scribed in terms of a best phase and figure of merit (Blow & Rossmann, 1961) or by Hendrickson–Lattman coefficients (Hendrickson & Lattman, 1970). In order to estimate a unimodal probability distribution for the modified phase, some estimate of the associated error must be made; this is usually achieved using the Sim weighting scheme (Sim, 1959).

Recombination with the initial phases assumes independence between the initial and modified phases and is a source of difficulties. However, in the absence of some form of phase constraint, most density-modification constraints are too weak to guarantee convergence to a reasonable solution. The exception is when high-order NCS is present; in this case, the combination of NCS and observed amplitudes is sufficient to determine the phases (Chapman *et al.*, 1992; Tsao *et al.*, 1992), and phase combination may be omitted; however, weighting of the phases is still necessary. In this case, it is also possible to restore missing reflections in both amplitude and phase.

15.1.4.1. *Sim and σ_a weighting*

The phase probability distribution for the density-modified phase is conventionally generated under assumptions that were made for the combination of a partial atomic model with experimental data. It assumes that the calculated amplitudes and phases arise from a density map in which some atoms are present and correctly positioned, and the remainder are completely absent (Sim, 1959). Thus, the difference between the true structure factor and the calculated value must be the effective structure factor due to the missing density alone. If the phase of this quantity is random and the amplitude is drawn from a Wilson distribution (Wilson, 1949), the following expression is obtained:

$$P_{\rm mod}(\varphi) = \exp[A\cos\varphi + B\sin\varphi], \qquad (15.1.4.2)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A &= X\cos\varphi_{\rm exp} \\ B &= X\sin\varphi_{\rm exp} \end{aligned} \qquad (15.1.4.3)$$

and

$$X = 2|F_{\rm exp}||F_{\rm mod}|/\Sigma_Q, \qquad (15.1.4.4)$$

where Σ_Q is the variance parameter in the Wilson distribution for the missing part of the structure. The figure of merit, w, can be derived from

$$w = I_1(X)/I_0(X), \qquad (15.1.4.5)$$

where I_0 and I_1 are zero- and first-order modified Bessel functions. A similar argument follows for centric reflections.

The error estimate for the phase depends on the effective amount of missing structure that is estimated on the basis of the agreement of the modified amplitudes with their measured values, where Σ_Q may be estimated by a number of means, for example (Bricogne, 1976),

$$\Sigma_Q = \langle |F_{\rm obs}|^2 - |F_{\rm mod}|^2 \rangle, \qquad (15.1.4.6)$$

where the average is normally taken over all reflections at a particular resolution. A more sophisticated approach is the σ_a method of Read (1986), which allows for errors in the atomic model and has also been used in density modification (Chapter 15.2).

Although these approaches have been applied with some success, the assumption in equation (15.1.4.1) that the density-modified amplitudes and phases are independent of the initial values is invalid. Since the density constraints are typically underdetermined, it is possible to achieve an arbitrarily good agreement between the model amplitudes and their observed values without improving the phases. As a result, phase weights from density modification are typically overestimated.

This problem has traditionally been addressed by limiting the number of cycles of density modification in which weakly phased reflections are included. Typically, density modification is started with only some subset of the data, such as those reflections well phased from MIR data. Only these reflections are included in the phase recombination, with other reflections set to zero. As the calculation progresses, more reflections are introduced until all the data are included. The figures of merit of reflections that undergo fewer cycles of phase recombination will be correspondingly smaller (*e.g.* Leslie, 1987; Zhang & Main, 1990*a*). In averaging calculations where considerable phase information is available from high-order NCS, it is still typically necessary to perform phase extension over hundreds of cycles and to add a very thin resolution shell of new reflections at each cycle.

The phases and figure of merit generated from density modification are more suited to the calculation of weighted F_o maps than $2mF_o - F_c$ maps. The $2mF_o - F_c$ map is designed to aid the structure completion from a partial model (Main, 1979). The $2mF_o - F_c$ map will restore features missing from the current model at full weight if the following conditions are fulfilled. First, the model phases must be close to their true values. Secondly, the difference between the model and observed amplitudes is a good indicator of the phase error and the difference between the calculated and observed amplitudes decreases as the phases approach their true values. Neither of these assumptions are necessarily true for density modification, since it may be applied to very poor maps with almost random phases, and under most density-modification schemes the structure-factor amplitudes may be over-fitted to the observed values.

15.1.4.2. *Reflection omit*

The modified map may be made more independent of the original map, as was assumed when multiplying the phase probability distributions in equation (15.1.4.1), through a reciprocal-space analogue of the omit map, the reflection-omit method.

The reflections are divided into (typically 10 or 20) sets and density-modification calculations are performed, excluding each set in turn from the calculation of the starting map, in a manner similar to a free-*R*-value calculation (Brünger, 1992). Density modification is applied to each map in turn, and the modified reflections from each of the free sets are combined to give a new, complete data set. This data set should be less dependent on the original amplitudes; therefore, the amplitudes may be expected to give a better indication of the quality of the modified phases.

The resulting maps obtained using solvent flattening and/or histogram matching are dramatically improved using the reflection-omit method (Cowtan & Main, 1996). In the case of averaging calculations, however, the reflection-omit approach makes little difference, since omitted reflections tend to be restored through noncrystallographic symmetry relationships to other regions of reciprocal space. It is possible that further improvements may be achieved by selecting reflection sets that approximately obey the NCS relationships.

15.1.4.3. *The γ correction and solvent flipping*

Abrahams & Leslie (1996) have shown that solvent flipping is dramatically more effective as a density modification than solvent flattening. This may be shown to be theoretically equivalent to performing a reflection-omit calculation for each reflection individually (Abrahams, 1997).

Solvent flattening is represented in reciprocal space by convolution of the structure factors with a function, $G(\mathbf{h})$, as

references