

- HIRTH, J. P. & LOTHE, J. (1968). *Theory of Dislocations*, pp. 398–440. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- KAMBE, K. (1963). *Z. Naturforsch.* **18a**, 1010–1011.
- KATO, N. (1963). *J. Phys. Soc. Japan*, **18**, 1785–1791.
- KATO, N. (1974). *X-Ray Diffraction*, pp. 350–436. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- LITZMANN, O. & JANAČEK, Z. (1974). *Phys. Stat. Sol. (a)*, **25**, 663–666.
- PENNING, P. & POLDER, D. (1961). *Philips Res. Rep.* **16**, 419–440.
- STROH, A. N. (1958). *Phil. Mag.* **3**, 625–646.
- TAKAGI, S. (1962). *Acta Cryst.* **15**, 1311–1312.
- TAKAGI, S. (1969). *J. Phys. Soc. Japan*, **26**, 1239–1253.
- TAUPIN, D. (1964). *Bull. Soc. Fr. Minér. Crist.* **87**, 469–511.
- TAUPIN, D. (1967). *Acta Cryst.* **23**, 25–35.

Acta Cryst. (1975). **A31**, 600

Analytic Approximations to Incoherently Scattered X-Ray Intensities

BY H. H. M. BALYUZI

Physics Department, Queen Elizabeth College (University of London), Campden Hill Road, London W8, England

(Received 8 August 1974; accepted 25 January 1975)

The theoretically calculated incoherently scattered X-ray intensities of Cromer & Mann [*J. Chem. Phys.* (1967). **47**, 1892–1893] and Cromer [*J. Chem. Phys.* (1969). **50**, 4857–4859] for the elements 2 to 95 and 102 have been fitted to an analytic function. The coefficients of fit are tabulated and the accuracy of the fitting is discussed. The accuracy is very good for $\sin \theta/\lambda \leq 1.5 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$.

In studies of liquids and amorphous solids by X-ray diffraction it is often necessary to remove the incoherently scattered contribution to the measured intensities. This contribution may be calculated using data taken from incoherent tables of theoretically calculated atomic incoherent X-ray intensities [$I_{inc}(s)$, $s = \sin \theta/\lambda$], e.g. *International Tables for X-ray Crystallography* (1962), Cromer & Mann (1967), Cromer (1969), Tavard, Nicolas & Rouault (1967). These published intensities are however only tabulated for certain fixed values of s whereas in practice they may be needed for values of s other than these. It is convenient therefore to fit the tabulated data to an analytic function of s which may then be evaluated as required for any intermediate values of s . This has been done by Hajdu (1972) for the incoherent intensities calculated using Clementi wave functions by Tavard *et al.* (1967) for the elements from 2 to 36 inclusive. An almost complete set of incoherent intensities has been calculated by Cromer & Mann (1967) for spherically symmetric free atoms and by Cromer (1969) for aspherical free atoms using SCF Hartree-Fock wave functions; only the intensities for elements from 95 to 101 inclusive are missing from the set. In this paper the coefficients of an analytic function which has been fitted to this set of incoherent intensities are presented.

In the tables of Cromer & Mann (1967) and Cromer (1969) the incoherent intensities are listed for each element at s values 0.0, 0.005, 0.01, 0.05, 0.10, 0.15, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 0.6, 0.7, 0.8, 0.9, 1.0, 1.5, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0, 5.0, 8.0 \AA^{-1} . In X-ray diffraction experiments intensity measurements are not usually made at values of s greater than 1.5 \AA^{-1} (the maximum possible value

of s attainable when using Mo $K\alpha$ X-rays in 1.41 \AA^{-1}) so it was decided to choose an analytic function which would fit the tabulated intensities well for s between 0.0 and 1.5 \AA^{-1} . Traditionally X-ray scattering factors have been fitted to a function which is the sum of a number of Gaussians and a constant; Cromer & Waber (1965) used four Gaussians and a constant and hence obtained a nine-coefficient fit. On the other hand electron scattering factors have been fitted to the sum of a number of Gaussians without any constant term, e.g. Smith & Burge (1962). It was therefore decided to try fitting $F(s) = Z - I_{inc}(s)$ (Z is the atomic number), which is a smoothly decreasing function of s of the same general form as X-ray and electron scattering factors, to the sum of either four Gaussians and a constant or of five Gaussians. Preliminary investigation showed that the latter gave a better overall fit and used less computer time in doing so. Hence the analytic function chosen was

$$F_{fit}(s) = \sum_{i=1}^5 a_i \exp(-b_i s^2),$$

where the a_i and b_i are the ten coefficients of fit. A non-linear least-squares fitting procedure (Pennington, 1970), in which the sum of the squares of the absolute differences between the fitted and tabulated values of $F(s)$ was minimized, was used to calculate the coefficients of fit. No weighting of the data was applied prior to the fitting procedure and hence no one region of s was emphasized relative to another.

In Table 1 the coefficients of fit are listed for each of the elements together with two indications of the quality of fit. The column headed MPD gives the mean

or equal to 1.5 \AA^{-1} were all 2.0, which meant that all the corresponding values of $F_{\text{tab}}(s)$ were zero. It was only possible to obtain a fit to the sum of four Gaussians (an eight coefficient fit) and hence a_5 and b_5 are listed as zero. The relative errors for s less than or equal to 0.8 \AA^{-1} are all less than 1% while the remainder are rather large or could not be calculated because of division by the zero $F_{\text{tab}}(s)$. However, because the actual values of $F_{\text{tab}}(s)$ are very small for s greater than 0.8 \AA^{-1} , the fit is in fact quite acceptable.

For the other elements the mean percentage differences are all less than 0.3% while the worst percentage differences are all less than 1% except for Li, where the problems were similar to those encountered with He, and K. The rather large value of 1.25% at $s = 1.5 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$ obtained in the latter case is not readily explicable but if the calculated and fitted values of $Z - I_{\text{inc}}(s)$ are plotted it is obvious that the overall fit is very good. The quality of the overall fit for the other elements is as good as or better than that for K.

The computations were performed using the CDC 6600 and 7600 computers at the University of London Computer Centre.

References

- CROMER, D. T. (1969). *J. Chem. Phys.* **50**, 4857–4859.
 CROMER, D. T. & MANN, J. B. (1967). *J. Chem. Phys.* **47**, 1892–1893.
 CROMER, D. T. & WABER, J. T. (1965). *Acta Cryst.* **18**, 104–109.
 HAJDU, F. (1972). *Acta Cryst.* **A28**, 250–252.
International Tables for X-ray Crystallography (1962). Vol. III. Birmingham: Kynoch Press.
 PENNINGTON, R. H. (1970). *Introductory Computer Methods and Numerical Analysis*, 2nd ed., pp. 417–427. New York: Macmillan.
 SMITH, G. H. & BURGE, R. E. (1962). *Acta Cryst.* **15**, 182–186.
 TAVARD, C., NICOLAS, D. & ROUAULT, M. (1967). *J. Chem. Phys.* **64**, 540–554.

Acta Cryst. (1975). **A31**, 602

Strengthening of the Σ_1 Relationship: a Quartet Method

BY C. GIACOVAZZO

Istituto di Mineralogia e Petrografia, Università degli Studi, Bari, Italy

(Received 11 April 1975; accepted 14 April 1975)

A probabilistic theory of special quartets is described which is able to fix the sign of reflexions with even indices. The method proves suitable for removing a large percentage of the Σ_1 formula failures.

Statement of the problem

Direct methods are today the most powerful crystallographic tool for solving equal-atom structures. Although various types of phase-determining formulae have been proposed, the most effective is the sign relationship

$$\varphi_{\mathbf{h}} + \varphi_{\mathbf{k}} + \varphi_{-\mathbf{h}-\mathbf{k}} \approx 0.$$

It has long been recognized, however, that this formula may not lead to a physically correct solution without the introduction of auxiliary phase information. Several procedures, therefore, have been proposed (*i.e.* symbolic addition procedures or multisolution methods) which are able to give routine solutions even to complicated structures. As the choice of starting reflexions constitutes a very critical element influencing success or failure of a direct solution of the phase problem, much effort has been devoted to improving the selection of the starting set (Germain, Main & Woolfson, 1970).

It is a matter of experience that the phase-determining process is more effective if one has a large starting set: unfortunately the size of the set is

limited by the number of phase combinations it is practical to explore. Thus it is useful to be able to enlarge the starting set by knowing in advance a number of phases.

In order to achieve this, several additional formulae have been exploited by different authors. In this paper we shall devote our attention to some auxiliary formulae which are able to fix the phase of the $E_{2\mathbf{h}}$ reflexions. We shall discuss their limits and shall try to improve their effectiveness. We treat here only the centrosymmetric case: formulae useful in non-centrosymmetric cases will be described in a subsequent paper.

The mathematical approach

A variety of conditional probability distributions will be described. We denote by $P(E_1, E_2, \dots, E_n)$ the joint probability distribution function of n normalized structure factors. The characteristic function of the distribution (Giacovazzo, 1975a) is

$$C(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n) = \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2}(u_1^2 + u_2^2 + \dots + u_n^2) \right] \\ \times \left\{ 1 + \frac{S_3}{t^{3/2}} + \frac{S_4}{t^2} + \frac{S_3^2}{2t^3} + \dots \right\}, \quad (1)$$