite width effects.

V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Charmed meson decays into a pseudoscalar meson and a tensor meson are studied. The charm to tensor meson transition form factors are evaluated in the Isgur-Scora-Grinstein-Wise quark model. The main conclusions are:

The external W -emission contribution to the decay $D_s^+ \rightarrow f_2(1270)^+ \pi^0$ is suppressed by the fact that $f_2(1270)$ is predominantly nn . Hence, this decay is dominated by the W -annihilation contribution. We argue that the Cabibbo-suppressed mode $D^+ \rightarrow f_2^+ \pi^0$ should be suppressed by one order of magnitude relative to $D_s^+ \rightarrow f_2(1270)^+ \pi^0$, contrary to the E791 measured results.

The long-distance W -annihilation contributions induced from nearby resonances via inelastic $\pi\pi$ -state interactions gives the dominant contributions to $(D^+; D_s^+) \rightarrow f_2(1270)^+ \pi^0, D_s^+ \rightarrow f_2(1270) K^+$. Under the factorization approximation, the decays $D^0 \rightarrow a_2^+(1320) K^-; \bar{K}_2^0(1430)^0; K_2^+(1430) K^-$ receive contributions solely from the W -exchange diagram.

Among the $D \rightarrow TP$ decays, $D_s^+ \rightarrow f_2(1270)^+ \pi^0$ has the largest branching ratio of order 10^{-3} . The modes $D^+ \rightarrow f_2(1270)^+ \pi^0, D^0 \rightarrow f_2(1270) \bar{K}^0, D_s^+ \rightarrow f_2^0(1525)^+, D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 \pi^+$ and $D^0 \rightarrow K_2^+ \pi^-$ are of order 10^{-4} .

The decay rate of $D \rightarrow TP$ is generally enhanced by a factor of 2–3 when the finite width effect of the tensor resonances is taken into account. In particular, it is necessary to include the finite width effect to explain the decays $D \rightarrow K_2(1430)\bar{K}$ and $D \rightarrow f_2^0(1525)K$.

Except for the Cabibbo-allowed decay $D_s^+ \rightarrow f_2(1270)^+ K$, the predicted branching ratios of $D \rightarrow TP$ decays are in general too small by one to two orders of magnitude compared to experiment. However, it is very unlikely that one can enhance the $D \rightarrow T$ transition form factors within the ISGW quark model by a factor of 3–5 to account for the discrepancy between theory and experiment. As many of the current data have not yet enough statistical significance, it is important to have more accurate measurements in the near future to pin down the issue.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported in part by the National Science Council of R.O.C. under Grant No. NSC 91-2112-M-001-038.

REFERENCES

- [1] A.C. Katoch and R.C. Verma, Phys. Rev. D 49, 1645 (1994); 55, 7315 (E) (1997).
- [2] J.H. Muñoz, A.A. Rojas, and G. Lopez Castro, Phys. Rev. D 59, 077504 (1999).
- [3] N. Isgur, D. Scora, B. Grinstein, and M.B. Wise, Phys. Rev. D 39, 799 (1989).
- [4] E791 Collaboration, E.M. Aitala et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 121801 (2002); *ibid.* 86, 765 (2001); *ibid.* 86, 770 (2001).
- [5] FOCUS Collaboration, talk presented by S. Erba at the DPF Meeting of the American Physical Society at William sburgh, Virginia, May 24-28, 2002; talk presented by S. Malvezzi at ICHEP 2002, Amsterdam, July 24-31, 2002; K. Stenson, hep-ex/0111083.
- [6] BaBar Collaboration, B. Aubert et al., hep-ex/0207089.
- [7] D. Scora and N. Isgur, Phys. Rev. D 52, 2783 (1995).
- [8] Particle Data Group, K. Hagiwara et al., Phys. Rev. D 66, 010001 (2002).
- [9] H.Y. Cheng, Eur. Phys. J. C 26, 551 (2003).
- [10] ARGUS Collaboration, H. Albrecht et al., Phys. Lett. B 308, 435 (1993).
- [11] E687 Collaboration, P.L. Frabetti et al., Phys. Lett. B 351, 591 (1995); *ibid.* B 331, 217 (1994).
- [12] CLEO Collaboration, H. Mura matsu et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 251802 (2002); S. Kopp et al., Phys. Rev. D 63, 092001 (2001).
- [13] D.M. Li, H. Yu, and Q.X. Shen, J. Phys. G 27, 807 (2001).
- [14] M. Wirbel, B. Stech, and M. Bauer, Z. Phys. C 29, 637 (1985); M. Bauer, B. Stech, and M. Wirbel, *ibid.* C 34, 103 (1987).
- [15] C.S. Kim, J.H. Lee, and S. Oh, Phys. Rev. D 67, 014002 (2003); 014011 (2003).
- [16] L.L. Chau and H.Y. Cheng, Phys. Rev. Lett. 56, 1655 (1986); L.L. Chau and H.Y. Cheng, Phys. Rev. D 36, 137 (1987); Phys. Lett. B 222, 285 (1989).
- [17] H.Y. Cheng, Phys. Rev. D 67, 034024 (2003).
- [18] M. Suzuki, Phys. Rev. D 65, 097501 (2002).
- [19] D. Melikhov and B. Stech, Phys. Rev. D 62, 014006 (2001).
- [20] J.L. Rosner, Phys. Rev. D 60, 114026 (1999); C.W. Chiang, Z. Luo, and J.L. Rosner, *ibid.* D 67, 014001 (2003).
- [21] H. Pölkahn, The Interactions of Hadrons, Amsterdam : North-Holland (1967).