

4.2. DISORDER DIFFUSE SCATTERING OF X-RAYS AND NEUTRONS

Georgopoulos & Cohen, 1977; Wu *et al.*, 1983). The method does not work for neutron diffraction. Also, the case of planar short-range order with corresponding diffuse intensity along rods in reciprocal space may be treated along the Borie & Sparks method (Ohshima & Moss, 1983).

Multi-wavelength methods taking advantage of the variation of the structure factor near an absorption edge (anomalous dispersion) are discussed by Cenedese *et al.* (1984). The same authors show that in some cases the neutron method allows for a contrast variation by using samples with different isotope substitution.

4.2.4.4.6. Powder diffraction

Evaluation of diffuse-scattering data from powder diffraction follows the same theoretical formulae developed for the determination of the radial distribution function for glasses and liquids (Debye & Menke, 1931; Warren & Gingrich, 1934). The final formula for random distributions may be given as (Fender, 1973)

$$I_d^p = \{ \langle |F(\mathbf{H})|^2 \rangle - |\langle F(\mathbf{H}) \rangle|^2 \} \sum_i s_i \sin(2\pi H r_i) / (2\pi H r_i). \quad (4.2.4.82)$$

s_i represents the number of atoms at distance r_i from the origin. An equivalent expression for a substitutional binary alloy is

$$I_d^p = \alpha(1 - \alpha) \{ |f_2(\mathbf{H}) - f_1(\mathbf{H})|^2 \} \sum_i s_i \sin(2\pi H r_i) / (2\pi H r_i). \quad (4.2.4.83)$$

4.2.4.4.7. Small concentrations of defects

In the literature small concentrations are treated in terms of fluctuations of the functions $\pi_{\mathbf{nv}}$ as defined in equation (4.2.4.56). Generally we prefer the introduction of the distribution function of the defects or clusters. Since this problem has already been treated in Section 4.2.4.4.3 only some very brief remarks are given here. The most convenient way to derive the distribution function correctly from experimental data is the use of low-angle scattering which generally shows one or more clear maxima caused by partly periodic properties of the distribution function. For the deconvolution of the distribution function, received by Fourier transformation of the corrected diffused low-angle scattering, the reader is referred to the relevant literature. Since deconvolutions are not unique some reasonable assumptions are necessary for the final solution. Anomalous scattering may be very helpful if applicable.

4.2.4.4.8. Cluster method

As mentioned above, the cluster method may be useful for the interpretation of disorder problems. In the general formula of diffuse scattering of random distributions equation (4.2.2.13) may be used. Here $|\langle F(\mathbf{H}) \rangle|^2$ describes the sharp Bragg maxima, while $|\Delta F(\mathbf{H})|^2 = \langle |F(\mathbf{H})|^2 \rangle - |\langle F(\mathbf{H}) \rangle|^2$ represents the contribution to diffuse scattering. Correlation effects can also be taken into account by using clusters of sufficient size if their distribution may be considered as random in good approximation. The diffuse intensity is then given by

$$I_d(\mathbf{H}) = \sum_{\nu} p_{\nu} |F_{\nu}(\mathbf{H})|^2 - \left| \sum_{\nu} p_{\nu} F_{\nu}(\mathbf{H}) \right|^2, \quad (4.2.4.84)$$

where $F_{\nu}(\mathbf{H})$ represents the difference structure factor of the ν th cluster and p_{ν} is its *a priori* probability. Obviously equation (4.2.4.84) is of some use in two cases only. (1) The number of clusters is sufficiently small and meets the condition of nearly random distribution. In principle, its structure may then be determined with the aid of refinement methods according to

equation (4.2.4.84). Since the second term is assumed to be known from the average structure, the first term may be evaluated by introducing as many parameters as there are clusters involved. A special computer program for incoherent refinement has to be used if more than one representative cluster has to be introduced. In the case of more clusters, constraints are necessary. (2) The number of clusters with similar structures is not limited. It may be assumed that their size distribution may be expressed by well known analytical expressions, *e.g.* Gaussians or Lorentzians. The distribution is still assumed to be random.

An early application of the cluster method was the calculation of the diffuse intensity of Guinier–Preston zones, where a single cluster is sufficient (see, *e.g.*, Gerold, 1954; Bubeck & Gerold, 1984). Unfortunately no refinements of cluster structures have so far been published. The full theory of the cluster method was outlined by Jagodzinski & Haefner (1967).

Some remarks on the use of residual factors should be added here. Obviously the diffuse scattering may be used for refinements in a similar way as in conventional structure determination. For this purpose a sufficiently small reciprocal lattice has to be defined. The size of the reciprocal cell has to be chosen with respect to the maximum gradient of diffuse scattering. Then the diffuse intensity may be described by a product of the real intensity distribution and the small reciprocal lattice. Fourier transformation yields the convolution of the real disordered structure and a large unit cell. In other words, the disordered structure is subdivided into large units and subsequently superimposed ('projected') in a single cell. In cases where a clear model of the disorder could be determined, a refinement procedure for atomic and other relevant parameters can be started. In this way a residual factor may be determined. A first approach has been elaborated by Epstein & Welberry (1983) in the case of substitutional disorder of two molecules.

The outstanding limiting factor is the collection of weak intensity data. The amount increases rapidly with the complexity of the structure and could even exceed by far the amount which is needed in the case of protein structure refinement. Hence, it seems to be reasonable to restrict the measurement to distinct areas in reciprocal space. Most of these publications, however, use too little information when compared with the minimum of data which would be necessary for the confirmation of the proposed model. Hence, physical and chemical considerations should be used as an additional source of information.

4.2.4.4.9. Comparison between X-ray and neutron methods

Apart from experimental arguments in favour of either method, there are some specific points which should be mentioned in this context. The diffuse scattering in question must be separated from Bragg scattering and from other diffuse-scattering contributions. Generally both methods are complementary: neutrons are preferable in cases where X-rays show only a small scattering contrast: (heavy) metal hydrides, oxides, carbides, Al–Mg distribution *etc.* In favourable cases it is possible to suppress (nuclear) Bragg scattering of neutrons when isotopes are used so that $\sum_{\nu} c_{\nu} f_{\nu} = 0$ for all equivalent positions. Another way to separate Bragg peaks is to record the diffuse intensity, if possible, at low $|\mathbf{H}|$ values. This can be achieved either by measurement at low θ angles or by using long wavelengths. For reasons of absorption the latter point is the domain of neutron scattering. Exceeding the Bragg cut-off, Bragg scattering is ruled out. In this way 'diffuse' background owing to multiple Bragg scattering is avoided. Other diffuse-scattering contributions which increase with the $|\mathbf{H}|$ value are thus also minimized: thermal diffuse scattering (TDS) and scattering due to long-range static displacements. On the other hand, lattice distortions, Huang scattering, ... should be measured at large values of $|\mathbf{H}|$. TDS