

The Application of Phase Relationships to Complex Structures

III. The Optimum Use of Phase Relationships

BY G. GERMAIN

Laboratoire de Chimie-Physique, Université de Louvain, 39 Schapenstraat, Louvain, Belgium

AND P. MAIN AND M. M. WOOLFSON

Physics Department, University of York, England

(Received 31 July 1970)

An improvement is described in the automatic procedure for solving crystal structures incorporated in the computer program *LSAM*. The development of signs from an initial set containing symbols is carried only as far as is necessary to establish strong relationships between the symbols. The information so gained is used in a fresh beginning of the symbolic-addition process. Some failure of relationships between symbols is allowed to give a multisolution method. A phase-permutation computer program for non-centrosymmetric structures, *MULTAN*, incorporates a weighted tangent formula. This is of the form

$$\tan \phi_h = \frac{\sum_{h'} w_{h'} w_{h-h'} |E_{h'} E_{h-h'}| \sin(\phi_{h'} + \phi_{h-h'})}{\sum_{h'} w_{h'} w_{h-h'} |E_{h'} E_{h-h'}| \cos(\phi_{h'} + \phi_{h-h'})} = \frac{T_h}{B_h}$$

and

$$w_h = \tanh\{\sigma_3 \sigma_2^{-3/2} |E_h| (T_h^2 + B_h^2)^{1/2}\}.$$

All phases are accepted as soon as they are found with the associated weight. This gives a fourfold increase in speed in development of the complete phase set. An absolute figure of merit is described to indicate probably correct phase sets for multisolution methods.

Direct methods have now advanced to the point where it can be claimed, with some justification, that they are the major crystallographic tool for the solution of equal-atom structures. There are regularly reported the routine solutions of structures which, not many years ago, would have been regarded as veritable tours de force. However the very efficiency of these methods can lead to a lack of sophistication in their use since even the crudest techniques of application produce results comparable with those of quite intricate alternative methods.

The general philosophy of our approach is to stretch the usefulness of direct methods as far as possible. They are not to be regarded just as an easy alternative to solving structures in some other way but rather as having the potentiality of development to the point where they can solve structures which could not otherwise reasonably be solved. It turns out that there are good and bad ways of using any given data set and that with the right techniques structures can be solved which do not yield to the most obvious methods of applying sign and phase relationships. We shall here describe the methods which we have found to be the most effective and to have given solutions when other methods have failed.

Centrosymmetric structures

The multisolution symbolic-addition process for centrosymmetric structures described by Germain &

Woolfson (1968) has been fully automated in the *LSAM* (Logical Symbolic Addition Method) computer program. The program goes through the stages:

(I) There are allocated origin-fixing signs to some reflexions and sign symbols to up to six others.

(II) From the \sum_2 relationship there is found the reflexion whose sign (perhaps in symbolic form) is given with the highest probability. This is added to the list of known signs and the process repeated until the highest probability is lower than some preset limit, P_L .

(III) All the triple-product sign relationships involving reflexions in the known list are examined to find relationships between sign symbols.

(IV) All sets of signs for symbols are found which satisfy a specified number of the strongest relationships between sign symbols. Each of these sets constitutes a possible solution.

(V) For each possible set of signs various figures of merit are computed which normally enable the correct solution to be recognized.

Relationships between sign symbols, found at stage III, are related to the situation in stage II when a reflexion is found in terms of two different combinations of symbols. Thus a reflexion may have an indicated sign

AB with probability 0.90

and *CD* with probability 0.85. (1)

If 0.90 is greater than P_L and is the highest probability for any new sign indication at this stage then the

Table 1. Computer output for the sign determining process

2,3,4,5 TETRAPHENYL CYCLOPENTADIENE 10 JULY 1969

PROBABILITY LIMIT FOR ACCEPTANCE OF SIGN SYMBOL IS .9500

NUMBER OF SIGNS DETERMINED IS 86

SYMBOL	A	B	C	D	E	F								
FREQUENCY	29	53	33	0	0	0								
1	A	1.CC00	2	B	1.0000	3	ABC	1.C000	4	BC	1.0000	5	B	-.0000
6	BC	.CC00	7	C	.9358	8	C	1.C000	9	B	.5000	10	AB	1.0000
11	AB	.2075	12		.5CC0	13		.5000	14	R	1.C000	15	+	1.0000
16	B	-.CC00	17		.5CC0	18	BC	.5993	19	ABC	.9999	20	+	.5000
21		.5C00	22	AC	1.0000	23		.5000	24		.5000	25	C	1.0000
26	+	1.C000	27	AB	1.C000	28	+	.1824	29		.5000	30		.5000
31	+	1.C000	32	B	1.C000	33	B	1.0000	34	ABC	.1854	35	BC	-.0000
36	BC	.9999	37	BC	1.CC00	38		.5C00	39		.5C00	40	BC	.0457
41		.5000	42	B	.0000	43		.5000	44		.5C00	45	BC	.0731
46	AB	1.CC00	47	AC	.2315	48	B	.6857	49	+	1.C000	50		.5000
51		.5C00	52		.5C00	53		.5000	54		.5000	55		.5000
56	AB	.9998	57		.5C00	58	C	.0019	59	A	.3186	60		.5000
61		.5C00	62	AB	1.0C00	63	BC	.0011	64		.5000	65	ABC	.9153
66		.5C00	67		.5C00	68	C	1.C000	69	C	.8402	70		.5000
71		.5C00	72		.5C00	73	AB	.0802	74	B	.9993	75	+	.9996
76	BC	.0004	77		.5C00	78	B	.9999	79		.5000	80	AB	.0023
81	BC	.0000	82		.5C00	83		.5000	84	+	.9999	85	B	1.0000
86	C	1.CC00	87	BC	.3274	88	AB	.7685	89	A	.1016	90		.5000
91	AE	.0C00	92		.5C00	93	+	.C000	94	BC	.9999	95	BC	.9996
96		.5C00	97	BC	.2749	98		.5000	99	C	.1371	100	B	.9999
101	AB	.9997	102	A	.2750	103		.5000	104		.5000	105	AB	.4750
106	B	1.CC00	107	BC	.3498	108		.5000	109	AB	.7577	110	ABC	1.0000
111	AB	.3498	112	ABC	.9988	113		.5000	114	ABC	.9958	115	AB	.0595
116	C	.9997	117	B	.411C	118		.5000	119		.5000	120	B	.3823
121	BC	.3870	122	ABC	.9296	123	B	.1347	124	AC	.7271	125		.5000
126		.5C00	127		.5C00	128	AB	.9974	129	C	.9994	130	AC	.0054
131	B	.0431	132		.5C00	133	AB	1.C000	134	+	.9988	135	C	.0002
136		.5C00	137	A	.7858	138	R	.0006	139	A	.0034	140	+	.0124
141	+	.0044	142		.5C00	143		.5000	144		.5000	145	B	.7721
146	+	.0058	147		.5C00	148		.5000	149	B	.2973	150		.5000
151		.5C00	152	C	.8085	153	ABC	.0215	154	+	.0131	155	B	.0000
156	+	.0552	157		.5000	158		.5000	159		.5000	160	+	.5000
161	AC	.0522	162		.5C00	163		.5000	164	+	.8205	165		.5000
166		.5000	167		.5C00	168	B	.3318	169		.5000	170	C	.4061
171	+	.99C0	172		.5000	173	C	.9949	174	C	.7858	175		.5000
176	B	.3870	177		.5000	178		.5000	179		.5000	180		.5000
181	AC	.8264	182	B	.0017	183		.5000	184	+	.0000	185		.5000
186	ABC	.3965	187	B	.9405	188		.5000	189	ABC	.6770	190	B	.6130
191	C	.5987	192	BC	.9945	193	AB	.998C	194		.5C00	195	+	1.0000
196	R	.2689	197		.5000	198		.5000	199		.5000	200		.5000
201		.5C00	202	BC	.8870	203		.5000	204		.5000	205		.5000
206	B	.9468	207		.5C00	208		.9965	209		.5000	210	B	.1347
211		.5000	212		.5C00	213	B	.5000	214		.5000	215	AB	.8890
216		.5C00	217		.5000	218		.5000	219		.5000	220	A	.9999
221		.5C00	222		.5C00	223	BC	.4158	224		.5000	225		.5000
226		.5C00	227		.5000	228	AC	.7311	229		.5000	230		.5000
231	A	.9999	232		.5C00	233		.5000	234		.5000	235		.5000
236		.5000	237	BC	.9437	238		.5000	239	BC	.3274	240		.5000
241		.5000	242		.5C00	243		.5000	244		.5000	245		.5000
246	+	.2244	247	BC	.5987	248		.5000	249		.5000	250	B	.7649
251		.5C00	252	B	.4681	253		.5000	254	AR	.7427	255		.5000
256	B	.7388	257		.5C00	258		.5000	259		.5000	260		.5000
261	AC	.1443	262		.5C00	263	C	.7311	264	BC	.2932	265	B	.9072
266		.5C00	267		.5000	268	A	.6593	269	+	.3100	270	AB	.9658
271		.5C00	272		.5000	273		.5000	274		.5000	275		.5000
276		.5C00	277		.5C00	278		.5000	279	AC	.7427	280		.5000
281	BC	.4455	282		.5C00	283		.5000	284		.5000	285		.5000
286		.5C00	287	B	.0035	288	BC	.9072	289		.5000	290	B	.1545
291		.5C00	292		.5000	293	B	.7503	294		.5000	295		.5000
296		.5C00	297	+	.5890	298		.5000	299		.5000	300	AR	.3635
301	B	.2176	302		.5C00	303	AB	.9866	304	AB	.7388	305		.5000
306	+	.9689	307	B	.2891	308	BC	.6271	309	ABC	.9523	310		.5000
311		.5C00	312		.5000	313		.5000	314		.5000	315	B	.6365
316		.5C00	317	AB	.3498	318	C	.7068	319		.5000	320	B	.9346
321	B	.0847	322		.5000	323	R	.4061	324	B	.2315	325	BC	.6457
326	C	.9998	327	R	.8375	328	AB	.9593	329		.5C00	330	AB	.4013
331	AB	.9282	332	+	.1347	333		.5000	334		.5000	335	BC	.7311
336	BC	.6225	337		.5C00	338	ABC	.6548	339		.5000	340		.5000
341		.5C00	342		.5000	343	RC	.2729	344		.5000	345		.5000
346	A	.6857	347		.5C00	348		.5000	349		.5000	350		.5000
351		.5000	352	AC	.9967	353		.5000	354		.5000	355		.5000
356	HC	.1571	357	AB	.6271	358		.5000	359	B	.0563	360	AC	.0911
361		.5C00	362	HC	.2932	363	B	.2891	364	A	.6900	365		.5000
366		.5C00	367	BC	.5939	368		.5000	369		.5000	370		.5000
371	C	.3870	372		.5000	373		.5000	374		.5000	375		.5000
376		.5C00	377	A	.3635	378	C	.6411	379		.5000	380		.5000
381	B	.7649	382		.5C00	383	AB	.9969	384		.5C00	385	B	.8115
386		.5C00	387		.5C00	388		.5000	389		.5000	390	AB	.3917
391	ABC	.9241	392		.5000	393	C	.1765	389		.5000	390	AB	.3917

2,3,4,5 TETRAPHENYL CYCLOPENTADIENE 10 JULY 1969

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN SYMBOLS

RELATIONSHIP	PROBABILITY
AC = S(1)	-.0C0C
A = S(2)	1.CC0C
C = S(3)	.0001

symbol AB will be accepted for this reflexion. Subsequently at stage III there will be a relationship between symbols

$$A B C D \simeq +1.$$

In practice, for reasonably complex structures, to get most reflexions determined in terms of symbols, P_L must be made as low as about 0.80. If several sign indications are accepted at this level of probability there is a non-negligible likelihood that some of them may be wrong.

There is another aspect of this situation which can be seen from the example given in (1). If AB and CD are actually similar sign indications, *i.e.* both plus or both minus, with probabilities P_1 and P_2 then the actual probability that the new sign indication is AB (or CD) is

$$P = \frac{P_1 P_2}{1 - P_1 - P_2 + 2P_1 P_2}. \quad (2)$$

For the numerical values quoted this gives $P=0.98$, a very high probability. However if AB and CD are actually opposite indications then the resultant probability for the sign being AB is only 0.61. In this event the chance of error is high and if prior knowledge of the signs represented by A , B , C and D was available the next reflexion to have its sign accepted would certainly not be this one.

The *LSAM* program in its original form has only once failed to solve a structure in such a way that the best set of signs gave an easily recognizable and substantially correct Fourier map. This was for the structure 2,3,4,5-tetraphenylcyclopentadiene, space group $C2/c$ with eight molecules in the unit cell. The *LSAM* program produced seven sets of signs; the map from the set with the highest figures of merit gave a recognizable molecule in a location which was obviously incorrect from packing considerations. The structure was eventually solved by a process which involved relaxing the space group to $C2$ (Evrard, 1971). When the *LSAM* determined signs were compared with those from the refined structure it was found that about one-third of them had been incorrect.

A 'post mortem' on this structure suggested that at some fairly early stage in sign development a wrong indication had been accepted. From this investigation there emerged a revision of the sign-development technique which is incorporated in the latest version of the program, *LSAM 2*.

In applying *LSAM 2* to 2,3,4,5-tetraphenylcyclopentadiene, 393 reflexions with $E > 1.5$ were utilized. The program selected two reflexions to fix the origin (space group $C2/c$) and three others to which it allocated letter symbols A , B and C . New signs were generated as in stage II but with a high probability limit, $P_L=0.95$. This caused the sign determining process to terminate with 86 signs developed. In Table 1 the computer output is shown at this stage. It is to be interpreted as follows: reflexion 36 has sign BC with

probability 0.9999 while reflexion 131 has sign $-B$ with probability 0.9569. Where the probability of an indication is less than 0.95 that reflexion has not been used in \sum_2 relationships to deduce extra signs.

The program next searched for relationships between symbols and found three

$$AC = -1, \text{ probability } 1.0000$$

$$A = +1, \text{ probability } 0.9999$$

$$\text{and } C = -1, \text{ probability } 0.9998.$$

These are shown at the foot of Table 1.

We see from this that to get strong relationships between symbols does not require the development of signs for most of the reflexions and that one can insist on much higher probabilities up to this stage. *LSAM* next considered the possibilities

$$A = +1, \quad B = +1, \quad C = -1$$

$$\text{and } A = +1, \quad B = -1, \quad C = -1$$

and started again from the beginning developing signs for each combination. The output from this stage is shown in Table 2. The second set had the higher figures of merit (Germain & Woolfson, 1968) and of the 372 signs determined in this set only 3 were incorrect. In fact *LSAM* was prepared to allow other combinations of sign for A , B and C - up to six in all - but the operator intervened so only the two most probable ones were considered.

It is possible to deduce why the change of procedure gave a successful outcome in this case. If it is assumed that the relationships from which the initial 86 signs were determined were all independent then the probability that all these signs were determined without error was the product of the individual probabilities for each sign being correct. This gives P_+ equal to about 0.70 and it is therefore more likely that all the signs are correctly found than that there should be any error. The true value of P_+ is higher since it is known that probabilities given by the usual hyperbolic tangent formula are an underestimate (Klug, 1958); while this is usually of little importance when considering the validity of a single sign determination it is more significant in this case where 86 probabilities are being multiplied together.

If the original scheme, when signs were developed by a step by step process with $P_L=0.80$, is examined in the same way then it is found that some incorrect sign determinations are almost inevitable. With, say the 100th sign incorrectly determined experience suggests that the situation would soon deteriorate to the point where from about the 150th sign onwards completely random signs might be generated. Relationships between sign symbols deduced from the total resultant sign determination would be rather uncertain and there would thus be a high likelihood of failure.

This analysis also suggests an objective procedure as an alternative to initially fixing a value of P_L by judg-

Table 2. Computer output for the development of signs for combinations of A, B, C = ± 1

The two most-probable combinations are shown.

LSAM PART 2		GERMAIN/MAIN		VERSION		JUNE 1969			
2,3,4,5 TETRA-PHENYL-CYCLO-PENTADIENE						10 JULY 1969			
THE FIRST 3 EQUATIONS TO BE CONSIDERED									
THE SOLUTION IS									
	A	B	C	D	E	F	SIGN		
A =	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		
B =	0	1	0	0	0	0	1		
C =	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1		
D =	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
E =	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
F =	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NUMBER OF SYMBOLES SOLVED FOR IS 2									
NUMBER OF SETS OF SIGNS TO BE GENERATED IS 6									
SIGN ACCEPTED IF PROBABILITY GREATER THAN .800									
SET NO 1	SIGNS OF SYMBOLS + + - + + +					FIGURES OF MERIT			
						1099.5	1353.4	1490	371
1 +	2 +	3 -	4 -	5 -	6 +	7 -	8 -	9 +	10 +
11 -	12 -	13 +	14 +	15 +	16 -	17 -	18 -	19 -	20 -
21 +	22 +	23 +	24 -	25 -	26 +	27 +	28 -	29 -	30 +
31 +	32 +	33 +	34 +	35 +	36 -	37 -	38 -	39 -	40 +
41 -	42 -	43 -	44 -	45 +	46 +	47 +	48 +	49 +	50 -
51 +	52 +	53 +	54 -	55 +	56 +	57 -	58 +	59 -	60 +
61 +	62 +	63 +	64 -	65 -	66 +	67 -	68 -	69 +	70 -
71 +	72 -	73 -	74 +	75 +	76 +	77 -	78 +	79 +	80 -
81 +	82 -	83 +	84 +	85 +	86 -	87 +	88 +	89 -	90 +
91 -	92 +	93 -	94 -	95 -	96 -	97 -	98 +	99 +	100 +
101 +	102 -	103 +	104 +	105 +	106 -	107 +	108 -	109 +	110 -
111 -	112 -	113 -	114 -	115 -	116 -	117 +	118 +	119 -	120 +
121 -	122 -	123 -	124 -	125 -	126 -	127 +	128 +	129 -	130 +
131 +	132 +	133 +	134 +	135 +	136 -	137 +	138 -	139 -	140 -
141 -	142 -	143 +	144 +	145 +	146 -	147 -	148 +	149 +	150 -
151 +	152 -	153 +	154 -	155 -	156 +	157 +	158 +	159 +	160 -
161 +	162 +	163 +	164 +	165 -	166 -	167 -	168 +	169 -	170 +
171 +	172 +	173 -	174 +	175 +	176 +	177 +	178 +	179 -	180 +
181 -	182 -	183 -	184 -	185 -	186 +	187 +	188 -	189 -	190 +
191 +	192 -	193 +	194 +	195 +	196 +	197 -	198 -	199 +	200 -
201 +	202 -	203 -	204 -	205 +	206 +	207 +	208 +	209 -	210 +
211 -	212 -	213 +	214 +	215 +	216 +	217 -	218 +	219 -	220 +
221 +	222 -	223 +	224 -	225 -	226 -	227 +	228 -	229 -	230 +
231 +	232 -	233 +	234 -	235 -	236 -	237 -	238 -	239 +	240 -
241 -	242 -	243 +	244 -	245 -	246 -	247 +	248 -	249 +	250 -
251 -	252 -	253 +	254 +	255 -	256 +	257 +	258 -	259 -	260 +
261 +	262 -	263 -	264 +	265 +	266 -	267 +	268 -	269 -	270 +
271 +	272 -	273 -	274 -	275 -	276 -	277 -	278 +	279 -	280 +
281 -	282 -	283 +	284 +	285 +	286 -	287 -	288 -	289 -	290 -
291 -	292 +	293 +	294 -	295 +	296 -	297 +	298 -	299 -	300 -
301 -	302 +	303 +	304 +	305 -	306 +	307 -	308 -	309 -	310 -
311 +	312 +	313 -	314 +	315 +	316 +	317 -	318 -	319 +	320 +
321 -	322 -	323 -	324 +	325 -	326 -	327 +	328 +	329 +	330 -
331 +	332 +	333 +	334 +	335 +	336 -	337 +	338 -	339 -	340 -
341 +	342 +	343 +	344 +	345 +	346 -	347 +	348 -	349 -	350 +
351 +	352 -	353 +	354 +	355 +	356 +	357 +	358 +	359 -	360 +
361 -	362 -	363 -	364 -	365 -	366 +	367 -	368 +	369 +	370 -
371 -	372 -	373 -	374 +	375 +	376 +	377 +	378 -	379 +	380 -
381 +	382 -	383 +	384 +	385 +	386 -	387 -	388 +	389 -	390 -
391 -	392 -	393 -							
SET NO 2	SIGNS OF SYMBOLS + - - + + +					FIGURES OF MERIT			
						1251.9	1506.1	1592	374
1 +	2 -	3 +	4 +	5 +	6 -	7 -	8 -	9 -	10 -
11 +	12 +	13 -	14 -	15 +	16 +	17 -	18 -	19 +	20 -
21 -	22 -	23 -	24 -	25 -	26 +	27 -	28 -	29 +	30 -
31 +	32 -	33 -	34 -	35 -	36 +	37 +	38 +	39 -	40 +
41 +	42 +	43 +	44 +	45 -	46 -	47 +	48 -	49 +	50 +
51 -	52 +	53 -	54 -	55 +	56 -	57 +	58 +	59 -	60 +
61 +	62 -	63 -	64 +	65 +	66 +	67 +	68 -	69 +	70 +
71 -	72 -	73 +	74 -	75 +	76 -	77 -	78 -	79 -	80 +
81 -	82 -	83 +	84 +	85 -	86 -	87 -	88 -	89 -	90 +
91 +	92 -	93 -	94 +	95 +	96 -	97 +	98 -	99 +	100 -
101 -	102 -	103 +	104 +	105 +	106 -	107 -	108 -	109 -	110 +
111 +	112 +	113 +	114 +	115 +	116 -	117 -	118 +	119 +	120 -
121 +	122 +	123 +	124 -	125 -	126 +	127 -	128 -	129 -	130 +
131 -	132 +	133 -	134 +	135 +	136 +	137 +	138 +	139 -	140 -
141 -	142 +	143 +	144 +	145 -	146 -	147 +	148 +	149 -	150 +
151 -	152 -	153 -	154 -	155 +	156 +	157 -	158 +	159 -	160 -
161 +	162 -	163 -	164 +	165 -	166 +	167 +	168 -	169 -	170 +
171 +	172 -	173 -	174 +	175 -	176 -	177 -	178 +	179 +	180 +
181 -	182 +	183 +	184 -	185 +	186 -	187 -	188 -	189 +	190 -
191 +	192 +	193 -	194 -	195 -	196 -	197 +	198 +	199 -	200 +
201 +	202 +	203 -	204 +	205 +	206 -	207 -	208 -	209 -	210 +
211 +	212 -	213 -	214 -	215 -	216 -	217 -	218 -	219 -	220 +
221 +	222 +	223 -	224 -	225 +	226 -	227 +	228 -	229 -	230 +
231 +	232 +	233 -	234 -	235 -	236 +	237 +	238 -	239 -	240 +
241 -	242 -	243 +	244 -	245 -	246 -	247 -	248 +	249 -	250 +
251 +	252 +	253 +	254 +	255 +	256 -	257 -	258 -	259 -	260 +
261 +	262 +	263 -	264 -	265 +	266 +	267 +	268 -	269 -	270 -
271 -	272 -	273 +	274 -	275 -	276 +	277 -	278 -	279 -	280 +
281 +	282 +	283 -	284 -	285 -	286 -	287 +	288 +	289 -	290 +
291 +	292 -	293 -	294 +	295 +	296 +	297 +	298 +	299 -	300 -
301 +	302 +	303 -	304 -	305 +	306 +	307 +	308 +	309 +	310 +
311 +	312 +	313 -	314 -	315 -	316 -	317 +	318 -	319 +	320 +
321 +	322 -	323 +	324 -	325 +	326 -	327 -	328 -	329 -	330 +
331 -	332 +	333 -	334 +	335 +	336 +	337 -	338 +	339 +	340 +
341 +	342 -	343 -	344 +	345 +	346 -	347 -	348 -	349 -	350 -
351 +	352 -	353 +	354 -	355 +	356 -	357 -	358 -	359 +	360 +
361 +	362 +	363 +	364 -	365 -	366 +	367 +	368 -	369 +	370 +
371 -	372 -	373 +	374 +	375 +	376 +	377 +	378 -	379 +	380 -
381 -	382 -	383 -	384 +	385 -	386 +	387 +	388 -	389 +	390 -
391 +	392 +	393 -							

ment. One may begin by finding new signs, one at a time, and calculating the cumulative product of probabilities at each step. When this has reached some value, 0.95 for example, all possible relationships between symbols can be found and if the probabilities of these are judged to be high enough then stage IV of the process can be commenced. Otherwise one goes further in finding new signs until the cumulative product has reached another limit, say 0.90. The search process is continued until the probability of the cumulative product is as high as possible compatible with having sufficiently high probabilities for the relationships between symbols. This procedure is not written into *LSAM* at the time of writing but may be included in due course.

Non-centrosymmetric structures

The multi-solution method of solving crystal structures proposed by Germain & Woolfson (1968) has been fully automated in the *MULTAN* computer program and a number of fairly complex structures (up to 46 atoms in the asymmetric unit, $P2_12_12_1$) have been solved in this way.

Various trial procedures for phase development have been tried. They all had the general character that the strongest new phase indication from the tangent formula was accepted and incorporated in the known set and that after n such new phase determinations cyclic refinement of phases by the tangent formula was carried out. The various techniques tried were:

- (1) Taking n small, about five to ten, so that one always went forward with a highly self-consistent set of phases.
- (2) Taking n very large so that new phases were accepted in large numbers before refinement was carried out.
- (3) Making successive values of n increase in some exponential way, *i.e.* 5, 10, 20, 40 *etc.*

The trials showed, rather surprisingly, that frequent refinement was not only time-consuming but could be positively harmful. For example in one trial with space group $P2_12_12_1$ and 142 reflexions the starting set contained seven reflexions. With $n=10$ the final mean error in determined phase angle was 85.2° . For $n=20$ or any higher value up to 135 the mean error in determined phase angle was about 30° !

However the fastest and most efficient process of all was found to be the use of a weighted tangent formula. Whenever a new phase, φ_h , is determined there is also calculated a corresponding weight, w_h . An effective scheme, incorporated in a routine called *FASTAN*, was found to be

$$\tan \varphi_h \approx \frac{\sum_{h'} w_{h'} w_{h-h'} |E_{h'} E_{h-h'}| \sin(\varphi_{h'} + \varphi_{h-h'})}{\sum_{h'} w_{h'} w_{h-h'} |E_{h'} E_{h-h'}| \cos(\varphi_{h'} + \varphi_{h-h'})} = \frac{T_h}{B_h} \quad (3)$$

$$w_h = \tanh \{ \sigma_3 \sigma_2^{-3/2} |E_h| (T_h^2 + B_h^2)^{1/2} \}. \quad (4)$$

where σ_2 and σ_3 have been defined by Karle & Karle (1966).

Since the tangent formula is weighted, all reflexions are included the whole of the time and there is no rejection criterion for a phase other than the weight being calculated as very small or zero. The form of weighting ensures that poorly determined phases have little effect in the determination of other phases, while the fact that all phases are included in the phase determination process leads to very efficient propagation of phase knowledge throughout the data set. It has been found that the weighted tangent formula converges on the final result significantly more quickly than the normal unweighted formula where one starts with a small subset of E 's and only after several cycles is the whole of the data included. In the authors' own case, the weighted tangent formula is about four times faster than the more conventional approach and on at least one occasion gave the correct structure when the unweighted tangent formula did not.

The weighting scheme, as proposed in equations (3) and (4), is an empirical one which is found to give sensible results. For this, as with most weighting schemes, the important thing is to get the right general form for the weighting function and the exact analytical expression used is normally not very critical.

The final phases as given by *FASTAN* have associated weights and a small weight indicates an uncertain phase. It can be shown by an approximate analysis that, taking these uncertainties into consideration, a Fourier synthesis with suitably weighted coefficients $K|E|$ gives a higher signal:noise ratio than a normal $|E|$ map.

Let us consider a Fourier map

$$\Psi(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{\mathbf{h}} K_{\mathbf{h}} |E_{\mathbf{h}}| \cos(2\pi \mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{r} - \varphi_{\mathbf{h}}) \quad (5)$$

at r_j , the centre of the j th atom

$$\Psi(r_j) = \sum_{\mathbf{h}} K_{\mathbf{h}} |E_{\mathbf{h}}| \cos(2\pi \mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{r}_j - \varphi_{\mathbf{h}}). \quad (6)$$

It can be shown by arguments similar to those given by Cochran & Woolfson (1955) that the expectation value of $\cos(2\pi \mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{r}_j - \varphi_{\mathbf{h}})$ is

$$\langle \cos(2\pi \mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{r}_j - \varphi_{\mathbf{h}}) \rangle = \frac{Z_j}{\{\sum Z_i^2\}^{1/2}} |E_{\mathbf{h}}| \quad (7)$$

where Z_j is the atomic number of the j th atom and the summation is over all atoms in the unit cell. It is assumed in this that the form factors of the various atoms all have the same shape and differ only by a scale factor.

Replacing the cosine in expression (6) by its expectation value we have

$$\langle \Psi(r_j) \rangle = \frac{Z_j}{\{\sum Z_i^2\}^{1/2}} \sum_{\mathbf{h}} K_{\mathbf{h}} |E_{\mathbf{h}}|^2. \quad (8)$$

If the errors in φ_h are not too large we can obtain an expression for the error in $\Psi(\mathbf{r}_j)$ due to errors in the φ_h 's. This is

$$\Delta\Psi(\mathbf{r}_j) = -\sum_{\mathbf{h}} K_{\mathbf{h}} |E_{\mathbf{h}}| \sin(2\pi\mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{r}_j - \varphi_{\mathbf{h}}) \Delta\varphi_{\mathbf{h}}. \quad (9)$$

Since the $\Delta\varphi_h$'s are as equally likely to be positive as negative the expectation value of $\Delta\Psi(\mathbf{r}_j)$ is zero.

However the mean-square value of $\Delta\Psi(\mathbf{r}_j)$ is non-zero and equals

$$\langle \{\Delta\Psi(\mathbf{r}_j)\}^2 \rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{h}} K_{\mathbf{h}}^2 |E_{\mathbf{h}}|^2 \langle \sin^2(2\pi\mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{r}_j - \varphi_{\mathbf{h}}) \Delta\varphi_{\mathbf{h}}^2 \rangle. \quad (10)$$

Taking

$$\langle \sin^2(2\pi\mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{r}_j - \varphi_{\mathbf{h}}) \rangle = 0.5$$

and

$$\langle \Delta\varphi_{\mathbf{h}}^2 \rangle = V_{\mathbf{h}}$$

the variance in the determination of φ_h , we find the root-mean-square value of $\Delta\Psi(\mathbf{r}_j)$

$$\langle \{\Delta\Psi(\mathbf{r}_j)\}^2 \rangle^{1/2} = \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{h}} K_{\mathbf{h}}^2 |E_{\mathbf{h}}|^2 V_{\mathbf{h}} \right\}^{1/2}. \quad (11)$$

For a high signal-to-noise ratio we might expect the ratio of the expression given in (8) to that given in (11) to be a maximum *i.e.* ignoring constant factors,

$$X = \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{h}} K_{\mathbf{h}} |E_{\mathbf{h}}|^2}{\left\{ \sum_{\mathbf{h}} K_{\mathbf{h}}^2 |E_{\mathbf{h}}|^2 V_{\mathbf{h}} \right\}^{1/2}}. \quad (12)$$

to be a maximum.

Multiplying all the K 's by a constant factor does not affect the value of X so we can consider the problem as one of minimizing $\sum_{\mathbf{h}} K_{\mathbf{h}} |E_{\mathbf{h}}|^2 V_{\mathbf{h}}$ while keeping $\sum_{\mathbf{h}} K_{\mathbf{h}} |E_{\mathbf{h}}|^2$ fixed.

Now

$$d(\sum_{\mathbf{h}} K_{\mathbf{h}} |E_{\mathbf{h}}|^2) = \sum_{\mathbf{h}} |E_{\mathbf{h}}|^2 dK_{\mathbf{h}} = 0 \text{ for constant } \sum_{\mathbf{h}} K_{\mathbf{h}} |E_{\mathbf{h}}|^2$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} d(\sum_{\mathbf{h}} K_{\mathbf{h}}^2 |E_{\mathbf{h}}|^2 V_{\mathbf{h}}) &= 2 \sum_{\mathbf{h}} K_{\mathbf{h}} |E_{\mathbf{h}}|^2 V_{\mathbf{h}} dK_{\mathbf{h}} \\ &= 0 \text{ for } \sum_{\mathbf{h}} K_{\mathbf{h}}^2 |E_{\mathbf{h}}|^2 V_{\mathbf{h}} \text{ to be a minimum.} \end{aligned}$$

The values of K_h satisfy the second condition if $K_h V_h$ equals a constant.

It is found that if we interpret the quantity

$$\alpha'_h = 2\sigma_3\sigma_2^{-3/2} |E_{\mathbf{h}}| (T_{\mathbf{h}}^2 + B_{\mathbf{h}}^2)^{1/2} \quad (13)$$

which is twice the argument of \tanh in equation (4), as corresponding to the normal α_h as defined by Karle & Karle (1966) then $K_h = \alpha_h$ is a reasonable approximation. This is shown in Table 3; the values of α and V may be found tabulated in the paper by Germain, Main & Woolfson (1970).

Table 3. Values of α , V and αV

α	V (radians ²)	αV (radians ²)	α	V (radians ²)	αV (radians ²)
0.0	3.290	0.000	6.0	0.184	1.104
0.5	2.349	1.175	8.0	0.134	1.072
1.0	1.604	1.604	10.0	0.106	1.060
2.0	0.764	1.528	12.0	0.087	1.044
3.0	0.437	1.311	16.0	0.065	1.040
4.0	0.298	1.192	20.0	0.051	1.020

The values of α'_h , which vary between 0.6 and 56.9, are shown as ALPHA in Table 4 which is a typical output from *FASTAN* for a trial structure.

The above rough analysis suggests that $\alpha'_h |E_{\mathbf{h}}|$ should be used as a Fourier coefficient to get the greatest signal-to-noise ratio. However this analysis is rather rough and the derivation of equation (9) depends on small errors in the φ 's – which will not always be the case. The authors feel that weighting according to α'_h is possibly too severe and that instead w_h may turn out to be a more sensible weighting function. For the extreme values of α'_h of 0.6 and 56.9 the corresponding values of w_h are 0.291 and 1.000. Further investigations of weighting, both theoretical and empirical, will be made in due course.

Additional information

Germain, Main & Woolfson (1970) described the convergence method for selecting origin-and-enantiomorph-fixing reflexions together with some others to form a good starting set. As described in that paper the investigator chose origin-and-enantiomorph-fixing reflexions and these were tested for efficiency by the convergence method which also found the best other reflexions to take with them.

An improved version of the convergence method is incorporated in *MULTAN* as a routine called *CONVERGE*. This does not require any intervention on the part of the investigator but automatically finds the best possible starting set of reflexions including those required to fix the origin and enantiomorph.

The routine *CONVERGE* also applies the \sum_1 formula (Hauptman & Karle, 1953) to find probable signs of centric reflexions. The form of the \sum_1 expressions depends on the space group; for $P2_12_12_1$ for example one finds

$$S\{E_{2h2k0}\} \simeq S\left\{ \sum_{\mathbf{l}} (-1)^{l+h} (|E_{hkl}|^2 - 1) \right\} \quad (14)$$

with the probability that $E_{2h,2k,0}$ is positive

$$\begin{aligned} P_+\{E_{2h2k0}\} &= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \tanh \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \sigma_3 \sigma_2^{-3/2} |E_{2h,2k,0}| \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \sum_{\mathbf{l}} (-1)^{l+h} (|E_{hkl}|^2 - 1) \right\}. \quad (15) \end{aligned}$$

The weight associated with each sign determination is $|2P-1|$ (see, for example, Woolfson, 1956) and \sum_1

phases with these weights can be incorporated into the starting sets. Their phases are kept constant and contribute to the phase determination with their initial weight until they are determined by the tangent formula with a larger weight. Thereafter they take on the value and weight indicated by the tangent formula. The other reflexions in the starting set are kept constant until the tangent formula refinement has essentially converged; they are then allowed to refine to their final values which takes about two further cycles.

In Table 5 is shown the beginning and end of the output from *CONVERGE*. There were six signs found from \sum_1 and these were all included in the starting set. Although one of them (10,0,8) was incorrect the weighting scheme was able to handle the situation and a correct set of phases was found. There were two general phases whose phases were permuted in various combinations of $\pm(\pi/4$ or $3\pi/4)$ giving sixteen different starting points to be explored.

MULTAN gives a number of possible sets of phases and in order to evaluate their relative plausibility it is necessary to have some figures of merit. One fairly obvious criterion is

$$Z = \sum_h \alpha_h \tag{16}$$

and it appears that it often enables the correct solution to be distinguished from incorrect solutions. However it is difficult to judge the worthiness of the values of Z in an absolute way – that is to say that one cannot tell whether or not the highest value of Z might conceivably correspond to a correct solution. For this reason we have developed an absolute figure of merit based on the statistics of the values of α . In Germain, Main & Woolfson (1970) it was shown that the expected value of $\langle \alpha_h^2 \rangle_e$, is given by

$$\langle \alpha_h^2 \rangle_e = \sum_{h'} K_{h,h'}^2 + 2 \sum_{h'} \sum_{\substack{h'' \\ h' \neq h''}} K_{h,h'} K_{h,h''} \frac{I_1(K_{h,h'})}{I_0(K_{h,h'})} \frac{I_1(K_{h,h''})}{I_0(K_{h,h''})}$$

where

$$K_{h,h'} = 2\sigma_3 \sigma_2^{-3/2} |E_h E_{h'} E_{h-h'}|.$$

For a random set of phases the expectation value of α_h^2 is given by

$$\langle \alpha_h^2 \rangle_r = \sum_{h'} K_{h,h'}^2. \tag{17}$$

One can thus use as an absolute figure of merit

$$M_{abs} = \frac{Z - \sum_h \langle \alpha_h^2 \rangle_r^{1/2}}{\sum_h \langle \alpha_h^2 \rangle_e^{1/2} - \sum_h \langle \alpha_h^2 \rangle_r^{1/2}}. \tag{18}$$

Table 4. Values of α'_h

Computer output for *FASTAN* for a trial structure.

RAFFINOSF FASTAN PHASE DETERMINATION 11 JUNE 1970

STARTING PHASES INPUT FROM CARDS
FOURIER OUTPUT NOT REQUIRED

SET NO.	1	SIGMA ALPHA = 0.31337E+04					ABSOLUTE FIGURE OF MERIT = 1.1321												
H	K	L	PHI	ALPHA	H	K	L	PHI	ALPHA	H	K	L	PHI	ALPHA	H	K	L	PHI	ALPHA
0	0	8	0	17.4	0	0	12	180	44.6	0	1	6	90	30.2	0	1	14	90	13.1
0	1	20	90	17.8	0	1	25	90	7.9	0	2	4	180	50.6	0	5	3	90	11.1
0	5	16	270	11.8	0	6	4	180	9.6	0	6	7	0	10.7	0	6	12	180	42.8
0	6	14	9	17.0	0	6	19	180	7.7	0	7	8	270	14.7	0	7	12	90	6.5
0	7	28	90	40.8	0	8	0	0	18.4	0	8	8	0	4.9	0	8	12	180	11.2
0	9	16	270	0.6	0	9	21	270	18.9	0	10	3	0	7.2	0	11	6	270	8.1
0	11	14	270	2.1	0	12	1	0	21.6	0	12	13	180	3.9	1	0	6	0	22.9
1	4	15	235	15.6	1	4	25	261	8.2	1	1	11	299	19.8	1	5	1	149	15.0
1	6	17	120	17.3	1	6	25	150	24.2	1	7	14	280	25.2	1	7	15	263	26.0
1	8	10	155	11.7	1	8	14	174	12.2	1	8	21	332	18.7	1	9	5	309	6.1
1	10	6	270	11.6	1	11	7	338	4.0	1	11	8	86	6.4	1	10	10	4	42.0
2	2	17	344	7.1	2	3	3	231	5.0	2	4	3	68	7.1	2	4	13	186	8.6
2	4	20	257	21.1	2	5	17	182	6.7	2	5	20	220	14.0	2	5	24	354	16.9
2	7	3	335	7.2	2	7	5	189	15.7	2	7	14	99	3.8	2	7	17	17	13.4
2	9	3	226	36.1	2	9	5	306	14.8	2	9	12	112	3.9	2	9	13	318	15.3
2	10	7	268	10.7	2	11	1	159	26.4	2	10	2	228	5.2	2	10	3	57	22.2
2	10	8	38	7.8	2	10	9	304	15.9	2	11	9	176	10.7	2	11	16	328	14.1
2	10	18	262	1.8	2	14	3	277	8.0	3	0	18	0	22.9	3	1	19	299	10.6
3	3	7	166	18.0	3	3	19	13	9.9	3	3	23	149	12.1	3	4	13	268	12.1
3	6	20	11	8.3	3	7	1	11	14.3	3	7	11	160	30.7	3	8	14	310	9.8
3	9	19	10	14.6	3	10	12	159	2.9	3	11	1	180	8.1	3	11	3	34	13.0
3	10	7	294	29.7	3	11	11	6	14.4	3	10	13	276	12.1	3	11	15	200	9.7
4	0	17	270	23.2	4	0	20	0	3.0	4	1	0	180	18.4	4	1	5	71	27.7
4	1	18	73	26.4	4	1	19	170	3.2	4	2	17	310	15.7	4	3	19	180	13.4
4	4	21	126	23.3	4	5	17	96	15.6	4	7	13	335	7.5	4	7	16	94	23.6
4	5	103	1.6	4	9	8	235	10.1	4	10	4	177	25.7	4	10	10	167	9.2	
5	0	6	180	16.7	5	0	14	180	33.8	5	0	17	270	5.9	5	1	10	312	5.9
5	1	24	68	10.1	5	2	0	90	11.9	5	2	12	305	6.4	5	4	8	173	25.6
5	5	20	31	6.9	5	6	2	320	5.8	5	7	0	90	7.8	5	7	2	338	40.6
5	7	9	27	17.0	5	7	12	264	26.7	5	7	14	132	23.9	5	8	2	6	8.1
5	8	16	57	14.3	5	9	5	243	16.0	5	9	10	333	20.0	5	9	11	192	2.1
5	11	8	251	14.3	6	2	16	281	11.2	6	3	1	317	7.4	6	0	21	270	12.7
6	1	19	4	4.9	6	4	7	75	12.3	6	4	18	333	9.9	6	3	9	234	2.9
6	3	18	142	4.3	6	4	7	75	12.3	6	4	18	333	9.9	6	7	1	219	14.6
6	7	13	10	9.6	6	7	16	295	13.8	6	8	3	250	17.7	6	8	8	94	6.5
7	0	8	0	1.6	7	0	15	90	5.6	7	0	15	90	5.6	7	0	18	0	3.0
7	1	7	263	17.5	7	2	1	235	48.8	7	2	9	245	42.8	7	3	1	13	13.6
7	3	11	155	22.0	7	4	3	263	38.4	7	4	5	71	26.1	7	4	13	83	11.8
7	7	0	90	0.7	7	7	5	270	3.5	7	8	2	67	11.8	7	8	11	315	7.5
7	9	11	180	12.8	8	1	2	164	20.3	8	1	15	127	10.8	8	2	8	212	26.2
8	3	9	159	7.8	8	3	17	168	27.0	8	4	3	97	5.8	8	4	4	23	16.4
8	5	5	16	7.2	9	3	11	327	5.6	10	0	8	180	2.0	8	4	4	23	16.4

END

Table 5. Computer output for the computer program CONVERGE

The beginning and end of the program are shown.

CONVERGENCE WITH SIGMA ONE										RAFFINOSE					11 JUNE 1970							
NUMBER OF SETS OF PHASES PRODUCED IS LIMITED TO 32																						
MINIMUM ESTIMATED ALPHA IS 0.50																						
HIGH E'S ONLY USED FOR SIGMA 1																						
SIGMA 1 RESULTS																						
SIGN ACCEPTED IF PROBABILITY GREATER THAN 0.5700																						
CODE	H	K	L	PROB	CODE	H	K	L	PROB	CODE	H	K	L	PHOJ	CODE	H	K	L	PHOJ			
12	0	0	8	0.7282	2	0	0	12	0.8717	8	0	2	4	0.4874	16	0	6	14	0.5070			
22	0	8	0	0.5000	14	0	6	12	0.5000	16	0	6	14	0.5070	24	0	8	12	0.5000			
117	4	0	20	0.5000	162	6	0	14	0.3774	163	6	0	18	0.5000								
213	10	0	8	0.7142																		
TOTAL ESTIMATED ALPHA IS 0.2903E+04																						
TOTAL RANDOM ALPHA IS 0.1154E+04																						
CONVERGENCE MAPPING																						
26	0	9	16	2.29	21	-8	0	1.67	165	-178	0	1.14	141	-157	1	1.19						
25	0	8	10	2.65	140	157	1	1.79	40	56	0	1.23	90	60	1	1.14						
31	0	11	14	2.90	121	133	0	1.42	94	110	1	1.41	29	-178	1	1.17	-40	193	1	1.13		
169	6	3	9	3.47	55	-155	0	1.61	165	-8	0	1.18	17	187	1	1.20	11	-105	1	1.18		
195	7	4	18	3.49	89	-149	1	1.58	3	-185	1	1.19	89	161	0	1.19	18	-196	0	1.17		
181	7	0	8	3.81	157	-76	0	1.31														
159	5	9	11	3.86	79	157	0	1.32	-204	-109	0	1.26	-167	55	0	1.17	69	-99	0	1.13		
					56	-119	0	1.35														
30	0	11	11	3.86	144	9	0	1.13	16	-9	1	1.19	43	49	0	1.19	34	-55	0	1.17		
43	1	4	26	3.82	200	-187	1	1.94	-70	-59	1	1.52	-164	153	0	1.25	66	-34	1	1.17		
208	8	4	3	4.07	47	80	0	1.55	-207	-20	0	1.22	34	-192	0	1.14	125	-121	0	1.14		
166	6	1	19	4.08	6	-207	1	1.12	53	149	0	1.50	120	60	0	1.28	-46	146	1	1.19		
163	6	0	18	4.20	-49	155	0	1.79	75	-130	0	1.28	113	-110	1	1.25	49	-150	0	1.23		
175	6	7	11	4.23	2	-174	1	1.61	47	-140	1	1.22	-204	-76	1	1.21	70	-119	1	1.21		
117	4	0	20	4.31	188	-45	0	1.18	121	202	0	1.44	203	119	1	1.23	7	119	1	1.21		
58	1	11	8	4.45	41	192	0	1.21	6	-118	1	1.16	-55	60	0	1.29	-129	-144	0	1.21		
107	3	10	12	4.63	27	-40	0	1.83	177	144	0	1.15	137	83	0	1.47	-158	202	0	1.28		
57	1	11	7	4.67	172	144	0	1.15	-38	82	0	1.14	-111	118	1	1.54	-123	-158	1	1.21		
131	4	8	5	4.77	204	-155	1	1.72	2	-55	0	1.81	95	79	0	1.17	123	-14	0	1.55		
					-35	-150	0	1.15									47	-95	1	1.27		
153	5	7	14	4.68	2	149	0	2.46	-140	22	1	1.80	156	-8	0	1.55						
140	5	1	14	3.68	-14	149	0	2.53	24	-149	1	1.71	53	35	1	1.21						
24	0	8	12	3.99	2	22	0	2.47	47	40	1	1.41										
22	0	8	0	2.47	12	-8	0	1.79	23	-1	0	1.20	70	-35	1	1.35						
47	1	6	25	4.48	66	110	0	2.35	53	-8	0	1.91	70	133	0	1.78						
66	2	4	20	4.46	-14	66	0	1.93	70	-8	0	1.69										
70	2	6	16	2.29	95	-155	0	2.29	116	87	1	1.40	53	-40	0	1.33						
86	2	10	8	3.58	93	59	0	1.96	126	-192	1	2.14										
93	0	8	0	4.09	124	187	1	1.43	-95	-80	0	2.13										
53	1	8	21	4.23	-116	155	0	2.66	-126	187	1	1.94										
95	3	2	20	3.47	123	192	1	2.08	-51	111	0	1.67	-126	-12	1	1.35						
123	4	2	17	3.62	126	8	0	1.72														
126	4	4	21	4.21	-116	209	0	1.69	162	-60	0	1.87										
116	4	0	17	4.07	59	-111	1	2.75	204	-8	0	1.66	40	-188	0	1.43	-204	-12	0	1.30		
209	8	4	4	4.71	14	204	0	2.03	35	-187	0	1.95	-40	-153	1	1.49						
204	8	2	8	3.87	133	-130	0	1.96	35	8	0	1.31	51	64	1	1.22						
40	1	2	13	3.06	-102	-187	1	1.61	158	118	0	1.54	136	-130	0	1.29						
51	1	8	10	4.64	137	130	0	2.13	3	155	0	1.75	-180	-62	0	1.68						
158	5	9	10	4.17	59	-118	1	1.87	23	-8	0	1.82	1	12	0	1.50						
14	0	6	12	4.74	188	-192	1	2.55	193	187	1	1.54	188	153	1	1.37	23	8	0	1.17		
12	0	6	4	4.25	-110	157	0	2.85	-180	110	0	2.54										
136	4	8	4	4.84	193	-8	0	1.75	1	187	0	1.60	16	193	1	1.60	-3	190	1	1.50		
188	7	2	9	4.73	8	187	0	1.97	1	-192	0	1.43	23	192	1	1.36						
193	7	4	5	3.64	192	187	0	2.35	76	82	1	1.69										
8	0	2	4	3.68	-149	82	1	2.24	3	-190	0	1.64										
192	7	4	3	3.32	-155	-190	1	2.20	-60	118	0	2.06										
82	2	11	1	3.71	-149	80	1	2.15														
190	7	3	3	2.15	-76	187	0	2.21	-3	-155	0	2.13										
149	5	7	2	3.78	-155	-84	1	2.35														
187	7	2	1	2.35																		
155	5	8	4	0.01	-84	-118	1	1.66	-3	-84	0	1.41	87	3	1	1.23						
76	2	9	3	3.20	2	-87	1	1.68														
84	2	10	3	1.88	137	110	1	2.48	1	80	0	1.28										
87	2	10	9	3.22	59	-133	0	2.67	1	136	0	1.53	213	-136	1	1.47						
137	5	0	14	.54	60	80	0	1.99	35	-110	0	1.74	-59	-136	0	1.61						
133	4	10	4	4.21	110	-80	1	2.06	111	80	0	1.87										
136	5	0	6	3.37	59	-35	0	1.72														
80	2	10	1	1.72	111	-60	0	2.34														
59	1	10	10	2.34	2	-110	0	3.65														
111	3	10	7	3.65																		
110	3	10	5	0.01																		
KNOWN PHASES																						
CODE	H	K	L	PHI 100*MT	CODE	H	K	L	PHI 100*MT	CODE	H	K	L	PHI 100*MT	CODE	H	K	L	PHI 100*MT			
1	0	8	360	46	2	0	0	12	180	86	16	0	6	74	360	22	213	10	0	8	360	43
23	0	8	360	19	162	6	0	14	180	25												
ORIGIN FIXING REFLECTIONS																						
CODE	H	K	L	PHI	CODE	H	K	L	PHI	CODE	H	K	L	PHI	CODE	H	K	L	PHI			
3	0	1	6	90	35	1	0	9	90	60	2	0	3	90	118	4	1	0	360			
OTHER REFLECTIONS IN STARTING SET																						
CODE	H	K	L	CODE	H	K	L	CODE	H	K	L	CODE	H	K	L							
110	3	10	5	155	5	8	4															
NUMBER OF SETS OF PHASES WRITTEN ON TAPE 74 IS 16																						
END																						

The value of M_{abs} would tend to be near zero for random phases and of order unity for correct phases. In practice correct sets of phases are found to give values of M_{abs} in the range about 1.0–1.4. While some incorrect sets of phases can also give values of M_{abs} of this magnitude it is unlikely that correct phases would give M_{abs} as low as 0.7, say. It should be stressed that no theoretical relationship has been found between M_{abs} and the probability of a set of phases being correct and that quoted judgments of the significance of values of M_{abs} are based on present experience – as yet limited.

Table 4 shows the value of M as 1.13 for the correct set of phases for raffinose (Berman, 1970) a trial structure for trying out methods.

Provision is made in *FASTAN* for the input of starting phases from cards. This is particularly useful when a recycling procedure is being used in which a number of phases have been calculated from a partial structure and are to be used as a basis for further phase determination. In this case it is advisable to fix most of the input phases for the initial stages of phase determination. This ensures that the new phases determined conform to the input information before refining all the phases together. If the input phases are allowed to refine immediately it is not uncommon for

them to change their values completely so they bear no relation to those input.

We wish to express our gratitude to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization for supporting liaison between our laboratories and also to the Science Research Council for its continuing support of our activities in York. We also wish to give thanks to the referee whose constructive criticisms of the first version of this paper led to a number of improvements in the presentation of the material.

References

- BERMAN, H. M. (1970). *Acta Cryst.* **B26**, 290.
 COCHRAN, W. & WOOLFSON, M. M. (1955). *Acta Cryst.* **8**, 1.
 EVRARD, G. (1971). *Acta Cryst.* Submitted for publication.
 GERMAIN, G. & WOOLFSON, M. M. (1968). *Acta Cryst.* **B24**, 91.
 GERMAIN, G., MAIN, P. & WOOLFSON, M. M. (1970). *Acta Cryst.* **B26**, 274.
 HAUPTMAN, H. & KARLE, J. (1953). *Solution of the Phase Problem. I. The Centrosymmetric Crystal*. A.C.A. Monograph No. 3.
 KARLE, J. & KARLE, I. L. (1966). *Acta Cryst.* **21**, 849.
 KLUG, A. (1958). *Acta Cryst.* **11**, 515.
 WOOLFSON, M. M. (1956). *Acta Cryst.* **9**, 804.

Acta Cryst. (1971). **A27**, 376

Short-Range Ordering of Vacancies and Fermi Surface of TiO

BY J. R. CASTLES,* J. M. COWLEY† AND A. E. C. SPARGO

School of Physics, University of Melbourne, Parkville, Victoria 3052, Australia

(Received 26 August 1970)

The structure of the disordered (high-temperature) phase of titanium monoxide has been studied by electron diffraction. Composition-dependent complex distributions of diffuse scattering are observed and interpreted in terms of short-range-ordered configurations of lattice vacancies. The proposition that the form of the diffuse scattering may correspond to ordering under the influence of long-range electronic energy terms and so show a direct relationship to the topology of the Fermi surface is examined.

Introduction

The titanium monoxide phase has statistically the NaCl type structure at high temperatures and is stable over a wide composition range e.g. from $\text{TiO}_{0.70}$ to $\text{TiO}_{1.25}$ at 1400°C and from $\text{TiO}_{0.90}$ to $\text{TiO}_{1.25}$ at 900°C and lower temperatures. The structure contains a large proportion of vacancies of both titanium and oxygen,

the relative number of each type depending on composition. For $\text{TiO}_{1.0}$ 15% of both kinds of site are vacant while $\text{TiO}_{1.25}$ has all oxygen sites full but 22% of the titanium sites empty.

Below a certain composition-dependent critical temperature, varying from 990°C for $\text{TiO}_{1.0}$ to about 750°C for $\text{TiO}_{1.25}$, super-lattice structures are formed by the ordering of vacancies. These have been analysed by Watanabe, Castles, Jostsons & Malin (1967) and Watanabe, Terasaki, Jostsons & Castles (1968, 1969) on the basis of electron diffraction single-crystal patterns and by Hilti (1968) using X-ray diffraction patterns taken from crystals having a single orientation with respect to the basic NaCl-type structure but com-

* Present address: Department of Chemistry, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, 66044, U.S.A.

† Present address: Physics Department, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85281, U.S.A.