- 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). A 31, 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  $\sin \theta/\lambda \le 1.5$  Å<sup>-1</sup>.

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 published 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 swhich 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 Å<sup>-1</sup>. In X-ray diffraction experiments intensity measurements are not usually made at values of s greater than 1.5 Å<sup>-1</sup> (the maximum possible value of s attainable when using Mo  $K\alpha$  X-rays in 1.41 Å<sup>-1</sup>) so it was decided to choose an analytic function which would fit the tabulated intensities well for s between 0.0 and 1.5 Å<sup>-1</sup>. 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

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

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 percentage difference between the fitted and tabulated values of F(s) for the 16 values of s less than or equal to 1.5 Å<sup>-1</sup>, *i.e.* MPD =  $100 \sum_{j=1}^{16} r_j$ , where  $r_j = |F_{fit}(s_j) - F_{tab}(s_j)|/|F_{tab}(s_j)|$ . The column headed WPD gives the worst percentage difference at any of the values of s less than or equal to 1.5 Å<sup>-1</sup>, *i.e.* WPD =  $100 \text{ Max}(r_j)$ .

The final column of the table which is headed S gives the source of the tabulated incoherent intensities for each of the elements; CM denotes Cromer & Mann (1967) and C denotes Cromer (1969).

The only element whose incoherent intensities caused problems in the fitting procedure was He. This was because the intensities tabulated for s greater than

Table	1.	Anal	vtic	coefficients	for	Z-	Iin (	(s)	
			J				-incy	~ ,	ł

ELEMENT Z	A1	B1	A2	B2	A3	B3	A4	B4	A5	B5	MPD	WPD	5
HE 2	.5246	32.3717	1.0188	14.7084	.4068	6.6884	.0498	2.4843	0	0	**	ж 1 049	CM
BE 4	.4634	185.8560	1.5592	104,6010	.7685	4.8589	1.0623	2.1932	.1470	.7641	.026	.107	CM
B 5	.9046	104.9510	1.9822	46.0191	.2279	8.9873	1.4873	1.9674	.3979	.6778	.067	.355	ç
N 7	.9070	64.1555	2.8972	20.8507	1.1659	7.7576	1.5526	1.0335	.4769	.3516	.078	.554	См
0 8	.8847	52.0053	3.2189	16.4487	1.7990	6.5958	1.5538	.8143	.5434	.2815	.043	.165	ç
NE 10	1.1544	34,2567	3.8033	9.7672	2,8085	4.0375	1.6647	.5256	.5687	.1800	.043	.309	см
NA 11 MG 12	1.0243	293.4110	2.0704	15.2373	5.3197	4.4697	1.5214	·6246	1.0637	.1922	.094	.304	CM
AL 13	2.6790	121.3630	1.2336	16.0728	5.9358	3.2632	1.6622	.6616	1.4835	. 1586	.145	.650	c
SI 14 P 15	2,1006	116.9570	2.2025	34.7760	5.3063	3.3215	2.5162	.9933	1.8716	. 1553	.110	.438	C CM
S 16	2.0717	86.7211	4.2023	21,4574	5.6883	2.1255	2.2623	.5882	1.7735	.1128	.124	.787	c
CL 17 AR 18	2.1221	73.8395 65.6187	5.0905 5.9791	17.9756 14.4380	5.6885 5.6104	1.8037	2.2809	.5162	1.8164	.1008	.095	.447	C CM
K 19	1.0863	425.4740	2.8562	35.7249	5.6616	9.3261	6 7809	1.0206	2.6145	.1036	.190	1.247	CM
CA 20 SC 21	2.0554	289.8620	2.7251	28.7190 26.8528	5.9104	7.4788	6.7171 6.7745	.8644	2,5916	.0920	.129	.527	CM
TI 22	2.1983	226.9580	3.2282	24.9306	7.0649	5.6213	6.8832	.6865	2.6243	.0758	.091	. 423	ē
V 23 CR 24	2.2399	206.3990	3.4340	22,9026	7.6412	4.9366	7.02/0	.5876	2.6558	.0697	.093	.568	С СМ
MN 25	2.3156	174.6560	3.7420	19.5879	8.8241	3.8896	7.3811	.5326	2.7355	.0597	.083	.669	СM
CO 27	2.3141	151.3370	4.4188	18.2898	9.2624	3.5861	7.6872	.5155	2.9404	.0597	.067	.504	C C
NJ 28	2.4174	139.9630	4.7076	14.5797	10.2289	2.8142	7.8357	. 4203	2.8071	.0476	.097	.520	Č
ZN 30	2.4474	125.0830	5.1080	12.8443	11.4407	2.3122	8.1791	.4076	2.8943	.0410	.090	.299	CM
GA 31	3.0360	104.5770	5.1760	11.2803	11.6692	2.0663	8.2940	.3314	2.8148	.0380	.084	.260	Ċ
AS 33	3.3385	82.4879	5.6229	12,0723	12.2449	1.8317	8.8668	.2996	2.9138	.0356	.130	.347	CM
SE 34	3.5333	73.4400	5:9644 5 5541	12.2369	12.4403	1.7151	9.1212	.2824	2.9289	.0318	.137	.367	Ę.,
KR 36	3.0598	70.8068	7.6671	12.5940	12.5852	1.5230	9.6168	.2577	3.0647	.0294	.133	.330	СМ
RB 37 SR 38	2.3770	178.8670	8.6605	13.9200	12.5729	1.5224	10.1507	.2567	3.2083	.0289	.205	.482	CM
Y 39	3,5086	177.4230	9.2574	11.0509	12.4297	1.3242	10.4962	.2300	3.2840	.0263	.198	.464	C
ZR 40 NB 41	3.8436	152.2740	9.6980 10.5738	10.0161	12.3352	1.2610	10.7459	.2206	3.3493	.0254	.211	.534	C C
MB 42	3.9567	105.1800	11.1228	8.0754	12.1674	1.1551	11.2328	2038	3.4857	.0237	. 192	.608	ČМ
RU 44	4.3317	77.6118	10.7065	7.9151 6.4667	12.1316	1.2769	12.0687	.2105	3,7296	.0240	.280	.799	CM C
RH 45	4.8745	71.5772	12.2804	6.1701	12.0133	1.0589	12.0245	.1853	3.7592	.0220	.210	.625	č
AG 47	5.3490	58.9663	13.4127	4.9329	11.9402	.8575	12.3201	.1655	3.9205	.0206	.076	.193	CM
CD 48	4.5224	87.3897	9.6282	7.7119	14,9509	1.5820	14.2066	.2036	4.6563	.0234	.276	.898	СM
SN 50	4.9677	83.2133	7.4873	10.1130	17.4268	1.7605	14.9229	.2062	5,1678	.0238	.218	.787	c
SB 51 TF 52	4.6001	82.5070	7.4399	12.5902	18.3475	1.7906	15.1777	.2029	5.4096	.0238	.199	.712	CM
I 53	4.3147	78.6996	8.3728	14.9421	19.1961	1.6795	15.3645	. 1921	5,7365	.0232	.165	.755	č
XE 54 CS 55	3.4467 2.5751	88.3050 224.5980	19.4724 19.7181	1.6131	9.7473	16.1669	15.4210	.1869	5,9034	.0229	.147	.751	CM CM
BA 56	3.2477	266.5930	19.7824	1.4758	11.2142	16.2710	15.4790	.1775	6.2602	.0225	.165	.678	СM
LA 57 CE 58	3.6683	224,7260	11.7149	14.7472 14.0417	19.8077 20.1925	1.3823	15.4015 15.4540	.1708	6.3860 6.5996	.0222	. 151	.662	C C
PR 59	3,6287	208.1030	11.9193	13.8486	20.8823	1.3025	15.6425	.1690	6.8971	.0222	.178	.619	č
PM 61	3.8009	184.3400	12.0836	13.2282	21.2664	1.25/3	15.7405	.1677	7.1521	.0222	.182	.609	С С
SM 62	3.8533	176.3920	12.3520	12.2878	22.0136	1.1810	16.0323	.1672	7.7082	.0223	. 192	.627	č
GD 64	4.1100	160.8590	13.0008	11.0492	22.2962	1.0914	16.2937	.16/6	8.2594	.0224	189	.620	LM C
TB 65	4.1589	155.1860	13.2197	10.6407	22.4627	1.0667	16.5329	. 1674	8.5842	.0224	.195	.649	č
HO 67	4.0620	145.9760	13.2132	10.3972	22,9351	1,0569	17.3999	.1752	9.3388	.0227	.220	.704	C C
ER 68 TM 69	4.0815	142.0720	13.3282	10.1525	22.9865	1.0438	17.8548	.1785	9.6967	.0229	.227	.773	č
YB 70	4.1014	135.8330	13.4586	9.8125	22.9675	1.0290	18.9998	.1860	10.4188	.0227	.169	.732	C CM
HF 72	4.3261	133.3600	13.8638	9.1664	22.6992	.9951	19.3649	.1861	10.6986	.0230	.207	.820	Č
TA 73	4.7416	117.6480	14.9284	7.9070	22.0214	.9250	20.0290	.1850	11.2347	.0225	.180	.749	Ċ
RE 75	4.8423	112.6940	15.6421	7.3551	21.6701	.8892	20.3207	. 1837	11.4817	.0226	.169	.689	C
05 76	5.3630	93.6155	17.5066	6.0569	23.3197	.7156	20.9425	.1373	8.8158	.0127	.179	.458	C
PT 78	5.6451	69.2594 69.2677	18.8015	5.3127	15.5924	1.2550	26.5617	.1702	14,2784	.0242	.123	.352	ç
AU 79	5.8170	65.4079	19.5635	4.9469	20.3716	.6809	20.6837	.1680	12.5114	.0214	.114	.192	См
TL 81	6,5803	69.9997	19.6010	4.6032	19.0547	.7375	22.4442 23.0433	.1779	13.0069	.0216	. 156	.253	СM С
PB 82	7.3754	62.4634	19.7974	4.2561	18.0002	.7021	23.2605	.1757	13.4943	.0213	. 151	.246	č
PO 84	9.0662	48.3272	20.0183	3,6624	23.6273	.06/5	23.3246	.1722	13.6777 13.8913	.0210	.147	.280	CM
AT 85 RN 85	9.9223	43.7514	20.2544	3.4229	23.9015	.1680	16.7271	.6271	14.1028	.0206	.138	.330	č
FR 87	2.5332	269.8780	11.5319	21.9610	24.7459	2.0716	31.9247	.2243	14.2879	.0203	.141	.381	CM
RA 88 AC 89	3.2249	321.6630	11.6694	20.3845	24.8687	1.9730	31.8957	.2166	16.3306	.0219	.094	.303	СM
TH 90	4.0181	232.3710	12.6119	17.3825	24.9621	1.7950	31.8646	.2035	16.5249	.0215	.086	.257	С С
РН 91 U 92	3.7926 3.9051	236.8030 221.1780	12.6626 12.8415	17.5908	25.8795	1,7607	31.9403	.1984	16.7045	.0209	.094	.272	ć
NP 93	4.0333	207.7270	12.9014	16.3175	26.7571	1.6677	31.4732	.1954	17.8065	.0205	.098	.208	C
PU 54 AM 95	4.2695	185.9550	12.5662	15.5936 14.9676	28.0362 28.6781	1.5914	31,9382	.1834	17.1487	.0200	.113	.241	Č
NG 102	4.7363	135.6760	14.1419	12.0550	32.9866	1.1972	31.6913	.1510	18,3800	.0180	.141	.272	CM

or equal to  $1.5 \text{ Å}^{-1}$  were all 2.0, which meant that all the corresponding values of  $F_{tab}(s)$  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  $0.8 \text{ Å}^{-1}$  are all less than 1% while the remainder are rather large or could not be calculated because of division by the zero  $F_{tab}(s)$ . However, because the actual values of  $F_{tab}(s)$  are very small for s greater then  $0.8 \text{ Å}^{-1}$ , 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 Å<sup>-1</sup> obtained in the latter case is not readily explicable but if the calculated and fitted values of  $Z-I_{inc}(s)$  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. A 28, 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 $\sum_{1}$ 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  $\sum_{i}$  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

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

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  $E_{2h}$ 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  $P(E_1, E_2, \ldots, E_n)$  the joint probability distribution function of *n* normalized structure factors. The characteristic function of the distribution (Giacovazzo, 1975*a*) is

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