

- COOPER, M. J. & NATHANS, R. (1968). *Acta Cryst.* A **24**, 481.
- FURNAS, T. C. (1957). *Single Crystal Orienter Instruction Manual*. Milwaukee: General Electric Company.
- HAMILTON, W. C. & ABRAHAMS, S. C. (1969). *Acta Cryst.* A **26**, 18.
- HAMILTON, W. C., ROLLETT, J. S. & SPARKS, R. A. (1965). *Acta Cryst.* **18**, 129.
- International Union of Crystallography (1959). *Acta Cryst.* **12**, 1054.
- International Union of Crystallography (1964a). *Acta Cryst.* **17**, 1183.
- International Union of Crystallography (1964b). *Acta Cryst.* **17**, 1616.
- MACKENZIE, J. K. & MASLEN, V. W. (1968). *Acta Cryst.* A **24**, 628.
- MATHIESON, A. MCL. (1969). *Acta Cryst.* A **25**, 264.

Acta Cryst. (1970). A **26**, 18

International Union of Crystallography
Commission on Crystallographic Apparatus
Single-Crystal Intensity Measurement Project Report
II. Least-Squares Refinements of Structural Parameters

BY WALTER C. HAMILTON

Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York 11973, U.S.A.

AND S. C. ABRAHAMS

Bell Telephone Laboratories, Inc., Murray Hill, New Jersey 07974, U.S.A.

(Received 21 July 1969)

The structure factors measured by the participants in the single-crystal intensity project of the I.U.Cr. Commission on Crystallographic Apparatus on D(+)-tartaric acid have been used in least-squares refinement of the structural parameters. The structure factors submitted by each participant were subjected to two refinements – once with heavy atoms only and once with all atoms including hydrogen. The parameters resulting from these refinements differ by magnitudes which suggest that the estimated standard deviations of the positional parameters obtained in the least-squares refinements are not infrequently a factor of about two too small and about $\sqrt{2}$ too small on the average. The agreement for the thermal vibration parameters may be even worse – by an additional factor of about two. These results are consistent with the indications of serious systematic errors in some of the experiments revealed in part I of this report. A modal group of six experiments with good interexperimental agreement leads to least-squares refined position parameters that are also in fair agreement; the maximum value of the ratio of the externally estimated standard deviation to the internal estimate from the least-squares refinements is about 2.5. The finding that results of possible high precision but low accuracy are not uncommon in single crystal-structure investigations is confirmed.

Introduction

In part I of this report (Abrahams, Hamilton & Mathieson, 1969), later referred to as part I, the interexperimental agreement factors and classical analysis-of-variance techniques have revealed the presence of systematic errors in many diffractometer experiments. Such errors cause differences between relative structure factors, measured by different experimenters on different specimens of the same substance, to be much larger than the internal consistency of the individual experiments would suggest. The analysis-of-variance techniques used in part I are appropriate for revealing the nature of the systematic differences among experiments without recourse to a theoretical model. Nevertheless, it is of interest to examine the results of applying the usual least-squares refinement procedure to the

structure factors to determine how the possible systematic errors are manifested in the refined positional and thermal parameters.*

Refinement procedure

Each set of structure factors was subjected to least-squares refinement, using the usual model for the oxygen and carbon atoms that

$$F(hkl) = K \sum_j f_j \exp [2\pi i(hx + ky + lz)] \exp \left[- \sum_{ik} h_i h_k \beta_{ik} \right]$$

* Since limited data sets consisting of no more than 332 independent reflections were used, none of the results below should be taken as definitive determinations of the average parameters in the D(+)-tartaric acid structure, especially since the reflections used extended only to $\sin \theta/\lambda = 0.5 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$.

and replacing the anisotropic thermal vibration term by $\exp\{-B(\sin\theta/\lambda)^2\}$ for the hydrogen atoms, where $\{h_i: i=1,2,3\}$ is identical to $\{h,k,l\}$. The parameters refined were the overall scale factor K and, for each atom, x,y,z and $\{\beta_{ik}: i=1,3; k=1,3\}$ or B for hydrogen atoms. Free-atom atomic scattering factors were used for all atoms (*International Tables for X-ray Crystallography*, 1962); no corrections were made for anomalous scattering (which is small). The space group was assumed to be $P2_1$ (Stern & Beevers, 1950). The numbering of the atoms is presented in Table 1 and agrees with that used by Okaya, Stemple & Kay (OSK, 1966) in the most recent published refinement of this structure. The heavy atom parameters of OSK were used as initial values in the full matrix least-squares refinements (Busing, Martin & Levy, 1962). The quantity minimized was $\sum w(|F_{\text{obs}}| - |F_{\text{calc}}|)^2$, where the weight w was assumed equal to $(0.1|F_{\text{obs}}|)^{-2}$.^{*} For each set of data an attempt was made to carry out two refinements, one with the ten heavy atoms only, and one including hydrogen atoms. In the latter case, the initial hydrogen atom parameters were taken from some preliminary neutron diffraction results of Cox, Sabine & Taylor (1966). In all the refinements, the y parameter of atom 1 was held fixed at 0.0343 – the final value of OSK; this is possible because of the one degree of freedom in the choice of origin in this space group.

Table 1. Atom numbering scheme

	Number		Number
O(1)	1	C(3)	9
O(2)	2	C(4)	10
O(3)	3	H(1)	11
O(4)	4	H(2)	12
O(5)	5	H(3)	13
O(6)	6	H(4)	14
C(1)	7	H(5)	15
C(2)	8	H(6)	16

Results

In Table 2 are presented the results of the heavy atom refinements.† Since experimenters 6 and 10 supplied one zone of data only, it was not possible to refine these data sets. (There was in fact insufficient data from these two experiments for an anisotropic two-

^{*} This weighting formula was found to be suitable by an analysis of the average value of $\Delta F/\sigma$ as a function of F . There were few reflections of low enough intensity to be overweighted by this formulation.

† It was not possible to refine the data for experiment 11b to a satisfactory solution. Non-positive-definite thermal parameters were obtained, and the convergence procedure became unstable, the agreement factor getting suddenly worse and then better. This was possibly due to the small number of independent structure factors that was available for this data set. Nevertheless, a set of parameters for this experiment is included in Table 2; this set corresponds to the lowest value for the agreement ratio obtained during the refinement procedure. The omission of this experiment from the analysis presented in Table 2 did not affect any of the conclusions.

dimensional refinement.) The parameters (P) are numbered in the order $x,y,z,\beta_{11},\beta_{22},\beta_{33},\beta_{12},\beta_{13},\beta_{23}$. Table 2 contains the following data:

(i) In the last fifteen columns are the parameters P_i obtained from the individual refinements; the least-squares estimated standard deviations are not given but may be inferred from the standard deviation of the mean (see σ below).

(ii) The MAXIMUM and MINIMUM of the fifteen parameter values obtained.

(iii) The mean parameter value (labelled AVERAGE) defined by

$$\mu = \frac{\sum_i P_i}{\sum_i \sigma_i^2} / \frac{1}{\sum_i \sigma_i^2}$$

where σ_i^2 is the estimated variance of the parameter from the least-squares refinement obtained in the usual way from the inverse matrix of the normal equations by multiplication by the goodness-of-fit parameter $\sum w(\Delta F)^2/(n-m)$.

(iv) The parameter value reported by OSK (1966) for the X-ray refinement.

(v) The estimated standard deviation of the weighted mean based on the agreement among the experiments:

$$\sigma_{\text{EXT}} = \left[\frac{\sum_i \frac{(P_i - \mu)^2}{\sigma_i^2}}{(n-1)\sum_i \frac{1}{\sigma_i^2}} \right]^{1/2}$$

(vi) The estimated standard deviation of the mean based on the individually estimated standard deviations:

$$\sigma_{\text{INT}} = \left[\sum_i \frac{1}{\sigma_i^2} \right]^{-1/2}$$

(vii) The variance ratio

$$\text{RATIO} = (\sigma_{\text{EXT}}/\sigma_{\text{INT}})^2$$

In the absence of systematic error RATIO is expected to have, on the average, a value close to unity. Except for the variance ratio, all numbers in Table 2 have been multiplied by 10^5 .

In Table 3 are presented similar results for the refinements which include the six hydrogen atoms. The fourth parameter for each hydrogen atom is the isotropic thermal parameter B . The data of experiments 1, 3, 12 and 14 did not lead to successful refinements; the positional and thermal parameters of the hydrogen atoms varied widely, and the refinements diverged. (It is possible that careful individual analysis in each of these cases would have led to non-divergent refinement. We note here only that a routine refinement starting from the initial neutron diffraction values was not possible for these four experiments, as it was for the others.) These experiments are thus omitted from Table 3.

sponding values in Table 3 are 5.8 and 57.7. The average value for the positional parameters is about 2 and for the thermal parameters about 5. (The mean value should be 1.0, $\sigma=0.4$.) Thus, if the agreement among experiments is taken as a criterion of accuracy, the internal estimates of the standard deviations from the least-squares refinements are too low by a factor of (RATIO)^{1/2}. If any one of the experimenters had reported his least-squares derived standard deviations, a false picture of the accuracy of these parameters could have been presented. The internal standard deviations for positional parameters could be as much as a factor of 2 too small: those for thermal parameters would not infrequently be an additional factor of 2 or 3 too small. It is of course possible that one or more experiments may be more accurate than the others and that the standard deviations reported in such experiments are a reliable indication of accuracy; it is clear however that the average accuracy is not as great as the precision of the individual refinements. Furthermore, the *average* parameter values differ from the OSK values by as much as $6.4 \sigma_{\text{EXT}}$ for O(3)_x and by $10.7 \sigma_{\text{EXT}}$ for O(4) _{β_{22}} .*

* The mean values in Tables 2 and 3 are probably less accurate than the results of OSK, since the latter are based on data extending to higher scattering angles. On the other hand, there is no reason to assume that the results of OSK are not subject to some systematic error which would render the quoted standard deviations too low by a factor of 2 or 3. Without any evidence to the contrary, the definitive parameters for this structure should be taken as those of OSK rather than any of those quoted here. The estimated σ 's of OSK are much smaller than the σ_{EXT} in this study.

The maximum variation between a position coordinate determined in an individual experiment and the average value for that coordinate in Table 2 is 0.043 Å.† The maximum variation from the value found by OSK is somewhat larger, 0.052 Å. In terms of the individual standard deviations from the least-squares refinements, such atomic position differences would be considered significant. However, use of a factor of 2 or 3 to obtain a more meaningful standard deviation, as suggested by the comparison between the external and internal estimates, would render most of the differences not statistically significant.

It is instructive to examine the least-squares refined structural parameters based on one group of experiments which were considered to have the best internal consistency as judged by a number of indicators (see part I for details). This *modal* group consisted of experiments 1, 2, 3, 5, 7 and 16. We have already noted that experiment 3 gave divergent results on attempting to refine the parameters for all atoms including hydrogen. In the following, we therefore compare only the *heavy* atom parameters. The results are listed in Table 5 in the same form as Table 2.

Excluding the β_{ij} values for $i \neq j$, which are particularly susceptible to anisotropic error, there are 539 different parameter values in Table 5. The range in each parameter value for the *modal* group may also be taken as a measure of consistency. The *average* range for the position parameters is $11.4 \sigma_{\text{INT}}$; for the thermal parameters it is $16.5 \sigma_{\text{INT}}$. Individual ranges, of

† Except for experiment 11b, which did not converge.

Table 4. Agreement ratios R and wR for the least-squares refinement of the data

$\sigma(x)$ is a typical value of the estimated standard deviation of a positional parameter in the heavy atom refinement.

Experiment number	Heavy atom refinement			Hydrogen atom refinement		Number of reflections* in refinement
	R	wR	$\sigma(x)$	R	wR	
1	0.063	0.094	0.0016	†	†	239
2	0.091	0.110	0.0006	0.076	0.091	368
3	0.049	0.060	0.0011	†	†	277
4	0.104	0.127	0.0008	0.089	0.107	331
5	0.034	0.064	0.0003	0.029	0.043	607
6	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	96
7	0.063	0.077	0.0004	0.047	0.052	429
8	0.079	0.114	0.0007	0.065	0.093	355
9	0.064	0.090	0.0005	0.048	0.066	366
10	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	129
11a	0.075	0.133	0.0010	0.063	0.123	342
11b	0.097	0.163	0.0022	§	§	164
12	0.112	0.178	0.0016	†	†	403
13	0.057	0.071	0.0006	0.047	0.060	417
14	0.081	0.104	0.0008	†	†	273
15	0.047	0.063	0.0008	0.029	0.039	324
16	0.049	0.070	0.0004	0.034	0.043	429

* The numbers greater than 332 occurred because of the appearance of equivalent reflections which were not averaged before the refinement.

† Diverged on attempted hydrogen atom refinement.

‡ Insufficient data for refinement.

§ Hydrogen atom refinement not attempted.

|| Did not converge. These were lowest R factors obtained.

below, the italicized value giving the frequency:

	Experiment					
	1	2	3	5	7	16
Maxima:	<i>11</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>31</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>7</i>
Minima:	<i>16</i>	<i>27</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>

The distribution of the maxima and minima differ significantly from the expected uniform distribution. That experiment 3 accounts for most of the maximum values and experiment 2 for the minimum values is further indication that the *modal* group still contains some systematic errors which are correlated with structural parameters.*

The low values found for the least-squares derived standard deviations are to be associated with the known systematic errors present in some, if not all, of the experiments. The formulas used to derive the internal standard deviations assume that only random errors are present in the observations. As this condition is increasingly violated, the apparent standard deviation, which is only a measure of the precision of fit between the model and the observations, becomes correspondingly unreliable as a measure of accuracy.

Conclusion

Systematic differences among structure factors from different experiments and different crystals are manifested in systematically different parameters when the data are subjected to least-squares refinement. Even if the parameters of an acceptable theoretical model re-

* The large number of extrema for experiment 3 is partially influenced by the fact that, because of the smaller number of reflections, it has larger internally estimated standard deviations. On this basis, the number of extrema should be 3 to 4 times as great as for other members of the modal group.

Acta Cryst. (1970). A26, 24

A Direct Method for the Determination of Polytype Structures. I. Theoretical Basis

BY K. DORNBERGER-SCHIFF

Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Strukturforchung, Berlin-Adlershof, Germany (DDR)

AND M. FARKAS-JAHNKE

Research Institute for Technical Physics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, Hungary

(Received 6 June 1967 and in revised form 5 June 1969)

A direct method for the determination of polytype structures of SiC, ZnS and similar substances from X-ray data is described. It is based on the values of a Patterson-like function (the 'Pattersonian') which only depends on the stacking of the translationally equivalent layers of the structure. The way of obtaining the Pattersonian function from the experimental intensities is described and an algorithm given by which the sequence of layers may be deduced. This sequence is conveniently characterized by the sequence of the digits of a binary number. The influence of experimental errors in the intensities on the possibilities of determining the real sequence is discussed.

Introduction

It has been found recently that optical and electronic data of semiconducting substances, especially of ZnS

and SiC, depend on the polytype present (Kholuyanov, 1964; Gobrecht, Nelkowski, Baars & Brandt, 1965; Hamilton, Patrick & Choyke, 1965; Patrick, 1965; Patrick, Choyke & Hamilton, 1965; Brafman & Stein-

fine without divergence, the derived parameters may be in error by several times the estimated standard deviations calculated from the goodness-of-fit achieved as a result of the least-squares refinement. Standard deviations on bond lengths and thermal parameters obtained in crystal structure refinements are realistic only if (1) there are no errors in the theoretical model and (2) if there are no systematic errors in the experiment. It is hoped that by projects such as this, the validity of (2) may be assessed so that we may direct our attention toward (1) – which includes all the questions of physical and chemical interest.

We would like to thank the following members and consultants of the 1963–1966 Commission on Crystallographic Apparatus of the I. U. Cr.: Professor M. M. Umanskij, Dr D. C. Phillips and Professor Y. Saito and, in particular, the chairman, A. McL. Mathieson, for exceedingly helpful comments. The project would of course not have been possible without the splendid cooperation of those who contributed data and who offered constructive criticism of earlier phases of the draft report.

References

- ABRAHAMS, S. C., HAMILTON, W. C. & MATHIESON, A. McL (1969). *Acta Cryst.* A25, 1.
 BUSING, W. R., MARTIN, K. O. & LEVY, H. A. (1962). USAEC Oak Ridge National Laboratory Report TM-305.
 COX, G. W., SABINE, T. M. & TAYLOR, G. H. (1966). Private communication.
International Tables for X-ray Crystallography (1962). Vol. III. Birmingham: Kynoch Press.
 OKAYA, Y., STEMPLE, N. R. & KAY, M. I. (1966). *Acta Cryst.* 21, 237.
 STERN, F. & BEEVERS, C. A. (1950). *Acta Cryst.* 3, 341.