

# On $D$ -Wave Meson Spectroscopy and the $K^*(1410)$ - $K^*(1680)$ Problem

L. Burakovsky\* and T. Goldman†

Theoretical Division, MS B285  
Los Alamos National Laboratory  
Los Alamos, NM 87545, USA

## Abstract

The mass spectrum of  $D$ -wave mesons is considered in a nonrelativistic constituent quark model. The results show a common mass degeneracy of the isovector and isodoublet states of the  $1^3D_1$  and  $1^3D_3$  nonets, and suggest therefore that the  $K^*(1680)$  cannot be the  $I = 1/2$  member of the  $1^3D_1$  nonet. They also suggest that the  $\eta_2(1870)$ , presently omitted from the Meson Summary Table, should be interpreted as the  $I = 0$   $s\bar{s}$  state of the  $1^1D_2$  nonet.

*Key words:* quark model, potential model,  $D$ -wave mesons

PACS: 12.39.Jh, 12.39.Pn, 12.40.Yx, 14.40.Cs

## 1 Introduction

The existence of a gluon self-coupling in QCD suggests that, in addition to the conventional  $q\bar{q}$  states, there may be non- $q\bar{q}$  mesons: bound states including gluons (gluonia and glueballs, and  $q\bar{q}g$  hybrids) and multiquark states [1]. Since the theoretical guidance on the properties of unusual states is often contradictory, models that agree in the  $q\bar{q}$  sector differ in their predictions about new states. Among the naively expected signatures for gluonium are

---

\*E-mail: BURAKOV@PION.LANL.GOV

†E-mail: GOLDMAN@T5.LANL.GOV

- i) no place in  $q\bar{q}$  nonet,
  - ii) flavor-singlet coupling,
  - iii) enhanced production in gluon-rich channels such as  $J/\Psi(1S)$  decay,
  - iv) reduced  $\gamma\gamma$  coupling,
  - v) exotic quantum numbers not allowed for  $q\bar{q}$  (in some cases).
- Points iii) and iv) can be summarized by the Chanowitz  $S$  parameter [2]

$$S = \frac{\Gamma(J/\Psi(1S) \rightarrow \gamma X)}{\text{PS}(J/\Psi(1S) \rightarrow \gamma X)} \times \frac{\text{PS}(X \rightarrow \gamma\gamma)}{\Gamma(X \rightarrow \gamma\gamma)},$$

where PS stands for phase space.  $S$  is expected to be larger for gluonium than for  $q\bar{q}$  states. Of course, mixing effects and other dynamical effects such as form-factors can obscure these simple signatures. Even if the mixing is large, however, simply counting the number of observed states remains a clear signal for non-exotic non- $q\bar{q}$  states. Exotic quantum number states ( $0^{--}, 0^{+-}, 1^{-+}, 2^{+-}, \dots$ ) would be the best signatures for non- $q\bar{q}$  states. It should be also emphasized that no state has yet unambiguously been identified as gluonium, or as a multiquark state, or as a hybrid.

In this paper we shall discuss  $D$ -wave meson states, the interpretation of which as members of conventional quark model  $q\bar{q}$  nonets encounters difficulties [3]. We shall be concerned with the four meson nonets which have the following  $q\bar{q}$  quark model assignments, according to the most recent Review of Particle Physics [4]:

- 1)  $1^1D_2$   $J^{PC} = 2^{-+}$ ,  $\pi_2(1670)$ ,  $\eta_2'(? )$ ,  $\eta_2(? )$ ,  $K_2(1770)$
- 2)  $1^3D_1$   $J^{PC} = 1^{--}$ ,  $\rho(1700)$ ,  $\omega(1600)$ ,  $\phi(? )$ ,  $K^*(1680)$
- 3)  $1^3D_2$   $J^{PC} = 2^{--}$ ,  $\rho_2(? )$ ,  $\omega_2(? )$ ,  $\phi_2(? )$ ,  $K_2'(1820)$
- 4)  $1^3D_3$   $J^{PC} = 3^{--}$ ,  $\rho_3(1690)$ ,  $\omega_3(1670)$ ,  $\phi_3(1850)$ ,  $K_3^*(1780)$ ,

and start with a discussion of the corresponding two problems associated with the isodoublet channel of these nonets. One of them is related to the  $K^*(1410) - K^*(1680)$  problem, the other to possible  $^1D_2 - ^3D_2$  mixing in the  $I = 1/2$  channel.

The two mesons,  $K^*(1680)$  (with mass  $1714 \pm 20$  MeV and width  $323 \pm 110$  MeV) and  $K^*(1410)$  ( $1412 \pm 12$  MeV,  $227 \pm 22$  MeV) are currently assigned to the  $1^3D_1$  and  $2^3S_1$  nonets, respectively (the latter,  $2^3S_1$   $J^{PC} = 1^{--}$ ,  $\rho(1450)$ ,  $\omega(1420)$ ,  $\phi(1680)$ ,  $K^*(1410)$ , has the same flavor quantum numbers as the former), although, as the Particle Data Group (PDG) states, “the  $K^*(1410)$  could be replaced by the  $K^*(1680)$  as the  $2^3S_1$  state” [5]. The problem with these mesons is that the  $K^*(1410)$  seems too light to be the  $2^3S_1$  state, even if one takes into account possible  $2^3S_1 - 1^3D_1$  mixing. Similarly, the  $K^*(1680)$  seems too light to be the  $1^3D_1$ . One may doubt even the existence of the  $K^*(1410)$ , as suggested first by Törnqvist [6], since it (as well as the  $K^*(1680)$ ) has been observed by only one group, LASS [7], although with superior statistics, in partial wave analyses under the much stronger  $K_2^*(1430)$  and  $K_0^*(1430)$ . Two older experiments [8, 9] quote a considerably higher mass,  $\simeq 1500$  MeV. In addition, its  $K\pi$  branching ratio is suspiciously small, only  $(6.6 \pm 1.3)\%$ . On the other hand, the  $K^*(1680)$  has a suspiciously large total width ( $\sim 400$ ) MeV, much larger than typical hadron widths, and a natural suspicion would be that it is really composed of two states of normal width ( $\sim 150 - 200$  MeV) [6], quite analogously to what has been suggested to be the case for the  $\rho(1600)$  and  $\omega(1600)$  which have been

resolved into  $\rho(1450)$  plus  $\rho(1700)$  and  $\omega(1420)$  plus  $\omega(1600)$  [10]. The masses of the two states contained in the  $K^*(1680)$  were determined in ref. [6] to be  $2\ ^3S_1$  ( $\approx 1608$ ) and  $1\ ^3D_1$  ( $\approx 1784$ ), from the requirement that the both fit the corresponding Regge trajectories. This is in agreement with the values obtained by Godfrey and Isgur in a relativized quark model [11],  $2\ ^3S_1(1580)$ ,  $1\ ^3D_1(1780)$ . An older experiment on the  $K^*(1680)$  quotes a mass of the same order,  $\sim 1800$  MeV [8].

Theoretically, for the four  $(n, L)$ -wave meson nonets, the isoscalar and isovector members of the  $n\ ^3L_L$  and  $n\ ^1L_L$  nonets with the same charge cannot mix, since they have opposite  $C$ - and  $G$ -parity, as long as one neglects  $SU(2)_I$  breaking. However, their isodoublet counterparts (strange, charmed, ... mesons) do not possess definite  $C$ -parity and, therefore, can in principle mix when only  $SU(3)$  flavor symmetry is broken. This type of mixing can take place for all  $L \geq 1$  mesons, as follows,

$$\begin{pmatrix} Q_{high} \\ Q_{low} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta_{nL} & \sin \theta_{nL} \\ -\sin \theta_{nL} & \cos \theta_{nL} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} n\ ^1L_L \\ n\ ^3L_L \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

where  $Q$  stands for the  $K, D, D_s, \dots$ . It is known that this mixing actually takes place for the  $P$ -wave mesons where the  $I = 1/2$   $K_{1A}$  and  $K_{1B}$  states of the  $1\ ^3P_1$  and  $1\ ^1P_1$  nonets, respectively, mix, leading to the physical  $K(1270)$  and  $K(1400)$  states [12, 13]. If such a mixing is also the case for the  $D$ -wave mesons, a question suggests itself regarding the physical masses of the  $I = 1/2$  states of the  $^3D_2$  and  $^1D_2$  nonets, which we call  $K_{2A}$  and  $K_{2B}$ , respectively, in the following.

If the assumption of Törnqvist about the  $K^*(1680)$  [6] is correct, one would have simultaneous mass near-degeneracy of the  $1\ ^3D_1$  and  $1\ ^3D_3$  meson nonets in the isovector and isodoublet channels, since in this case  $M(\rho(1700)) \approx M(\rho_3(1690))$ ,  $M(K^*(1780)) \approx M(K_3^*(1780))$ . As shown in our previous paper [14], similar degeneracy of the  $1\ ^3P_0$  and  $1\ ^3P_2$  nonets is an intrinsic property of  $P$ -wave meson spectroscopy and may be straightforwardly understood in a nonrelativistic constituent quark model. We now wish to apply this model to the  $D$ -wave mesons in order to show that near-degeneracy of the  $^3D_3$  and  $^3D_1$  nonets mentioned above also takes place. We note that this result is a direct consequence of the nonrelativistic constituent quark model which we discuss below; this mass near-degeneracy of the two nonets does not depend on the values of the input parameters, and cannot be considered as a numerical coincidence, as the results of, e.g., Godfrey and Isgur [11], may be viewed (their model finds the values  $M(K^*) = 1780$  MeV,  $M(K_3^*) = 1790$  MeV for the  $I = 1/2$   $1\ ^3D_1$  and  $1\ ^3D_3$  meson masses). We also expect our model to provide relevant information on possible  $K_{2A} - K_{2B}$  mixing.

## 2 Nonrelativistic constituent quark model

In the constituent quark model, conventional mesons are bound states of a spin  $1/2$  quark and spin  $1/2$  antiquark bound by a phenomenological potential which has some basis in QCD [15]. The quark and antiquark spins combine to give a total spin

0 or 1 which is coupled to the orbital angular momentum  $L$ . This leads to meson parity and charge conjugation given by  $P = (-1)^{L+1}$  and  $C = (-1)^{L+S}$ , respectively. One typically assumes that the  $q\bar{q}$  wave function is a solution of a nonrelativistic Schrödinger equation with the generalized Breit-Fermi Hamiltonian<sup>1</sup>,  $H_{BF}$ ,

$$H_{BF} \psi_n(\mathbf{r}) \equiv (H_{kin} + V(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{r})) \psi_n(\mathbf{r}) = E_n \psi_n(\mathbf{r}), \quad (2)$$

where  $H_{kin} = m_1 + m_2 + \mathbf{p}^2/2\mu - (1/m_1^3 + 1/m_2^3)\mathbf{p}^4/8$ ,  $\mu = m_1 m_2 / (m_1 + m_2)$ ,  $m_1$  and  $m_2$  are the constituent quark masses, and to first order in  $(v/c)^2 = \mathbf{p}^2 c^2 / E^2 \simeq \mathbf{p}^2 / m^2 c^2$ ,  $V(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{r})$  reduces to the standard nonrelativistic result,

$$V(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{r}) \simeq V(r) + V_{SS} + V_{LS} + V_T, \quad (3)$$

with  $V(r) = V_V(r) + V_S(r)$  being the confining potential which consists of a vector and a scalar contribution, and  $V_{SS}$ ,  $V_{LS}$  and  $V_T$  the spin-spin, spin-orbit and tensor terms, respectively, given by [15]

$$V_{SS} = \frac{2}{3m_1 m_2} \mathbf{s}_1 \cdot \mathbf{s}_2 \Delta V_V(r), \quad (4)$$

$$V_{LS} = \frac{1}{4m_1^2 m_2^2 r} \left( \left\{ [(m_1 + m_2)^2 + 2m_1 m_2] \mathbf{L} \cdot \mathbf{S}_+ + (m_2^2 - m_1^2) \mathbf{L} \cdot \mathbf{S}_- \right\} \frac{dV_V(r)}{dr} - [(m_1^2 + m_2^2) \mathbf{L} \cdot \mathbf{S}_+ + (m_2^2 - m_1^2) \mathbf{L} \cdot \mathbf{S}_-] \frac{dV_S(r)}{dr} \right), \quad (5)$$

$$V_T = \frac{1}{12m_1 m_2} \left( \frac{1}{r} \frac{dV_V(r)}{dr} - \frac{d^2 V_V(r)}{dr^2} \right) S_{12}. \quad (6)$$

Here  $\mathbf{S}_+ \equiv \mathbf{s}_1 + \mathbf{s}_2$ ,  $\mathbf{S}_- \equiv \mathbf{s}_1 - \mathbf{s}_2$ , and

$$S_{12} \equiv 3 \left( \frac{(\mathbf{s}_1 \cdot \mathbf{r})(\mathbf{s}_2 \cdot \mathbf{r})}{r^2} - \frac{1}{3} \mathbf{s}_1 \cdot \mathbf{s}_2 \right). \quad (7)$$

For constituents with spin  $s_1 = s_2 = 1/2$ ,  $S_{12}$  may be rewritten in the form

$$S_{12} = 2 \left( 3 \frac{(\mathbf{S} \cdot \mathbf{r})^2}{r^2} - \mathbf{S}^2 \right), \quad \mathbf{S} = \mathbf{S}_+ \equiv \mathbf{s}_1 + \mathbf{s}_2. \quad (8)$$

Since  $(m_1 + m_2)^2 + 2m_1 m_2 = 6m_1 m_2 + (m_2 - m_1)^2$ ,  $m_1^2 + m_2^2 = 2m_1 m_2 + (m_2 - m_1)^2$ , the expression for  $V_{LS}$ , Eq. (5), may be rewritten as follows,

$$V_{LS} = \frac{1}{2m_1 m_2 r} \left[ \left( 3 \frac{dV_V(r)}{dr} - \frac{dV_S(r)}{dr} \right) + \frac{(m_2 - m_1)^2}{2m_1 m_2} \left( \frac{dV_V(r)}{dr} - \frac{dV_S(r)}{dr} \right) \right] \mathbf{L} \cdot \mathbf{S}_+$$

<sup>1</sup>The most widely used potential models are the relativized model of Godfrey and Isgur [11] for the  $q\bar{q}$  mesons, and Capstick and Isgur [16] for the  $qqq$  baryons. These models differ from the nonrelativistic quark potential model only in relatively minor ways, such as the use of  $H_{kin} = \sqrt{m_1^2 + \mathbf{p}_1^2} + \sqrt{m_2^2 + \mathbf{p}_2^2}$  in place of that given in (2), the retention of the  $m/E$  factors in the matrix elements, and the introduction of coordinate smearing in the singular terms such as  $\delta(\mathbf{r})$ .

$$+ \frac{m_2^2 - m_1^2}{4m_1^2 m_2^2} \frac{1}{r} \left( \frac{dV_V(r)}{dr} - \frac{dV_S(r)}{dr} \right) \mathbf{L} \cdot \mathbf{S}_- \equiv V_{LS}^+ + V_{LS}^- \quad (9)$$

Since two terms corresponding to the derivatives of the potentials with respect to  $r$  are of the same order of magnitude, the above expression for  $V_{LS}^+$  may be rewritten as

$$V_{LS}^+ = \frac{1}{2m_1 m_2} \frac{1}{r} \left( 3 \frac{dV_V(r)}{dr} - \frac{dV_S(r)}{dr} \right) \mathbf{L} \cdot \mathbf{S} \left[ 1 + \frac{(m_2 - m_1)^2}{2m_1 m_2} O(1) \right]. \quad (10)$$

### 3 $D$ -wave spectroscopy

We now wish to apply the Breit-Fermi Hamiltonian to the  $D$ -wave mesons. By calculating the expectation values of different terms of the Hamiltonian defined in Eqs. (4),(8),(9), taking into account the corresponding matrix elements  $\langle \mathbf{s}_1 \cdot \mathbf{s}_2 \rangle$ ,  $\langle \mathbf{L} \cdot \mathbf{S} \rangle$  and  $S_{12}$  [15], one obtains relations similar to those for the  $P$ -wave mesons [14, 17],

$$\begin{aligned} M(^3D_1) &= M_0 + \frac{1}{4} \langle V_{SS} \rangle - 3 \langle V_{LS}^+ \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \langle V_T \rangle, \\ M(^3D_3) &= M_0 + \frac{1}{4} \langle V_{SS} \rangle + 2 \langle V_{LS}^+ \rangle - \frac{1}{7} \langle V_T \rangle, \\ M(\rho_2) &= M_0 + \frac{1}{4} \langle V_{SS} \rangle - \langle V_{LS}^+ \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle V_T \rangle, \\ M(\pi_2) &= M_0 - \frac{3}{4} \langle V_{SS} \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} M(K'_2) \\ M(K_2) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} M_0 + \frac{1}{4} \langle V_{SS} \rangle - \langle V_{LS}^+ \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle V_T \rangle & \sqrt{2} \langle V_{LS}^- \rangle \\ \sqrt{2} \langle V_{LS}^- \rangle & M_0 - \frac{3}{4} \langle V_{SS} \rangle \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} K_{2A} \\ K_{2B} \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $M_0$  stands for the sum of the constituent quark masses in either case. The  $V_{LS}^-$  term acts only on the  $I = 1/2$  singlet and triplet states giving rise to the spin-orbit mixing between these states<sup>2</sup>, and is responsible for the physical masses of the  $K_2$  and  $K'_2$ . Let us assume, for simplicity, that

$$\sqrt{2} \langle V_{LS}^- \rangle (K_{2B}) \simeq -\sqrt{2} \langle V_{LS}^- \rangle (K_{2A}) \equiv \Delta.$$

The masses of the  $K_{2A}$ ,  $K_{2B}$  are then determined by relations similar to those for the  $\pi_2$ ,  $\rho_2$  above, and  $M(K'_2) \simeq M(K_{2A}) + \Delta$ ,  $M(K_2) \simeq M(K_{2B}) - \Delta$ , or<sup>3</sup>

$$\Delta \simeq M(K'_2) - M(K_{2A}) \simeq M(K_{2B}) - M(K_2). \quad (11)$$

<sup>2</sup>The spin-orbit  $^3D_2 - ^1D_2$  mixing is a property of the model we are considering; the possibility that another mechanism contributes to this mixing, such as mixing via common decay channels [13] should not be ruled out, but is not included here.

<sup>3</sup> Actually, as follows from Eq. (28) below,

$$\frac{M(K'_2) - M(K_{2A})}{M(K_{2B}) - M(K_2)} = \frac{M(K_2) + M(K_{2B})}{M(K'_2) + M(K_{2A})} \simeq \frac{2M(K_{2B})}{2M(K_{2A})} \simeq 1,$$

when both the deviations  $M(K_{2B}) - M(K_2)$ ,  $M(K'_2) - M(K_{2A})$  and the mass difference  $M(K_{2A}) - M(K_{2B})$  are small compared to  $M(K_{2A})$ ,  $M(K_{2B})$ .

We thus obtain the following formulas for the masses of all eight  $I = 1, 1/2$   $D$ -wave mesons,  $\pi_2, \rho, \rho_1, \rho_2, K_{2B}, K^*, K_{2A}, K_3^*$  :

$$M(^1D_2) = m_1 + m_2 - \frac{3}{4} \frac{a}{m_1 m_2}, \quad (12)$$

$$M(^3D_1) = m_1 + m_2 + \frac{1}{4} \frac{a}{m_1 m_2} - \frac{3b}{m_1 m_2} - \frac{c}{2m_1 m_2}, \quad (13)$$

$$M(^3D_2) = m_1 + m_2 + \frac{1}{4} \frac{a}{m_1 m_2} - \frac{b}{m_1 m_2} + \frac{c}{2m_1 m_2}, \quad (14)$$

$$M(^3D_3) = m_1 + m_2 + \frac{1}{4} \frac{a}{m_1 m_2} + \frac{2b}{m_1 m_2} - \frac{c}{7m_1 m_2}, \quad (15)$$

where  $a, b$  and  $c$  are related to the matrix elements of  $V_{SS}, V_{LS}$  and  $V_T$  (see Eqs. (4), (6), (10)) and assumed to be the same for all of the  $D$ -wave states, and we have ignored the correction to  $V_{LS}^+$  in the formula (10) that is due to the difference in the masses of the  $n$  and  $s$  quarks. These masses, as calculated from (12)-(15), are (in the following,  $n$  stands for the mass of the  $\pi_2$ , etc., and we assume  $SU(2)$  flavor symmetry,  $n \equiv m_u = m_d, s \equiv m_s$ )

$$n = \frac{5\pi_2 + 3\rho + 5\rho_2 + 7\rho_3}{40}, \quad (16)$$

$$s = \frac{10K_{2A} + 6K^* + 10K_{2B} + 14K_3^* - 5\pi_2 - 3\rho - 5\rho_2 - 7\rho_3}{40}. \quad (17)$$

With the physical values of the meson masses (in GeV),  $\pi_2 \cong 1.67, \rho \simeq \rho_2 \simeq \rho_3 \cong 1.70, K_{2A} \simeq K_{2B} \cong 1.80, K^* \simeq K_3^* \cong 1.77$ , the above relations give

$$n \simeq 850 \text{ MeV}, \quad s \simeq 940 \text{ MeV},$$

so that the abovementioned correction, according to (10), is  $\sim 90^2/(2 \cdot 850 \cdot 940) \simeq 0.5\%$ , i.e., completely negligible. It follows from (12)-(15) that

$$\frac{15a}{m_1 m_2} = 3M(^3D_1) + 5M(^3D_2) + 7M(^3D_3) - 15M(^1D_2), \quad (18)$$

$$\frac{60b}{m_1 m_2} = 14M(^3D_3) - 5M(^3D_2) - 9M(^3D_1), \quad (19)$$

$$\frac{30c}{7m_1 m_2} = 5M(^3D_2) - 2M(^3D_3) - 3M(^3D_1). \quad (20)$$

By expressing the ratio  $n/s$  in four different ways, viz., directly from (16),(17) and dividing the expressions (18)-(20) for the  $I = 1/2$  and  $I = 1$  mesons by each other, one obtains the three relations,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{5\pi_2 + 3\rho + 5\rho_2 + 7\rho_3}{10K_{2A} + 6K^* + 10K_{2B} + 14K_3^* - 5\pi_2 - 3\rho - 5\rho_2 - 7\rho_3} \\ &= \frac{3K^* + 5K_{2A} + 7K_3^* - 15K_{2B}}{3\rho + 5\rho_2 + 7\rho_3 - 15\pi_2}, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

$$\frac{3K^* + 5K_{2A} + 7K_3^* - 15K_{2B}}{3\rho + 5\rho_2 + 7\rho_3 - 15\pi_2} = \frac{14K_3^* - 5K_{2A} - 9K^*}{14\rho_3 - 5\rho_2 - 9\rho}, \quad (22)$$

$$\frac{14K_3^* - 5K_{2A} - 9K^*}{14\rho_3 - 5\rho_2 - 9\rho} = \frac{5K_{2A} - 2K_3^* - 3K^*}{5\rho_2 - 2\rho_3 - 3\rho}. \quad (23)$$

First consider Eq. (23) which may algebraically be rewritten as

$$(K_3^* - K^*)(\rho_3 - \rho_2) = (K_3^* - K_{2A})(\rho_3 - \rho). \quad (24)$$

Since the  $\rho$  and  $\rho_3$  states are mass near-degenerate,  $\rho \approx \rho_3$  (their masses are  $1700 \pm 20$  MeV and  $1691 \pm 5$  MeV, respectively [4]), it then follows from (24) that either  $\rho_2 \approx \rho \approx \rho_3$ , or  $K^* \approx K_3^*$ . The first possibility leads, through the relations (19),(20) applied to the  $I = 1$  mesons, to  $b \approx c \approx 0$ , which would in turn, from the same relations for the  $I = 1/2$  mesons, imply  $K^* \approx K_{2A} \approx K_3^*$ . Although this case may not be excluded on the basis of current experimental data on the meson masses, we consider simultaneous disappearance of both the spin-orbit and tensor terms as dubious. We believe, therefore, that the physical case corresponds to

$$K^* \approx K_3^*, \quad (25)$$

so that, the mass near-degeneracy of the  $1^3D_1$  and  $1^3D_3$  meson nonets in the  $I = 1$  channel,  $\rho \approx \rho_3$ , implies similar near-degeneracy also in the  $I = 1/2$  channel. This result is a direct consequence of the model we are considering; the equality  $K^* = K_3^*$  follows from Eq. (24), independent of the values of the input parameters  $a, b, c, n, s$ , with the proviso that the result  $\rho = \rho_3$  is borne out experimentally.

With  $K^* = K_3^*$  and  $\rho = \rho_3$ , Eqs. (21) and (22) may be rewritten as

$$(\rho - \rho_2 + K^* - K_{2A})(\pi_2 + \rho_2 + 2\rho) = 2(K^* - K_{2A})(K_{2A} + K_{2B} + 2K^*), \quad (26)$$

$$(K_{2A} - K_{2B})(\rho - \rho_2) = (K^* - K_{2A})(\rho_2 - \pi_2). \quad (27)$$

One now has to determine the values of  $\rho_2$ ,  $K_{2A}$  and  $K_{2B}$ . The remaining equation is obtained from the mixing of the  $K_{2A}$  and  $K_{2B}$  states which results in the physical  $K_2$  and  $K_2'$  mesons. Independent of the mixing angle,

$$K_{2A}^2 + K_{2B}^2 = K_2^2 + K_2'^2. \quad (28)$$

With (in MeV)  $\pi_2 = 1670 \pm 20$ ,  $\rho = \rho_3 \cong 1690$ ,  $K^* = K_3^* \cong 1780$ ,  $K_2 = 1773$ ,  $K_2' = 1816$ , the solution to (26)-(28) is

$$\rho_2 = 1741 \mp 19 \text{ MeV}, \quad K_{2A} = 1827 \mp 17 \text{ MeV}, \quad K_{2B} = 1762 \pm 18 \text{ MeV}. \quad (29)$$

For this solution, we observe the sum rule

$$K_{2A}^2 - \rho_2^2 = 0.307 \text{ GeV}^2 \simeq K_{2B}^2 - \pi_2^2 = 0.316 \text{ GeV}^2, \quad (30)$$

which may be further generalized to include the near-degenerate  $\rho \approx \rho_3 \cong 1690$  MeV and  $K^* \approx K_3^* \cong 1780$  MeV:

$$K^{*2} - \rho^2 \approx K_3^{*2} - \rho_3^2 \cong 0.312 \text{ GeV}^2. \quad (31)$$

Relations of the type (30),(31) could have been expected by analogy with the formulas

$$K^{*2} - \rho^2 = K^2 - \pi^2, \quad K_2^{*2} - a_2^2 = K^2 - \pi^2, \quad \text{etc.},$$

provided by either the algebraic approach to QCD [18] or phenomenological formulas

$$m_1^2 = 2Bn + C, \quad m_{1/2}^2 = B(n + s) + C$$

(where  $B$  is related to the quark condensate, and  $C$  is a constant within a given meson nonet) motivated by the linear mass spectrum of a nonet and the collinearity of Regge trajectories of the corresponding  $I = 1$  and  $I = 1/2$  states, as discussed in ref. [19].

Note from (29) that both the  $K_{2A}$  and  $K_{2B}$  lie in the mass intervals provided by current experimental data on the  $K_2'$  and  $K_2$  states, respectively. This simply means that the mixing between these states is negligible (within uncertainties provided by data), or  $\sqrt{2}\langle V_{LS}^- \rangle \ll K_{2A} - K_{2B}$ . As we will see in Eqs. (32)-(34) below, this is entirely consistent with reasonable expectation based on the decrease of such matrix elements with increasing partial wave (see the corresponding  $P$ -wave results [14]).

Thus, the nonrelativistic constituent quark model we are considering suggests the following  $q\bar{q}$  assignments for the isovector and isodoublet states of the  $D$ -wave meson nonets:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_2 &\simeq 1680 \text{ MeV}, & K_{2B} &\simeq 1770 \text{ MeV}, \\ \rho &\simeq 1690 \text{ MeV}, & K^* &\simeq 1780 \text{ MeV}, \\ \rho_2 &\simeq 1730 \text{ MeV}, & K_{2A} &\simeq 1820 \text{ MeV}, \\ \rho_3 &\simeq 1690 \text{ MeV}, & K^* &\simeq 1780 \text{ MeV}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us now extract the matrix elements of the spin-spin, spin-orbit, and tensor interaction in our model. As follows from (18)-(20) and the above relations for the masses of the  $I = 1, 1/2$  mesons,

$$\langle V_{SS} \rangle \simeq \frac{a}{n^2} \simeq \frac{a}{ns} \cong 23.3 \text{ MeV}, \quad (32)$$

$$\langle V_{LS}^+ \rangle \simeq \frac{b}{n^2} \simeq \frac{b}{ns} \cong -3.3 \text{ MeV}, \quad (33)$$

$$\langle V_T \rangle \simeq \frac{c}{n^2} \simeq \frac{c}{ns} \cong 46.7 \text{ MeV}. \quad (34)$$

Also,  $\langle V_{LS}^- \rangle \cong 0$ , since the  $K_{2A} - K_{2B}$  mixing angle is close to zero. Therefore, the spin-spin and tensor terms of the Hamiltonian (2) are of the same order of magnitude, and the spin-orbit terms are negligibly small.

One may now estimate the masses of the isoscalar mesons of the four nonets assuming that they are pure  $s\bar{s}$  states. Applying (12)-(15) with  $m_1 = m_2 = s$ , we find

$$\eta_2 \simeq 1860 \text{ MeV}, \quad \phi \approx \phi_3 \simeq 1870 \text{ MeV}, \quad \phi_2 \simeq 1910 \text{ MeV}. \quad (35)$$

The value 1870 is within 1% of the physical value of the  $\phi_3$  mass,  $1854 \pm 7$  MeV [4]. There exists an experimental candidate for the  $\eta_2(1860)$  but it was omitted from the

recent Meson Summary Table as “needs confirmation”. This state indicated in PDG as the  $\eta_2(1870)$  [4] has been seen by the Crystal Ball collaboration in the final state  $\eta\pi^0\pi^0$  of a  $\gamma\gamma$  reaction as a resonant structure having mass and width  $1881 \pm 32 \pm 40$  MeV,  $221 \pm 92 \pm 44$  MeV, respectively [20], and as a similar structure in  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \eta\pi^+\pi^-$  by the CELLO collaboration, with mass and width  $1850 \pm 50$  MeV,  $\sim 360$  MeV, respectively [21].

The masses of the remaining isoscalar  $n\bar{n}$  states of the four nonets may be calculated by assuming that all four nonets are ideally mixed and using the Sakurai mass formula for an ideally mixed nonet [22],

$$M^2(I = 1) + M^2(I = 0, n\bar{n}) + 2M^2(I = 0, s\bar{s}) = 4M^2(I = 1/2). \quad (36)$$

In this way, one obtains

$$\eta_2' \simeq 1670 \text{ MeV}, \quad \omega \approx \omega_3 \simeq 1680 \text{ MeV}, \quad \omega_2 \simeq 1720 \text{ MeV}. \quad (37)$$

The value 1680 is within 1% of the physical value of the  $\omega_3$  mass,  $1667 \pm 4$  MeV, and 2% of that of the  $\omega$ ,  $1649 \pm 24$  MeV [4].

## 4 Concluding remarks

We have shown that a nonrelativistic constituent quark model displays a common mass near-degeneracy of the  $1^3D_1$  and  $1^3D_3$  meson nonets in the isovector and isodoublet channels, and suggests therefore that the  $K^*(1680)$  cannot be the  $I = 1/2$  member of the  $1^3D_1$  nonet. The mass of the true member of the latter is estimated to be  $\simeq 1780$  MeV. This may support the assumption of Törnqvist that the  $K^*(1680)$  should resolve into two separate resonances which are the  $I = 1/2$  members of the  $1^3D_1$  and  $2^3S_1$  nonets. The analysis of the LASS data on the reaction  $K^-p \rightarrow \bar{K}^0\pi^-p$  done by Bird [23] reveals a resonant structure with mass  $1678 \pm 64$  MeV and a huge width of  $454 \pm 270$  MeV; the two abovementioned states may be associated with its upper- and lower-mass parts, respectively.

The conclusion that the  $K^*(1410)$  does not belong to the  $2^3S_1$  nonet agrees with the results obtained by one of the authors in ref. [24] on the basis of the linear spectrum of a meson nonet discussed in [19], which does not support the  $K^*(1410)$  meson being the member of the  $2^3S_1$  nonet. (In [24], out of the two,  $K^*(1410)$  and  $K^*(1680)$ , the preference being the  $2^3S_1$   $I = 1/2$  state was given to the latter). If this is actually the case, and the true member of the  $2^3S_1$  nonet is, e.g., the low-mass part of the broad  $K^*(1680)$ , in agreement with Törnqvist, the question immediately arises as to what the real nature of this state is, if it does exist. A possible answer to this question may be the subject of subsequent investigation.

We close with briefly summarizing our findings:

1. A nonrelativistic constituent quark model displays a common mass near-degeneracy of the  $1^3D_1$  and  $1^3D_3$  meson nonets in the  $I = 1$  and  $1/2$  channels, and suggests therefore that the  $K^*(1680)$  cannot be the  $I = 1/2$  member of the  $1^3D_1$  nonet.

2. When matched to current experimental data on the meson masses, this model shows no mixing between the  $I = 1/2$  states of the  $1^3D_2$  and  $1^1D_2$  nonets. The spin-orbit terms of the Hamiltonian appear to be negligibly small.
3. The results suggest a sum rule

$$M^2(I = 1/2) - M^2(I = 1) \approx \text{const} \simeq 0.31 \text{ GeV}^2,$$

which holds for all four  $D$ -wave meson nonets.

4. The results also suggest that the  $\eta_2(1870)$  which is at present omitted from the Meson Summary Table, is the  $I = 1$   $s\bar{s}$  state of the  $1^1D_2$  nonet.
5. The  $q\bar{q}$  assignments for the  $P$ -wave nonets obtained on the basis of the results of the work, are

$$\begin{aligned} 1^1D_2 \ J^{PC} &= 2^{-+}, \ \pi_2(1680), \ \eta_2'(1670), \ \eta_2(1860), \ K_{2B}(1770) \\ 1^3D_1 \ J^{PC} &= 1^{--}, \ \rho(1690), \ \omega(1680), \ \phi(1870), \ K^*(1780) \\ 1^3D_2 \ J^{PC} &= 2^{--}, \ \rho_2(1730), \ \omega_2(1720), \ \phi_2(1910), \ K_{2A}(1820) \\ 1^3D_3 \ J^{PC} &= 3^{--}, \ \rho_3(1690), \ \omega_3(1680), \ \phi_3(1870), \ K_3^*(1780) \end{aligned}$$

## Acknowledgments

Correspondence of one of the authors (L.B.) with L.P. Horwitz during the preparation of this work is greatly acknowledged.

## References

- [1] For a review, see S. Meshkov, *in* Proceedings of the Aspen Winter Physics Conference, Aspen, CO, Jan 5-18, 1986; C.A. Heusch, *in* Proceedings of the 27th International Symposium on Multiparticle Dynamics, Seewinkel, Austria, June 16-20, 1986; S. Cooper, *in* Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on High Energy Physics, Berkeley, CA, July 16-23, 1986; F.E. Close, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **51** (1988) 833
- [2] M.S. Chanowitz, *Phys. Lett. B* **187** (1987) 409
- [3] M.R. Pennington, *Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.)* **21** (1991) 37
- [4] Particle Data Group, *Phys. Rev. D* **54** (1996) 1
- [5] Ref. [4], p. 99
- [6] N.A. Törnqvist, *Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.)* **21** (1991) 196
- [7] D. Leith and B. Ratcliff, *in* Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Hadron Spectroscopy, "Hadron 89", Ajaccio, France, 1989; ed. F. Binon *et al.*, Editions Frontieres (Gif-sur-Yvette) **C29** (1990) 3, 15

- [8] A. Etkin *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **22** (1980) 42
- [9] M. Baubillier *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. B **202** (1982) 21
- [10] A. Donnachie and H. Mirzaie, Z. Phys. C **33** (1987) 693  
A. Donnachie and A. Clegg, Preprint CERN TH-5210/88
- [11] S. Godfrey and N. Isgur, Phys. Rev. D **32** (1985) 189
- [12] G.W. Brandenburg *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **36** (1976) 703  
R.K. Carnegie *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. B **127** (1977) 509  
M.G. Bowler, J. Phys. G **3** (1977) 775
- [13] H.J. Lipkin, Phys. Lett. B **72** (1977) 249
- [14] L. Burakovsky and T. Goldman, Towards resolution of the enigmas of  $P$ -wave meson spectroscopy, to be published
- [15] W. Lucha, F.F. Schöberl and D. Gromes, Phys. Rep. **200** (1991) 127
- [16] S. Capstick and N. Isgur, Phys. Rev. D **34** (1986) 2809
- [17] H.G. Blundell, S. Godfrey and B. Phelps, Phys. Rev. D **53** (1996) 3712
- [18] S. Oneda and K. Terasaki, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **82** (1985) 1
- [19] L. Burakovsky and L.P. Horwitz, Found. Phys. Lett. **9** (1996) 561, *ibid.* in press;  
Nucl. Phys. A **609** (1996) 585, *ibid.* in press
- [20] K. Karch *et al.* Phys. Lett. B **249** (1990) 353  
K.H. Karch, Observation of a new  $\eta\pi^0\pi^0$  resonance at 1900 MeV/ $c^2$  in two photon reactions (in German), DESY-Internal Rep. F31-91-01  
K. Karch *et al.*, Z. Phys. C **54** (1992) 33
- [21] M. Feindt, Some snapshots of new CELLO and Crystal Ball results on gamma gamma reactions, Preprint DESY-90-128; presented in a talk at 25th Int. Conf. on High Energy Physics, Singapore, Aug. 2-8, 1990
- [22] J.J. Sakurai, *Currents and Mesons*, (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1969)
- [23] F. Bird, Report SLAC-332 (1989)
- [24] L. Burakovsky and L.P. Horwitz, Nucl. Phys. A **609** (1996) 585