CRYSTAL STRUCTURES OF

CsCH₃SO₃, LiN₂H₅SO₄, AND K₂Cr₂O₇

THE CRYSTAL STRUCTURES

OF CsCH₃SO₃, LiN₂H₅SO₄, AND K₂Cr₂O₇

Ву

JAMES KENNETH BRANDON, B. Sc.

A Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

McMaster University

October 1967

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (1967) (Physics)

McMASTER UNIVERSITY Hamilton, Canada

TITLE: The Crystal Structures of CsCH₃SO₃, LiN₂H₅SO₄, and K₂Cr₂O₇

AUTHOR: James Kenneth Brandon, B.Sc. (McMaster University) SUPERVISOR: Dr. I. D. Brown

NUMBER OF PAGES: xi, 175

SCOPE AND CONTENTS: X-ray diffraction experiments have been used to determine the structures of cesium methylsulfonate $(CsCH_3SO_3)$, lithium hydrazinium sulfate $(LiN_2H_5SO_4)$ above $160^{\circ}C$, and triclinic potassium dichromate $(K_2Cr_2O_7)$. The solved $CsCH_3SO_3$ structure is compared with $BaSO_4$ and the $CH_3SO_3^{-1}$ ion stereochemistry is discussed in terms of a current theory of bonding for such groups. The previously known structure of room temperature ferroelectric LiN2H5SO4 has received additional refinement and a comparison is made with the structure determined above 160°C. The symmetry and structure found for K₂Cr₂O₇ are compared with similar compounds and predictions are given for the yet unsolved structures of other K2Cr207 phases. The first accurate data for the Cr_{207}^{-2} ion stereochemistry is presented. This ion is compared to similar ones, and the possibility of extending a bonding theory to such ions involving chromium is discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author expresses thanks to Dr. I. D. Brown for his encouragement, advice, and criticism so kindly offered during his supervision of this research. The author is also grateful to other members of the crystallography group, especially to Dr. C. Calvo for useful discussions, and to fellow graduate students for their contributions to the pool of crystallographic computer programs.

The author is grateful to the Ontario Government and the National Research Council of Canada for personal financial support.

(iii)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
1.	INTRODUCTION	. 1
2.	THEORY	3
	2.1 Introduction	- 3
	2.2 Crystal Structure Determination	3
	2.3 Least Squares Refinement of Structure Parameter	ers 10
3.	THE CRYSTAL STRUCTURE OF CESIUM METHYLSULFONATE	16
	3.1 Introduction	16
	3.2 Experimental	17
	3.2 A Sample Preparation	17
	3.2 B Crystal Data	17
	3.2 C Intensity Data	18
	3.3 Structure Determination and Refinement	20
	3.3 A Solution in the [010] Projection	20
	3.3 B Refinement of Trial Three Dimensional Structures	23
	3.3 C Tests for the Correct Space Group	26
	3.3 D Possible Hydrogen Positions	27
	3.4 Description of the Structure	31
	3.5 Discussion and Conclusions	. 38
	3.5 A Comparison of $CsCH_3SO_4$ and $BaSO_4$	38
	3.5 B Possibility of Hydrogen Bonding	43
	3.5 C Bondlength Errors and Thermal Correction	ons 44

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

				Pa	age
		3.5	D	The Methylsulfonate Ion	46
	i	3.5	E	Comparison of the CH ₃ SO ₃ ⁻¹ Ion and a Related Series	48
4.	STRU SULI	JCTUF FATE	RAL	INVESTIGATIONS ON LITHIUM HYDRAZINIUM	52
	4.1	Intr	ođi	lction	52
		4.1	Α	Literature Survey	52
		4.1	в	Description of the Structure	54
		4.1	C	Possible Ferroelectric Mechanisms	57
	• •	4.1	D	Difficulties with Mechanisms Assigned to LiHzS	58
		4.1	Е	Further X-ray Analysis	62
	4.2	Cont Stru	inu Ictu	led Refinements of Room Temperature lres	63
		4.2	Α	Description and Comparison of Continued Refinements	63
		4.2	в	Discussion of Continued Refinements	67
		4.2	С	Analysis of Anisotropic Temperature Factors	68
		4.2	D	Hydrogen Positions	71
	4.3	Stru	icti	re of High Temperature LiN ₂ H ₅ SO ₄	73
		4.3	A	Experimental	73
		4.3	в	Structure Refinement	76
•		4.3	С	Conclusions from High Temperature Analysis	89
		4.3	D	Discussion of Experimental Difficulties and Possible Improvements	90

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

				Page
5.	THE DIC	CRYSTA HROMATE	L STRUCTURE OF TRICLINIC POTASSIUM	93
	5.1	Introd	uction	93
	5.2	Experi	mental	95
		5.2 A	General Crystal Data	95
		5.2 B	Intensity Data	96
		5.2 C	Attempts to Determine Space Group by Direct Experiment	100
	5.3	Solutio	on and Refinement of the Structure	102
	5.4	Descri	ption of the Structure	117
		5.4 A	Structure of the Dichromate Ions	117
		5.4 B	Ionic Packing to Form the Structure	121
		5.4 C	Structural Environments	127
		5.4 D	Anisotropic Thermal Parameter Analysis	129
	5.5	Discuss	sion and Conclusions	129
		5.5 A	Comparison of Cell Constants and Space Groups for Related Structures	129
		5.5 B	Relation to the Monoclinic C2/c Structures	135
	·	5.5 C	Speculation on the Structures of Other K ₂ Cr ₂ O ₇ Phases	148
		5.5 D	Discussion of the Dichromate Ion	151
6.	SUM	MARY		160
API	PEND	ICES		164
	I	The Sca Symmetr	attering Factor for a Spherically ric Atom Rotating About an Axis	164

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Page

II	Observed LiN2H5	SO4 Structure	Factor Data	· 166
	of Van den Hende	and Boutin		
		· • · · · ·		

III Verification of a Result Used in Section 5.3168BIBLIOGRAPHY171

LIST OF FIGURES

rigure no.		rage
3-1	Sharpened Patterson function projection down [010]	22
3-2	Initial electron density function projection down [010]	24
3-3	Final difference electron density function projection down [010]	28
3-4	Structure of cesium methylsulfonate viewed down [010]	33
3-5	The structures of (a) cesium methylsulfonate and (b) barium sulfate projected down [010]	34
3-6	Environment of a cesium ion in cesium methylsulfonate	36
3-7	Environment of a carbon atom in cesium methylsulfonate	37
3-8	The structure of the methylsulfonate ion shown in the idealized symmetry C _{3v}	47
4-1	[001] projection of LiHzS structure	55
4-2	Two alternative configurations for an ordered series of hydrogen bonds linking the hydrazinium ions: (a) $N - H \cdot \cdot N$ directed toward - <u>c</u> ; (b) $N - H \cdot \cdot N$ directed toward + <u>c</u>	56
4-3	Observed atom shifts in [001] projection between room temperature positions (dots) and high temperature positions (crosses)	88
5-1	Characteristic habit of triclinic potassium dichromate crystals	97
5-2	[001] projection of Patterson function for triclinic K2 ^{Cr20} 7	103

(viii)

LIST OF FIGURES (Continued)

Figure No.		Page
5-3	Side and end views for the two crystal- lographically distinct dichromate ions	118
5-4	Structure of triclinic K ₂ Cr ₂ O ₇ projected down [001]	122
5-5	Schematic diagram showing a row formed by potassium and dichromate ions	124
5-6	Structure of triclinic K ₂ Cr ₂ O ₇ projected (a) down [001]; and (b) down [010]	126
5-7	Space group comparison	136
5-8	Comparison of C2/c and PI structures (a) C2/c down <u>c</u> , (b) C2/c down <u>b</u> , (c) PI down <u>c</u> , (d) PI down <u>b</u>	137'
5-9	Comparison of C2/c and Pl layers	141'
5-10	Comparison of C2/c and Pl adjacent layer packing	144

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.		Page
3-1	Crystal data for CsCH ₃ SO ₃	19
3-2	Atomic parameters for CsCH ₃ SO ₃ in space group Pnma	30
3-3	Observed and calculated structure factors (F_0 and F_c) in units of 1/10 electron per unit cell with estimated standard errors (σ) in F_0	32
3-4	Interatomic distances and angles in cesium methylsulfonate	39
3-5	Comparison of the interatomic distances and angles in SO_4^{2-} , $CH_3SO_3^{-}$, $(CH_3)_2SO_2$, $(CH_3)_3SO^+$, and the hypothetical $(CH_3)_4S^{2+}$	49
4-1	Structural parameters following continued refinements	65
4-2	Comparison of bond lengths and angles in the continued refinements	66
4-3	Principal axes analysis for anisotropic temperature factors	69
4-4	Measured intensity ratios $R \equiv (I_{HT}^{/}I_{RT}^{})$ with standard errors and room temperature intensities with standard errors	77
4-5	High temperature intensity data with standard errors	80
4-6	Comparison of HT and RT refinement parameters	84

(x)

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table No.		Page
4-7	Comparison of bond distances and angles from HT and RT refinements	85
4-8	Coordinate changes from RT to HT refined structure	86
4–9	Bond length and angle changes from RT to HT refined structure	87
5-1	Transformations among various unit cell conventions	98
5-2	Crystal data for triclinic K ₂ Cr ₂ O ₇	99
5-3	Refined PI coordinates and temperature factors compared to transformed values of Kuzmin et al.	108
5-4	Observed and calculated structure factors (F_{O} and F_{C}) in units of 1/10 electron per unit cell with estimated relative standard errors (σ) in F_{O}	111
5-5	Interatomic distances and angles for the two crystallographically distinct di- chromate ions	120
5-6	Oxygen environments of potassium ions	128
5-7	Oxygen-oxygen distances between dichromate ions	130
5-8	Principal axes analysis for anisotropic temperature factors	131
5-9	Comparison of cell constants and space groups	134
5-10	Comparison of angles for related anions involving sulfur and chromium	154

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

The crystal structures of the three materials to be described in this thesis are each of interest for a variety of reasons. These reasons will be outlined in detail in the separate chapters dealing with their structures. There is, however, one common feature of all three compounds which makes them of current interest. They all contain atomic groups in which either sulfur or chromium atoms are found in at least approximate tetrahedral coordinations.

The interest in this feature arises because Cruickshank (1) has described a mechanism for π -bonding among the atoms in tetrahedral groups where the central atom is one of Si, P, S, or Cl, and the surrounding atoms are O or N. This π -bonding occurs in addition to the basic σ -bond mechanism which arises through the tetrahedral arrangement of sp³ hybrid orbitals around the central atom (2, Ch.4). In the theory, the π -bonding orbitals are formed by the 3d $_{x^2-y^2}$ and 3d $_2$ orbitals of the central atom together with the appropriate p orbitals of the four surrounding atoms. If for any reason strict tetrahedral symmetry should be lost, it is then proposed that the 3d_{xy}, 3d_{yz}, and 3d_{xz} orbitals can also add to the π -bonding strength. Cruickshank also discusses the

distortions from tetrahedral symmetry to be expected when some of the surrounding atoms are not suited to take part in any π -bonding. This is the case for the methylsulfonate ion in CsCH₃SO₃ where a methyl group has replaced one of the oxygen atoms of a sulfate ion. LiN2H5SO4 contains the sulfate ion itself, and Cruickshank has considered this ion as a basic example in developing his theory of π -bonding. Because sulfur and chromium are chemically similar and because they both can be found with tetrahedral oxygen coordinations, the dichromate ion $\operatorname{Cr}_2 \operatorname{O}_7^{-2}$ in potassium dichromate might be expected to be similar to the pyrosulfate ion $S_2 O_7^{-2}$ (3). Since much of the $S_2 O_7^{-2}$ ion stereochemistry can be accounted for (1) on the π -bonding theory, a comparison with the $\operatorname{Cr}_2 \operatorname{O}_7^{-2}$ ion ought to indicate experimentally the extent to which the theory is applicable when chromium is the central atom of a distorted oxygen tetrahedron.

Further discussion of the *m*-bonding theory will be postponed to later chapters where the details arise in explaining some experimental observations.

CHAPTER 2 THEORY

2.1 Introduction

The use of x-ray diffraction as a tool to investigate the arrangement of atoms in a crystal dates back to 1912 when an experiment suggested by P. M. Laue demonstrated that x-rays could be diffracted by the three dimensional periodic array of matter in a crystal. Since that date, theory and experimental techniques have been developed to a state far superior to that available when the first few simple crystal structures were determined. Today's students of crystallography are fortunate to have available a large number of reference works and texts which describe the theory and techniques of x-ray diffraction and crystal structure analysis (4)-(12). Therefore this present discussion will only outline very briefly the methods used. A relatively complete description is presented for the least squares refinement techniques.

2.2 Crystal Structure Determination

In single crystal x-ray diffraction experiments, a monochromatic x-ray beam interacts with the electrons in a crystal and is scattered by them. Since the electrons are concentrated mainly around the nuclei of the atoms which comprise the crystal, the scattering can be considered to arise from atoms and can be described in terms of atomic

scattering factors (7, Ch.3) for the different species of atom present.

Since the arrangement of atoms in a crystal is periodic, interference of the scattered x-rays produces diffracted beams in well defined directions. From the geometry of diffraction patterns, as detected on photographic film by special x-ray cameras, one can determine the unit cell parameters $\underline{a} \ \underline{b} \ \underline{c} \ \alpha \ \beta \ \gamma$ of the crystal lattice. The concepts of the reciprocal lattice (with unit cell parameters $\underline{a}^* \ \underline{b}^* \ \underline{c}^* \ \alpha^* \ \beta^* \ \gamma^*$) (7, Ch.1) and the Ewald sphere construction (7, Ch.1) are valuable in analysing the geometry of these diffracted beam or reflection a set of Miller indices (hk%) corresponding to the set of lattice planes which have produced the reflections (13, Ch.1).

From the symmetry of the diffraction patterns and from systematic absences (8, Ch.2) one can determine much about the space group symmetry of the unit cell. The relative integrated intensities of the diffracted beams contain part of the data necessary to determine the arrangement of atoms within the unit cell. These intensities I(hkl) are real numbers and are related to the magnitudes of the structure factors. The structure factors are complex numbers of the form F(hkl) = A(hkl) + i B(hkl) where A and i B are the real and imaginary parts of F and $\emptyset = \tan^{-1} \frac{B}{A}$ is the phase of the structure factor. If both the magnitude and phase of

each structure factor were known, it would be possible to determine the periodic electron density $\rho(x,y,z)$ in the unit cell according to the three dimensional Fourier series (8,Ch.1)

 $\rho(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{z}) = \frac{1}{\nabla} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} F(\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}) \exp\{-2\pi \mathbf{i}(\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{k}\mathbf{y} + \mathbf{k}\mathbf{z})\} [2-1]$

where x,y,z are fractional coordinates along $\underline{a} \ \underline{b} \ \underline{c}$ and V is the unit cell volume.

Simplifications of [2-1] are possible in which projections of electron density are calculated. For example a projection down b of the unit cell electron density is

 $\rho(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = \frac{1}{A'} \sum_{\substack{k=-\infty \\ h \ k=-\infty}}^{+\infty} F(h0k) \exp\{-2\pi i(h\mathbf{x} + k\mathbf{z})\}$ [2-2] where A' is the area of the unit cell projection.

A direct calculation of ρ by [2-1] or [2-2] is not possible since the phases of the structure factors F(hkl) are not measurable in diffraction experiments. This lack of knowledge is called the phase problem of crystallography. If the structure is centrosymmetric, the imaginary part of the structure factor is identically zero and the phase problem reduces to a problem of determining the sign of A.

It is common practice to devise a model for the structure and calculate the magnitudes and phases of the structure factors for this model. These complex numbers F_{c} (hkl) usually involve a scale factor K and a temperature factor T which allows $|F_{c}(hkl)|$ to be fitted to the observed

 $F_{O}(hkl)$. Frequently 1/K is applied to the set $F_{O}(hkl)$.

$$F_{c}(hkl) = K \sum_{i=1}^{N} f_{i}(hkl) T_{i}(hkl) \exp 2\pi i (hx_{i} + ky_{i} + lz_{i}) [2-3]$$

where f_i(hkl) is the atomic scattering factor of atom i (7,Ch.3)
T_i(hkl) is the Debye Waller temperature factor (7, Ch.5)
i is an index running over the N atoms in a unit cell

and $x_i y_i z_i$ are the fractional coordinates of atom i.

The temperature factor

ain²

$$\mathbf{F}_{i} = \exp \left\{-B_{i} \frac{\sin^{2} \Theta}{\lambda^{2}}\right\} \qquad [2-4]$$

adjusts the calculated structure factors to account for the thermal motion of the atoms about their mean positions. B_i is an adjustable parameter for each atom and can be related to an isotropic root mean square displacement $\{\overline{u_i^2}\}^{1/2}$ of atom i according to (7, Ch.5)

$$B_{i} = 8\pi^{2} \frac{u_{i}^{2}}{u_{i}^{2}} . \qquad [2-5]$$

Since B
$$\frac{5110}{\lambda^2} = \frac{1}{4} \{h^2 a^2 + k^2 b^2 + l^2 c^2 + 2hka^2 b^2 \cos \gamma + 2hka^2 c^2 \cos \beta^2 + 2kkb^2 c^2 \cos \alpha^2 \}$$

an anisotropic temperature factor conveniently takes the form of an ellipsoid according to $T = \exp \{\beta_{11}h^{2} + \beta_{22}k^{2} + \beta_{33}k^{2} + 2\beta_{12}hk + 2\beta_{13}hk + 2\beta_{23}kk\} [2-6]$ with six adjustable thermal parameters $\beta_{11} = \beta_{22} = \beta_{33} = \beta_{12} = \beta_{13}$

and β_{23} . The directions and magnitudes of the three

principal axes of these ellipsoids can be found and the root mean square displacements along these three perpendicular directions can be calculated analogously to [2-5].

If the magnitudes $|F_{c}(hkl)|$ calculated by eqn [2-3] for the model are similar to the experimental set $F_{o}(hkl)$, then the model is considered a reasonable approximation of the true structure. The phases of the calculated $F_{c}(hkl)$ may then be used with the observed magnitudes $F_{o}(hkl)$ to calculate an electron density function. A plot of this function or one of its projections usually suggests adjustments which will improve the model, and the whole procedure can be repeated.

A difference electron density function uses the coefficients $F_0(hkl) - F_c(hkl)$ in place of F (hkl) in eqn [2-1], with $F_0(hkl)$ taking the calculated phases of $F_c(hkl)$ when their magnitudes are reasonably similar. This function is a more sensitive indicator of the changes necessary to improve the model structure.

At each stage one can examine how well the proposed model structure fits the observed data by calculating an agreement index R

$$R = \left[\frac{\Sigma \omega \left(|F_{O}(hk\ell)| - |F_{C}(hk\ell)|\right)^{2}}{\Sigma \omega |F_{O}(hk\ell)|^{2}}\right]$$
[2-7]

where the summations are over all reflections (hkl) and ω is a weighting factor for each reflection customarily taken as

 $1/\sigma^2$, where σ is the estimated standard error for $F_o(hkl)$. A decreasing R value indicates an improved fit between observed and calculated structure amplitudes.

A common method of initially devising a model structure is that introduced by Patterson (14) where the squares of the experimental diffraction amplitudes are used as coefficients in a Fourier series

 $P(u,v,w) = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{h=0}^{+\infty} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{+\infty} |F_0(hkl)|^2 \exp \left\{-2\pi i (hu + kv + lw)\right\} [2-8]$ where P(u,v,w) is the Patterson function at u,v,w and u,v,ware fractional coordinates along <u>a</u> <u>b</u> <u>c</u>. This Patterson function may be shown (8,Ch.1) to be equal to

$$\begin{array}{c} 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \\ V \quad \int \quad \int \quad \rho(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \quad \rho(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{w}) \quad \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} \quad \mathrm{d}\mathbf{y} \quad \mathrm{d}\mathbf{z} \\ 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \end{array}$$

It will therefore have large values at positions $u\underline{a} + v\underline{b} + w\underline{c}$ corresponding to vectors in the unit cell connecting regions of large electron density. From such vector maps a model structure can often be found (10). For projections, say down b, the Patterson function reduces to the form

 $P(u,w) = \frac{1}{A'} \sum_{\substack{k=-\infty \\ h \ k=-\infty}}^{+\infty} |F_0(h0l)|^2 \exp\{-2\pi i(hu + lw)\}$ [2-9]

where A' is the area of the unit cell projection.

To obtain a set of experimental structure amplitudes $F_0(hkl)$ from the observed intensities I(hkl), it is necessary to apply some geometrical correction factors. These are:

- The Lorentz correction which compensates for variations in the time periods for which different crystal planes are moving through their reflecting positions. This factor does depend on camera geometry.
- II) The polarization correction which compensates for the fact that different polarization components of the incident beam are not scattered equally.

Corrections I and II are commonly seen combined for a given x-ray camera technique. The squares of the experimental structure amplitudes are $|F_0(hkl)|^2 \propto \frac{1}{Lp} I(hkl)$ where L is the Lorentz factor, and p is the polarization factor. For unpolarized incident radiation $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{2}{1 + \cos^2 20}$ (11,Ch.7) where 0 is the Bragg scattering angle of the reflection. The Lorentz factor for various camera geometries is quoted in reference (11,ch.7).

There is another group of effects for which corrections may be necessary. These include absorption, primary extinction and secondary extinction (11,Ch.8). Usually one arranges by experimental design that these effects are small compared to the expected random errors of intensity measurements. These effects are therefore frequently ignored, at least during the preliminary stages of a structure determination.

2.3 Least Squares Refinement of Structure Parameters

With large memory high speed computers available, a convenient procedure for refining a promising model structure is a least squares analysis. In this approach, one adjusts the parameters in the model to minimize the sum of the squares of the differences between the observed and calculated structure factors. Since the observed values usually contain certain unavoidable inaccuracies, and since these are usually random in nature, it is necessary in using a least squares refinement to provide a large overdeterminacy of observed data.

The steps involved in a crystallographic least squares refinement process will now be described. For a given model a set of structure factors is calculated according to the function f, one for each measured reflection hkt.

i.e.
$$F_{c}(\underline{h}) = f(\underline{h}, p_{i})$$

where the vector notation <u>h</u> denotes the set of indices hkl of the reflection and where p_i are the parameters of the model. The set p_i , i = 1 N, contain the x,y,z, β_{11} , β_{22} , β_{33} , β_{12} , β_{13} , β_{23} , and a multiplicity factor for each atom. In addition, layer scaling constants are also considered as adjustable parameters and may be included in the p_i list. The six anisotropic β 's may be replaced by one parameter B for isotropic temperature factor refinement.

The parameters in the model structure are assumed to have approximately correct values given by p_i whereas the true values are considered to be the set $p_i + \Delta p_i$. In a linear approximation using the first two terms of a Taylor series expansion one has the relation

$$f(p_i + \Delta p_i) \simeq f(p_i) + \sum_{i} \Delta p_i \frac{\partial f(p_i)}{\partial p_i}$$

The discrepancy between the structure factors calculated from the true parameters and from the approximate set is then

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{T}} \mathbf{F}(\underline{\mathbf{h}}) = |\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{T}}(\underline{\mathbf{h}})| - |\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{C}}(\underline{\mathbf{h}})|$$

$$= |F_{c}(\underline{h})| + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \{\Delta p_{i} \frac{\partial |F_{c}(\underline{h})|}{\partial p_{i}}\} - |F_{c}(\underline{h})|$$
$$\Delta_{T}F(\underline{h}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \{\Delta p_{i} \frac{\partial |F_{c}(\underline{h})|}{\partial p_{i}}\}.$$

or

Ideally if one knew exact values for $|F_0| - |F_c|$ these could be substituted into the left hand side and one could solve any set of N such equations for the N unknown Δp_i values: However if the measurements of $|F_0(\underline{h})|$ are subject to random errors, each may be considered to be in discrepancy from $F_{\pi}(\underline{h})$ by an amount $E(\underline{h})$

$$\mathbf{E}(\underline{\mathbf{h}}) = |\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{T}}(\underline{\mathbf{h}})| - |\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{O}}(\underline{\mathbf{h}})| .$$

Therefore we have in the actual situation

$$\Delta_{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{F}(\underline{\mathbf{h}}) = |\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{O}}(\underline{\mathbf{h}})| - |\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{O}}(\underline{\mathbf{h}})| + \mathbf{E}(\underline{\mathbf{h}})|.$$

Hence

$$\mathbf{E}(\underline{\mathbf{h}}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{N} & \frac{\partial |\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{C}}(\underline{\mathbf{h}})|}{\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \Delta \mathbf{p}_{i}} & \frac{\partial |\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{C}}(\underline{\mathbf{h}})|}{\partial \mathbf{p}_{i}} \end{bmatrix} - |\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{O}}(\underline{\mathbf{h}})| + ||\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{C}}(\underline{\mathbf{h}})| .$$

Using the usual principle of least squares one requires for a sufficiently large number of reflections that the sum of the squares of the values $E(\underline{h})$ should be a minimum, i.e. that $\Sigma \omega(h) E^2(h)$

$$= \sum_{\underline{h}}^{\underline{h}} \omega(\underline{h}) \left[\begin{cases} N & \partial P_{\underline{i}} \frac{\partial |F_{\underline{c}}(\underline{h})|}{\partial P_{\underline{i}}} \\ \underline{i} = 1 \end{cases}^{\underline{i}} - |F_{\underline{o}}(\underline{h})| + |F_{\underline{c}}(\underline{h})| \end{cases} \right]^{2}$$

be minimized. Here $\omega(\underline{h})$ is a factor used to weight the individual reflections.

This function is a minimum when its N first order partial derivatives with respect to each of the p_i parameters are all zero.

i.e.
$$\frac{\partial}{\partial p_i}, \{ \sum_{\underline{h}} \omega(\underline{h}) \in \mathbb{E}^2(\underline{h}) \} = 0 \text{ for all } i' = 1...N ,$$

i.e. $0 = \sum_{\underline{h}} \omega(\underline{h}) \begin{bmatrix} 2\left[\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \Delta p_{i} \frac{\partial |F_{c}(\underline{h})|}{\partial p_{i}}\right\} - |F_{o}(\underline{h})| + |F_{c}(\underline{h})|\right] \\ \partial |F_{o}(\underline{h})| \end{bmatrix}$

$$\frac{\partial |F_{c}(\underline{h})|}{\partial p_{i'}} \qquad i' = 1...N$$
 using the fact that second order derivatives

 $\frac{\partial^2 |F(\underline{h})|}{\partial p_i, \partial p_i} \quad dis-$

appear in the linear approximation.

These N equations may be rewritten to give

$$\sum_{\underline{\mathbf{h}}} \omega(\underline{\mathbf{h}}) \left\{ \sum_{\underline{\mathbf{i}}=1}^{\mathbf{N}} \Delta \mathbf{p}_{\underline{\mathbf{i}}} \frac{\partial |\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{c}}(\underline{\mathbf{h}})|}{\partial \mathbf{p}_{\underline{\mathbf{i}}}} \right\} \frac{\partial |\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{c}}(\underline{\mathbf{h}})|}{\partial \mathbf{p}_{\underline{\mathbf{i}}}'}$$

$$= \sum_{\underline{\mathbf{h}}} \omega(\underline{\mathbf{h}}) \left\{ |\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{0}}(\underline{\mathbf{h}})| - |\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{c}}(\underline{\mathbf{h}})| \right\} \frac{\partial |\mathbf{F}(\underline{\mathbf{h}})|}{\partial \mathbf{p}_{\underline{\mathbf{i}}}'}$$

or

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} \left\{ \sum_{\underline{h}} \omega(\underline{h}) \right\} \frac{\partial |F_{\underline{C}}(\underline{h})|}{\partial p_{\underline{i}}} \frac{\partial |F_{\underline{C}}(\underline{h})|}{\partial p_{\underline{i}}} \Delta p_{\underline{i}}$$

$$= \sum_{\underline{h}} \omega(\underline{h}) \Delta F(\underline{h}) \frac{\partial |F_{c}(\underline{h})|}{\partial p_{i}} \qquad i' = \dots N$$

where $\Delta F(\underline{h}) \equiv |F_{O}(\underline{h})| - |F_{C}(\underline{h})|$. These are N linear equations in the N unknowns $\Delta p_{\underline{i}}$ i = 1,...N. In matrix notation these become

$$(A)_{N \times N} (\Delta P)_{N \times 1} = (B)_{N \times 1}$$

with matrix elements defined by

$$(A)_{ij} = \sum_{\underline{h}} \omega(\underline{h}) \quad \frac{\partial |F_{\underline{c}}(\underline{h})|}{\partial P_{\underline{i}}} \quad \frac{\partial |F_{\underline{c}}(\underline{h})|}{\partial P_{\underline{j}}}$$
$$(\Delta P)_{\underline{i}} = \Delta P_{\underline{i}}$$
$$(B)_{\underline{j}} = \sum_{\underline{h}} \omega(\underline{h}) \quad \Delta F(\underline{h}) \quad \frac{\partial |F_{\underline{c}}(\underline{h})|}{\partial P_{\underline{j}}}$$
for $i, j = 1 \dots N$.

Calculating A^{-1} , the inverse of the matrix A, one then uses matrix multiplication to solve for the matrix ΔP ,

 $\Delta P = A^{-1} A \Delta P = A^{-1} B$.

This yields directly the components of ΔP and hence the required adjustments for the set of approximate parameters in the model.

During least squares refinement, a calculation of estimated standard errors for the refined parameters p_i is possible. The formula applicable would normally be

$$p_{1}^{2} = \frac{\left\{\sum \omega(\underline{h}) \left[\Delta'F(\underline{h})\right]^{2}\right\} (\underline{A^{-1}})_{11}}{N_{u} - N}$$

where N_u is the number of reflections with non zero weight used during refinement, and Δ 'F(<u>h</u>) are the differences between observed structure factors and those calculated with the new parameters p_i + Δ p_i. Since these new structure factors are not usually calculated until a later refinement cycle, the $\sigma_{p_i}^2$ are approximated according to $\left\{\sum_{k} \omega(\underline{h}) \left[\Delta F(\underline{h})\right]^2 - \sum_{i,j} B_{i,j} \Delta p_{i,j}\right\} (A^{-1})_{ii}$

$$\sigma_{p_i}^2 \doteq \frac{h}{N_u - N}$$

From the definition of B_{i} , the correction term in this form can be seen to provide a valid approximation for Δ 'F(<u>h</u>) in terms of the values Δ F(<u>h</u>) available during the present cycle of refinement.

During refinement it is hoped that parameters to be simultaneously refined do not have large correlations between them. Large correlations between two parameters in a model structure imply that either or both of them may undergo a coupled adjustment in improving the least squares fit and are not strictly refining as independent variables. In this case there arises some uncertainty whether the proper adjustment to either parameter has been determined. Large correlations may also point out the unsuitable nature of the model and in some cases may even indicate the structure to be indeterminate. A relative measure of the strength of interaction between any two parameters p_i and p_j may be inspected from the C_{ij} element of the correlation matrix defined by

$$C_{ij} = \frac{[A^{-1}]_{ij}}{\{[A^{-1}]_{ii} \ [A^{-1}]_{jj}\}^{1/2}}$$

These elements are normalized to unity for i=j and one hopes that elements for $i\neq j$ in any refinement remain small fractions of unity.

CHAPTER 3 THE CRYSTAL STRUCTURE OF CESIUM METHYLSULFONATE

3.1 Introduction

The interest in cesium methylsulfonate $CsCH_3SO_3$ (hereafter abbreviated as CsMS), and specifically in the methylsulfonate ion, arises from a discussion by Cruickshank (1) about possible π -bonding between a central silicon, phosphorous, sulfur, or chlorine atom and surrounding oxygen or nitrogen atoms when these substances form a tetrahedral group. Cruickshank also considers the case where the four ligands are not all identical either in chemical species or position, and suggests what resulting distortions from tetrahedral symmetry might be expected. Since no bond lengths and angles have been determined for the methylsulfonate ion, study of this group is of value as an experimental test of Cruickshank's theories for an example where sulfur is the central atom.

In addition, a comparison of the CsMS structure to a similar one such as BaSO₄ points out differences in the two crystal structures attributable to the different stereochemistries of the methylsulfonate and sulfate groups.

3.2 Experimental

3.2 A Sample Preparation

Several samples containing cesium methylsulfonate crystals (CsMS) were supplied during the course of this work by Dr. E. A. Robinson of the University of Toronto. The crystals were prepared (15),(16^{*}) from cesium carbonate and an aqueous solution of methansulfonic acid. Equimolar quantities of the reagents were used and the solution evaporated nearly to dryness. The salt was filtered off and washed with methanol. It was dissolved in a small quantity of water and reprecipitated by addition of methanol. Recrystallization was from aqueous methanol.

The samples contained white amorphous lumps as well as a few colourless crystals of CsMS. As was discovered during x-ray investigations there were clear colourless crystals of cesium sulfate Cs₂SO₄ also present in the samples. However, the desired CsMS crystals could easily be distinguished from cesium sulfate by their x-ray diffraction patterns.

3.2 B Crystal Data

The colourless cesium methylsulfonate (CsMS) crystals were frequently needle shaped, elongated in the <u>b</u> direction. They were found to be deliquescent and in humid weather would often deteriorate before a full set of x-ray intensity

In this reference, the material is called "Caesium methanesulphonate".

photographs could be collected.

The unit cell parameters were measured from hk0 and 0kl precession camera photographs taken with Zr-filtered Mo-radiation ($\lambda_{MOK\alpha_1} = 0.70930$ Å (17)). The observed systematic absences were consistent with either the centrosymmetric Pnma (D_{2h}^{16}) or the noncentrosymmetric Pn2₁a (C_{2v}^9) space group. The structure analysis shows that the correct space group is probably Pnma. The density of CsMS crystals was measured by floatation in a density column of tetrabromoethane and trichloroethylene calibrated using crystals of CaF₂, CaCl₂ and NaCl. The measured density agrees with the value calculated assuming four formula units per unit cell. The crystal data are summarized in Table 3-1.

3.2 C Intensity Data

The crystal selected for x-ray intensity photographs was a rectangular parallelepiped with dimensions 0.07 x 0.15 x 0.07 mm elongated in the [010] direction. It was mounted externally on a capillary since the photographs were being taken during a season of low atmospheric humidity. Equi-inclination Weissenberg photographs of the layers hkl k = 0,1,2,3,4, and 5 were taken using Ni-filtered Cu-radiation ($\lambda_{CuK\alpha} = 1.54184 \text{ Å} (17)$). Each layer was recorded on five photographs of varying exposure times ($\frac{1}{3}$, 1, 3, 9 and 27 hours) and each film was developed under identical conditions. Collection of this many exposures TABLE 3-1

Crystal data for CsCH₃SO₃

System	Orthorhombic
Systemmatic absences	hk0 h = 2n + 1
	$0k\ell k + \ell = 2n + 1$
Space group	Pnma (D_{2b}^{16})
Cell constants	
a	9.526 ± 0.005 Å
b	6.264 ± 0.006 Å
C C	8.692 ± 0.008 Å
Unit cell volume	518.7 ± 0.7 Å3
Reciprocal cell constants	
a*	0.1046 [±] .0001 Å
b*	$0.1596 \stackrel{\pm}{=} .0002 \stackrel{\text{a}}{\text{A}} \stackrel{-1}{=}$
С*	0.1150 [±] .0001 Å-1
Density	
Measured	2.90 \pm 0.06 gm cm ⁻³
Calculated	2.920 \pm 0.004 gm cm ⁻³
Number of formula units per unit cell	4
X-ray absorption coefficients	$\begin{array}{ccc} MOK\alpha & 75.2 & cm^{-1} \\ CuK\alpha & 586. & cm^{-1} \end{array}$

per layer allowed easy measurement of the weakest and strongest reflections and also provided more than one independent intensity measurement which could be averaged for the majority of the reflections.

A lattice row template was used to index the Weissenberg films and the intensities were measured visually by comparison with a calibrated wedge film. The wedge was prepared by exposing a film to a diffracted beam of x-rays for successively longer time intervals, the film holder being displaced slightly between each exposure. Each intensity measurement was assigned a standard error which could be used for weighting the individual reflections during least squares refinement of the structure.

The intensities were then corrected for the Lorentz and polarization effects. The form of these corrections for the equi-inclination Weissenberg method is given in (11, Ch.7). No absorption corrections were attempted even though μ R for Cu radiation was about 2.0 (5, Table 5.3.5B). <u>3.3 Structure Determination and Refinement</u> 3.3 A Solution in the [010] Projection

For both of the possible space groups Pnma and Pn2₁a the projection down [010] is a centrosymmetric one having plane group symmetry pgg. A solution for the structure in this centrosymmetric projection using the h0% data was

attempted first. This projection was selected because the problem of determining the phases of the structure factors reduces to one of determining only the signs (+ or -) of the real part of each structure amplitude since the imaginary parts are identically zero. Also, since Z = 4 ($Z \equiv$ the number of formula units per unit cell) the Cs and S atoms are restricted to lie on mirror planes in Pnma and the orientation of the methylsulfonate group is similarly restricted by the mirror planes perpendicular to [010]. Hence a solved [010] projection could possibly distinguish the correct space group for the observed methylsulfonate group orientation.

The h0l observed structure amplitudes were used to calculate a Patterson function projection down [010], according to equation [2-9]. This function revealed probable positions for the large cesium atoms but little else, so a sharpened Patterson function (10, Ch.4) was calculated in order to increase the resolution. Figure 3-1 shows this sharpened Patterson function. It was solved by the method of superposition (8,Ch.7) to give the four Cs atoms and the four S atoms in the unit cell. With these proposed x and z atom coordinates and with a temperature factor and scale factor provided by Wilson's method (8, Ch.4), structure factors $F_{c}(h0l)$ were calculated according to eqn.[2-3]. These were found to be close



FIGURE. 3-1

Sharpened Patterson Function Projection Down [010]. Contours are Drawn at Equal Intervals in Arbitrary Units.

enough to the observed structure factor magnitudes $|F_{0}(h0l)|$ to allow a [010] electron density projection to be calculated according to eqn.[2-2]. The signs of the $F_{0}(h0l)$ were considered to be known if $|F_{C}(h0l)|$ was not less than $\frac{1}{2}$ $|F_{0}(h0l)|$.

This electron density function, shown in Figure 3-2, revealed three possible positions close to the S atom for the O and C atoms. Further Fourier syntheses indicated one of these positions to be the C atom since it was at least 1.7 Å from the S atom and S-O distances were not expected to be this long. One of the two remaining positions did not show spherical contours and this was interpreted to be two O atoms which were partially superposed in this projection. The third position was interpreted to be the remaining O atom. No H atom positions could be seen in any of these initial electron density projections.

3.3 B Refinement of Trial Three Dimensional Structures

Since there was some doubt that two of the O atoms overlapped exactly in the [010] projection, it was proposed that there was no mirror plane through the methylsulfonate group perpendicular to [010] and that the noncentrosymmetric space group Pn2₁ a should be used for a trial three dimensional structure If Pnma should



FIGURE 3-2

Initial Electron Density Function Projection Down [010]. Contours are Drawn at Equal Intervals in Arbitrary Units. Dashed Lines Denote Negative Contours.
be the true space group then the Pn2₁a refinement should indicate this fact by generating the mirror plane. A trial three dimensional structure was obtained by calculating appropriate y coordinates for a possible structure, making use of the known x and z values. This trial structure was used as a starting point for least squares refinement.

The least squares program allowed adjustment of x, y, z and six anisotropic temperature factor components for each atom along with scale factors for each of the layers of data. In Pn2, a the y coordinate of one atom must be chosen arbitrarily and so the Cs atom was given the value $y = \frac{1}{4}$ corresponding to its constrained value in Pnma space group. After a few refinement cycles the atom positions in the Pn2, a model were not very much different from those required by the centrosymmetric Pnma space group. Hence the structure was also refined in Pnma. The best weighted agreement index, R as defined by eqn. [2-7], obtainable in Pnma was 0.1206 compared to 0.1199 in Pn2, a. Hence there was not very much difference in the fits to the observed data given by these two models. Since Pnma used 37 variable parameters compared to 59 for $Pn2_1a$, one would normally prefer the Pnma model which uses fewer variables to obtain a nearly equivalent fit. However the real question at this point seemed to be whether small deviations from a

centrosymmetric structure actually exist in CSMS.

3.3 °C Tests for the Correct Space Group

An attempt to detect piezoelectricity was made in order to investigate further the question of the correct space group. The presence of a piezoelectric effect would indicate that the noncentrosymmetric $Pn2_1$ a space group was correct. The equipment constructed for this purpose was essentially the transmission type piezoelectricity detector described by Blume (18) except that a commercial signal generator was used as the FM source with frequency modulation chosen as 1000 c.p.s. A differential input oscilloscope with sensitivity of 0.1 mv. was used to display the detector output. No piezoelectric resonances were observed in CsMS over the frequency range 1 x 10⁶ to 50 x 10⁶ c.p.s. The absence of an observable piezoelectric effect is consistent with either space group so these measurements failed to resolve the question.

Hamilton's tables for significance tests (19) on the crystallographic R factors were also used in an attempt to determine the correct space group. These significance tests indicate the statistical chance of error if one accepts an unrestrained model with a lower R factor in preference to a restrained model with larger R factor. Since the R factor ratio for the two refinements was small $(R(Pnma)/R(Pn2_1a) = 1.006)$, it was necessary to extend

the series of tables given by Hamilton to higher levels of significance. This was done using Hamilton's relation between the R factor ratio and the F table values (19, Eqn. 24), and Merrington and Thompson's relation (20) which gives the F values for significance levels greater than 0.5 in terms of those less than 0.5. Only the necessary table values were calculated corresponding to $R_{20,366,\alpha}$ for the significance levels $\alpha = 0.750$, 0.900, 0.950, 0.975, 0.990, and 0.995, and these were examined as a function of α . Since the observed ratio of 1.006 still lay below the lowest of these calculated values (1.010 calculated for $\alpha = 0.995$), there is statistically more than 99.5% chance of error if one excluded the Pnma refinement and proposed that only the Pn2, a refinement is correct. Hamilton's test therefore indicates a very remote chance of the space group being Pn2, a, and the rest of the discussion will be based on the structure refined in Pnma space group.

3.3 D Possible Hydrogen Positions

In an attempt to detect hydrogen atom positions, a difference electron density projection down [010] was calculated. The Fourier coefficients used were the differences between the observed h01 structure factors and those calculated from parameters refined in Pnma with three dimensional data. The function is shown in Figure 3-3. The broken straight lines enclose regions in which



FIGURE 3-3

Final Difference Electron Density Function Projection Down [010]. Contours are Drawn at Equal Intervals in Arbitrary Units. Atom Positions Used to Calculate F are Shown. The Dotted Lines are Zero Contours and the Dashed Lines are Negative Contours. The Broken Straight Lines Enclose Regions in which H Atoms Might be Expected.

hydrogen peaks might be expected, assuming tetrahedral S-C-H angles and C-H bond lengths of 1.10 Å or less. Some density is found in this region, but the peaks are smaller than other difference Fourier peaks in this projection and it would be unwise to draw any conclusions in such circumstances.

Another attempt to detect hydrogen atoms was made by including them in the model at likely positions and examining any improvement in the agreement between calculated and observed structure factors. Three hydrogen atoms were included in the model assuming that they were part of a rotating methyl group. The structure factor contribution for each such atom may be calculated like any other atom in eqn. [2-3] but with a modified atomic scattering factor (see Appendix I). The rotating hydrogen atoms were constrained to make tetrahedral S-C-H angles and to have C-H distances of 1.10 Å (6, Table 4.2.3). The calculation was insensitive to this small addition of scattering matter as R only decreased by 0.001. Consequently from this analysis and from the [010] difference electron density, no hydrogen positions could be confirmed in this x-ray analysis.

Table 3-2 gives the final atomic coordinates and anisotropic temperature factors in space group Pnma together with the standard errors calculated during the least squares refinement.

TABLE 3-2

Atomic parameters for CsCH₃SO₃ in space group Pnma. (Figures in parantheses are the standard errors in the last digits quoted.)

Atom	Multiplicity and site [†]	x			Y	Z	· · · ·
Cs	4(c)	0.0610	(2)		1/4	0.1324	(2)
S	4(c)	0.2740	(7)		3/4	0.2182	(7)
01	4 (c)	0.1366	(17)		3/4	0.1538	(22)
02	8 (d)	0.3015	(14)	0.5	5569 (25)	0.3072	(18)
С	4(c)	0.4015	(32)		3/4	0.0647	(.39)

	Te	mperature f	actor compor	nents*		
						· · · · ·
Atom	^β 11	^β 22	^β 33	β12	β13	β23
Cs	88 (2)	215 (7)	116 (2)	0	-10 (2)	0
S	63 (7)	224 (28)	84 (7)	0	-10 (6)	0
01	55 (18)	310 (80)	129 (30)	0	3 (18)	0
02	118 (18)	187 (55)	171 (22)	40 (22)	-21 (18)	97 (31)
с	97 (37)	623(165)	147 (42)	0	113 (37)	0
	•	2000 - A.	• • • • • • • • • • • •	• • • • • • • • • •		

*Anisotropic temperature factors appear in the structure factor calculations in the form $T = \exp[-10^{-4}(\beta_{11}h^2 + \beta_{22}k^2 + \beta_{33})^2 + 2\beta_{12}hk + 2\beta_{13}h\ell + 2\beta_{23}k\ell)].$ [†]Site symbol as defined for the space group Pnma in International Tables (4).

Table 3-3 presents the observed structure amplitudes F_o together with their estimated standard errors σ and the structure factors, F_c , calculated from the parameters of Table 3-2. The atomic scattering factors used throughout these calculations were taken from (6, Table 3.3.1A) for S ref. SXC-69, O ref. SX-8, C ref. SX-6, and H ref. Q-1; and from (6, Table 3.3.1B) for Cs.

3.4 Description of the Structure

Figure 3-4 shows the structure of one unit cell of cesium methylsulfonate (CsMS) projected down [010]. The two mirror planes perpendicular to b are at y = 1/4and y = 3/4. The n and a glide planes perpendicular to a and c respectively are shown by broken lines. The groups shown in heavy outline lie on the mirror plane at y = 3/4, while those in fainter outline are below on the mirror plane at y = 1/4. The oxygen atom O2 is situated below the mirror plane in each methylsulfonate group and is related to another oxygen atom by reflection in the mirror plane. 02 and 02' its mirror image, are superposed when viewed down [010] as in Fig. 3-4. By operation of the n and a glide plane symmetry elements on the atoms of any asymmetric unit, the complete unit cell and its neighbouring cells can be generated. Fig. 3-5(a) shows an extended diagram of the [010] projection. Here the anions have been drawn as projections of triangular pyramids with the carbon atoms marked as black circles. The

FC ۶c σ FC FC σ FC σ F C FØ. HK L, F2 765640761088547464707869881661189712881398554671116878812657274863956417700565796771747725210823094827761747474 217564494772274447298692929666323534348139855467111687881265727486395641770056579627117477252108230948277617474 217564494772274447298692929666323534481398554671116828812265727486395691747005657962711747725210823094827761277 60688488621412154102541028815533886702401793748688824407716855448230277733031888317844384773973102068574712824873897367324970853771220784789730232575504 \$\$*CO1*CN*91617576657175465065777466*517577665*545668555#1286705454545456554576602652475658680687671647141747464647589402706712 20000011 12345557871745578701234557812345578123455770123455120123455129123455578912345578901234557891234557891234557123455771234557701234557 246802173456789012012345678901121234567890101234567890101234567890112345678901 2345678123456701234512246

Observed and calculated structure factors (F_0 and F_c) in units of 1/10 electron per unit cell with estimated relative standard errors (σ) in F_0 . A minus sign following F_0 indicates an unobserved reflection; an asterisk indicates an unreliable F_0 measurement which was not used in the least squares refinement.

TABLE 3-3



FIGURE 3-4

Structure of cesium methylsulfonate viewed down [010].



FIGURE 3-5

The structures of (a) cesium methylsulfonate and (b) barium sulfate projected down [010]. The groups in heavy outline lie on the mirror plane at y = 3/4; those in faint outline lie on the one at y = 1/4. The atoms O2 and O2' are related by reflection in the mirror plane at y = 3/4.

dark and light shading is again used to indicate groups on the y = 3/4 and y = 1/4 mirror planes respectively.

Figure 3-6 shows the environment of a cesium ion, with the distances in Å marked for each neighbour. Six of the nine oxygen atom neighbours can be considered as forming a slightly distorted triangular prism which is shown by dotted lines. Two more O atoms lie outside the triangular faces. The ninth O neighbour is situated outside one of the rectangular faces. The nearest C atom at 3.77 Å is found outside one of the other rectangular faces. All other C atoms are more than 4.36 Å away. The dotted lines drawn around one Cs atom in Fig. 3-5(a) describe this same set of O neighbours viewed in the [010] projection.

The environment found for a carbon atom is shown in Fig. 3-7 with distances marked in Å units. This figure does not explicitly show the O and S atoms belonging to the same methylsulfonate group as the C atom, nor does it show any H atoms of the methyl group since these could not be located. The C atom lies approximately in the plane formed by the three oxygen neighbours. The oxygen atom Ol and the Cs atom are coplanar with the C-S bond since all these atoms lie in the same mirror plane. No other C-O distance is less than 4.15 Å except of course those O atoms belonging to the same methylsulfonate group. Each C atom is related to two others by centres of symmetry.



Environment of a cesium ion in cesium methylsulfonate. Distances are marked in Å. Atom labels are as defined in Table 3-4.



Environment of a carbon atom in cesium methylsulfonate. Distances are shown in Å. Sulfur and oxygen atoms belonging to the same CH_3SO_3 ion are not shown, nor are the hydrogen atoms since these were not located. Atom labels are as defined in Table 3-4 with the additional 2₁ axis through (x,z) = (1/2,0).

These features of the C atom environment are also evident from the [010] projection in Fig. 3-5(a).

Table 3-4 gives the interatomic distances and angles in CSMS together with their standard errors. In certain cases distances are also given after applying corrections for thermal motion (21) assuming a riding motion of the O and C atoms on the heavier central S atom. The significance of these corrections and the standard errors will be discussed in Section 3.5 C.

3.5 Discussion and Conclusions

3.5 A Comparison of CsCH₃SO₃ and BaSO₄

In discussing many of the features of the CsMS structure it is useful to make a comparison with the structure of the isoelectronic compound barium sulfate, $BaSO_4$. Barium sulfate also crystallizes in space group Pnma with four formula units per unit cell, and has cell constants a = 8.86, b = 5.44, c = 7.14 Å. The barium sulfate structure was studied by James and Wood (22) in 1925 as one member of an isostructural series which they suggest includes strontium and lead sulfate, strontium and barium selenate and chromate, potassium and rubidium permanganate, and potassium fluoborate. More recent neutron diffraction work on barium sulfate (23) has yielded more reliable values for some of the oxygen coordinates. The fact that barium sulfate and CsMS crystallize in the same space group with similar cell constants

T	AE	SLE	3-	-4

Interatomic distances and angles in cesium methylsulfonate. (Figures in parantheses are the standard errors in the last digits quoted.)

	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	Uncorrected*	Corrected*
S-01	<u> </u>	1.424(18) Å	1.434(19) Å
S-02	X2†	l.460(16) Å	1.4 85(18) Å
S-C		1.804(33) Å	1.846(38) Å
Mean S-O		.448(12) Å	1.468(17) Å
01-S-02	X2	111.9 (8) ⁰	
02-5-02' ‡		111.9(13) ⁰	
Ol-S-C		109.2(16) ⁰	
02-S-C	x2	105.8(11) 0	· .
Cs-Ol	x2	3.22 (1) Å	· .
Cs-02	X2	3.35 (2) Å	
Cs-02(a)§	X2	3.18 (2) Å	
Cs-02(b)	X2	3.34 (2) Å	
Cs-Ol(c)	·	3.12 (2) Å	
Cs-C (d)	· · ·	3.77 (3) Å	
•			

For a discussion of these corrections for thermal motion, see text.

[†]The multiplicity X2 indicates that two equivalent bonds exist related by the mirror plane through the central atom. [‡] The atom 02' is related to 02 by reflection in the mirror

plane y = 3/4.

[§]The following are symmetry transformations applied to the coordinates of Table 3-2.

(a): x-1/2, y, -z + 1/2; (b): -x + 1/2, y - 1/2, z - 1/2; (c): -x, -y + 1, -z; (d): -x + 1/2, y - 1/2, z + 1/2.

might lead one to expect that they were isostructural. However a detailed comparison indicates that this is not the case even though the structures are closely related.

Fig. 3-5(b) shows the structure of barium sulfate projected down [010] and may be compared to the [010] projection of CsMS in Fig. 3-5(a). In both structures, the a glide planes and <u>b</u> translations generate layers perpendicular to the <u>c</u> axis. The structure of an individual layer is very similar in the two materials with only a slight difference occurring in the orientation of the anions within a layer.

However the stacking of the layers relative to each other is quite different in the two crystals. Adjacent layers in CsMS are displaced relative to one another by about a/4 compared to the positions of the corresponding adjacent layers in barium sulfate. This displacement may alternatively be seen as a difference in the positions of the atoms along the <u>a</u> direction when measured from the centre of symmetry at the origin, or when measured from the n glide planes. The particular arrangement of the layers in CsMS is seen to provide channels in the structure running parallel to <u>b</u>. Since the S-C bonds are directed into these channels, the methyl groups are expected to occupy these relatively open regions, and in so doing they avoid close contacts with Cs ions. On the other hand

this arrangement of the layers is observed to retain close contacts between O atoms and Cs ions.

In both barium sulfate and CsMS each O atom has three neighbouring cations. The Ba ion has twelve O neighbours at distances ranging from 2.7 Å to 3.3 Å (22), whereas the Cs ion has only nine O neighbours at distances between 3.12 Å and 3.35 Å. The nearest O neighbours to the Cs and Ba ions have been indicated by dotted lines in Fig. 3-5(a) and (b).

Since barium sulfate and CsMS are isoelectronic compounds whose forms can be pictured as compact ionic structures, one might expect to be able to relate any prominent structural differences to the differences in the constituent ions. Since Ba and Cs are neighbouring elements in the periodic table they are expected to have similar effects on the packing even though they carry different charges when ionized and have different ionic radii (1.35 Å for Ba^{+2} , 1.69 Å for Cs^{+1} (2, Table 13-3)). However, in considering the differences between the two anions, one would not be surprised to find them in quite different environments as a result of their interactions in a structure. There are two points of difference that are relevant. The first is a difference observed in the geometry of the anion when a methyl group replaces an O atom. The elongation of the anion along the S-C direction and the addition of three H atoms is expected to increase the volume of the anion. The

second difference is one of charge distribution. In both the SO_4^{-2} ion and the $CH_3SO_3^{-1}$ ion the negative charge is expected to be evenly distributed among the oxygen atoms of the ion. However the methyl group will probably carry very little negative charge and when viewed externally would appear to carry a slightly positive charge since the H atoms have their electrons mainly in bonding orbitals between the protons and the C atom. The differences in the structures observed for BaSO4 and CsCH2SO2 can be explained in terms of these simple pictures of volume and charge distribution differences for the two anions. The volume difference results in a structure for cesium methylsulfonate which has relatively open regions to accommodate the methyl groups. The arrangement of the methyl groups in these regions results in only a small amount of contact between the methyl groups and positive cesium ions.

The stable configuration adopted by CsMS is one which maintains three cation contacts for each oxygen atom as is the case in barium sulfate. Local charge neutrality may be demonstrated by assuming that electron charges on each oxygen atom are $-2e \times 1/4 = -0.5e$ in $BaSO_4$, and $-le \times 1/3 = -0.33e$ in $CsCH_3SO_3$. Each Ba^{+2} is then surrounded by 12 oxygens each contributing 1/3 of its -0.5e, or a total of 12 x-0.5e x 1/3 = -2e, to balance the +2e charge on the barium ion.

Each Cs⁺¹ is surrounded by 9 oxygens each contributing 1/3 of its -0.33e, or a total of 9 x -0.33e x 1/3 = -1e, to balance the +le charge on the cesium ion.

3.5 B Possibility of Hydrogen Bonding

Although no hydrogen atoms were located by this x-ray analysis, possible hydrogen bonds could be inferred if short C-O distances were observed. Any hydrogen bonding between carbon and oxygen is expected to be quite weak, and examples known to exhibit such hydrogen bonds are comparatively few. The three closest oxygens to each carbon atom (excluding those on the same anion) have been shown in Fig. 3-7 and lie at distances of 3.32, 3.53 and 3.53 Å. The first of these is within the value 3.4 Å found for the sum of Van der Waal radii for the methyl group and the oxygen atom (2.0 Å and 1.40 Å (2, Table 7-20)), and might suggest a hydrogen bond. However the C-Ol direction seems unsuitable since it gives a S-C-Ol angle of 85° . The other two oxygen neighbours, while probably too distant to consider, also are unsuitably located as they both have S-C-O angles of 96° .

It seems very unlikely that the strong covalent C-H bonds which are expected to form tetrahedral S-C-H angles (109.5°) would distort by 25° or so in favour of any weak hydrogen bonding interaction with the neighbouring oxygen atoms. For this reason no hydrogen bonds are likely to exist in CsMS. Indeed the lack of close interactions for

the H atoms with the rest of the structure suggests that the methyl group may be rotating about the S-C axis at room temperature.

3.5 C Bondlength Errors and Thermal Corrections

Standard errors have been given in Table 3-4 for the bond lengths and angles. These include the standard errors in the atom coordinates provided by the least squares refinement and the standard errors in the cell constants. This error does not include possible systematic errors such as those caused by the thermal motion of the atoms. It is possible to correct the S-O and S-C distances for temperature effects (21) by making assumptions about their relative motions. The values of the thermally corrected bond lengths are given assuming that the methylsulfonate group is undergoing a riding or librational type of motion. The standard errors quoted for corrected distances take into account the standard errors in the uncorrected values and the standard errors calculated by the least squares program for the temperature factors.

However, since the intensity data were not corrected for absorption, these temperature factors may contain systematic errors which would not appear in the standard errors derived during their least squares refinement. In addition the methylsulfonate group may not be undergoing a riding motion but instead the relative motions of the sulfur,

oxygen and carbon atoms might be uncorrelated. In this event the corrected values in Table 3-4 are 0.05 Å too small. The assumption of a riding motion is probably a better one to make for a group such as the methylsulfonate ions since it is more likely that a covalently bonded group would undergo a rigid body type motion rather than a random motion of the individual atoms. However, with possible uncertainties of 0.05 Å in any of the corrected bondlengths, the difference between the distances S-Ol and S-O2 is probably not significant. The mean values for the observed S-O bondlengths as quoted in Table 3-4 should provide the most reliable values for these distances in the methylsulfonate ion.

The neglect of the H atoms might be expected to affect the position and the temperature factor of the C atom. However, when the rotating charge distribution was included in the model to take account of H atom scattering (see Section 3.3D), no significant shortening of the S-C bond could be observed. Hence the atomic coordinates used in calculating the thermally uncorrected S-C distance were probably not affected by the omission of H atoms in the model. However it seems quite likely that the C atom anisotropic temperature factors would be affected by this omission. Hence the thermally corrected S-C bondlength value could be less reliable than its standard

error would indicate.

3.5 D The Methylsulfonate Ion

Certain features of the methylsulfonate ion have previously been described, particularly those which influence the crystal structure as a whole. The following discussion deals with the stereochemistry of the ion and its chemical significance.

The methylsulfonate ion is only required by the crystallographic space group to have C_s point symmetry (S, C, and O lie on a mirror plane, H neglected). However, within the accuracy of our results it probably has the higher C_{3v} symmetry. An idealized diagram of the ion in this symmetry is shown in Fig. 3-8.

The bond distances and angles in the methylsulfonate ion agree fairly well with values found in the literature for similar groups involving S-O and S-C bonds. The mean S-O bond distances of $1.448 \pm .012$ Å or $1.468 \pm .017$ Å ^{*} (see Table 3-4) can be compared to the following values: $1.461 \pm .005$ Å ^{*} in potassium methylenedisulfonate, K_2 [CH₂(SO₃)₂] (24);

1.44 $\stackrel{+}{=}$.02 Å in sulfanilic acid monohydrate NH₃⁺C₆H₄SO₃⁻. H₂O (25);

1.44 \pm .01 Å in metanilic acid NH₃ $+ c_6 H_4 SO_3^{-1}$ (26);

* The values marked with an asterisk include corrections for thermal motion.





The structure of the methylsulfonate ion shown in the idealized symmetry $\rm C_{3v}$.

, and

1.454 Å in sodium napthionate tetrahydrate NH₂C₁₀H₆SO₃Na·4H₂O (27).

The uncorrected S-C bondlength of $1.80 \stackrel{+}{-} .03$ Å can be compared with the following values quoted for S-C single bonds which are also uncorrected for thermal motion:

1.770 $\stackrel{+}{=}$.007 Å in the bridged carbon of K₂ [CH₂(SO₃)₂] (24), 1.77 $\stackrel{+}{=}$.02 Å in NH₃ + C₆H₄SO₃ · H₂O (25); 1.80 $\stackrel{+}{=}$.01 Å in NH₃ + C₆H₄SO₃ (26); and 1.766 Å in NH₂C₁₀H₆SO₃ Na·4H₂O (27).

The thermally corrected S-C bondlength value of 1.85 $\stackrel{+}{-}$.04 Å may not be too reliable because of unusual carbon atom temperature factor effects (see discussion in previous section).

3.5 E Comparison of the $CH_3SO_3^{-1}$ Ion and a Related Series

It is useful to compare the bondlengths and angles of the methylsulfonate ion with others in the isoelectronic series containing the sulfate ion SO_4^{-2} (1), the dimethyl sulfone molecule $(CH_3)_2SO_2$ (28), the trimethyloxosulfonium ion $(CH_3)_3SO^+$ (29) (30), and the hypothetical $(CH_3)_4S^{+2}$ ion. This comparison is presented in Table 3-5. The bond lengths used in this comparison have been corrected for thermal motion. For dimethyl sulfone these corrections have been made using the average of the temperature factors quoted by Sands (28) and assuming a riding motion for the molecule.

	ΤZ	łΒ	L	E	3-	-5
--	----	----	---	---	----	----

Comparison of the interatomic distances and angles in SO_4^{2-} , $CH_3SO_3^{-}$, $(CH_3)_2SO_2$, $(CH_3)_3SO^{+}$, and the hypothetical $(CH_3)_4S^{2+}$. (Figures in parentheses are the standard errors in the last digits quoted.)

49(1) 1	.47(2)	1 47(2)		·····
19(1) 1	.47(2)	1 17(2)	1 (8(0))	
		,	1.4/(2)	
1	.85(4)	1.79(2)	1.79	1.79
9.5 1	11.9(13)	117.9(8)		
. 1	06.9(16)	108.8(8)	112.7(7)	
	•	103.0(8)	106.1(8)	109.5
	9.5 l . l	1.85(4) 9.5 111.9(13) 106.9(16)	1.85(4) 1.79(2) 9.5 111.9(13) 117.9(8) 106.9(16) 108.8(8) 103.0(8)	1.85(4) 1.79(2) 1.79 1.79 1.79 1.79 1.79 1.79 1.79

Certain trends are apparent as successive 0 atoms are replaced by methyl groups:

- (1) With methyl groups present the angles at the S atom deviate from the tetrahedral value of 109.5°. Angles which are subtended by O atoms increase at the expense of angles involving the C atoms. The experimental errors indicate that these observed differences are significant.
- (2) None of the S-C distances differ too significantly from 1.80 Å.
- (3) The S-O bond distances appear to decrease as more methyl groups are substituted for O atoms. However this decrease may not be significant.

The configurations for this series can be understood in terms of the theory proposed by Cruickshank (1). The theory suggests that appreciable π -bonding exists in certain tetrahedral groups in addition to the usual σ bonding. This π -bonding arises from overlap of d and d 2 electron $z^2 - x^2 - y^2$ electron orbitals of the central atom with p orbitals of the four surrounding atoms. When one or more methyl groups are substituted, this hypothesis suggests the following effects:

 The S-C distance will be that of a single σ-bond since the C atom has no p electrons available for π-bonding.

(2) If the arrangement is not strictly tetrahedral, say if the angles deviate from tetrahedral values, still stronger π -bonding can arise from the d_{xy} , d_{yz} , and d_{xz} orbitals of the central atom. With methyl groups present the O-S-O angles can open because the C atoms are more distant and the negatively charged O atoms can repel one another by electrostatic forces. The angle changes which are observed when methyl groups are present satisfy this criterion necessary for even stronger π -bonding and the remaining S-O distances are expected to be shortened.

The data of Table 3-5 appear to verify these predictions. Hence these results are in accord with the predictions of Cruickshank regarding the nature of the bonding in compounds of this type with S as the central atom.

CHAPTER 4 STRUCTURAL INVESTIGATIONS ON LITHIUM HYDRAZINIUM SULFATE

4.1 Introduction

4.1 A Literature Survey

The preparation of lithium hydrazinium sulfate, $LiN_2H_5SO_4$ (hereafter referred to as LiHzS), was described in 1916 by Sommer and Weise (32). Crystals of LiHzS at room temperature belong to the orthorhombic space group Pbn2, (C_{2v}^9) with cell constants a = 8.99, b = 9.94, c = 5.18 Å, and four formula units per cell. In 1958 these crystals were reported by Pepinsky, Vedam, Okaya, and Hoshino (33) to exhibit good ferroelectric hysteresis loops over the range -15°C to 80°C, but no dielectric anomalies were observed between -196°C and 140°C. Excessive conductivity interfered with both the ferroelectric and dielectric measurements above these two temperatures. In 1963 Cuthbert and Petch (34) reported the results of proton and Li⁷ nuclear magnetic resonance studies. This work indicated the probable hydrogen atom configurations and motions in the crystal, and suggested from the Li⁷ signals the possible existence of a high temperature polymorph above 160°C. Also in 1963 Blinc, Schara and Poberaj (35) used electron spin resonance experi-

ments to study paramagnetic centres produced in Y-irradiated LiHzS.

Crystal structure analyses of room temperature ferroelectric LiHzS were reported simultaneously in 1964 by Brown (36) and by Van den Hende and Boutin (37) and a two dimensional structure was reported by Niizeki and Koizumi (38) which agreed with the other two determinations. Also in 1964 Vanderkooy, Cuthbert, and Petch (39) reported the results of conductivity experiments on LiHzS crystals and suggested that the large conductivity in the c direction was caused by proton transfer along the sequence of hydrogen bonds linking the hydrazinium groups. Studies of Raman spectra from LiHzS were published in 1965 by Krishnan and Krishnan (40). A neutron diffraction study on LiHzS published in 1967 by Padmanabhan and Balasubramanian (41) describes a crystal structure in agreement with the x-ray results. These authors also report hydrogen atom positions and prefer a static model rather than their attempted refinement of a dynamic model in which the NH, groups of the hydrazinium ions would be rotating. A recent paper by MacClement, Pintar and Petch (42) reports measurements of the proton spin-lattice relaxation time along with improved

"The dynamic model structure factor contribution formula which these authors report they have used is either in error or suffers from a misprint. See Appendix I.

proton magnetic resonance measurements. These results contradict the interpretation from the neutron diffraction experiments that the hydrogen positions of the NH₃ groups are static.

4.1 B Description of the Structure

The x-ray, neutron, and NMR experiments have given considerable information about the room temperature structure of LiHzS. Fig. 4-1 shows the structure in the [001] projection. The sulfur and lithium atoms are each surrounded by four oxygen atoms at the corners of a tetra- . hedron. These tetrahedra form a framework by sharing corner oxygen atoms. The hydrazinium groups, NH2--NH3+, are situated in channels running through the framework along c and have their N-N bonds approximately perpendicular to c. The earlier proton magnetic resonance studies (34) have shown that the atoms N2 are part of the NH_3^+ groups and that these hydrogen atoms are probably rotating at room temperature about the N1-N2 direction. The neutron diffraction results (41) have been interpreted as favouring a static model for these hydrogens, but this interpretation has since been challenged (42). The atoms N1 are part of the NH2 groups and each Nl is hydrogen bonded to the adjacent Nl atom within the same channel. Each Nl is also hydrogen bonded to the oxygen atom 04 of the framework. Fig. 4-2(a) and (b) show the two possible configurations

FIGURE 4-1



[001] Projection of LiHzS Structure. Broken lines indicate hydrogen Bonds Involving the NH₂ Groups.

ស ហ



FIGURE 4-2

Two Alternative Configurations for an Ordered Series of Hydrogen Bonds Linking the Hydrazinium ions:

- (a) N H · · · N directed toward \underline{c} ;
- (b) N H · · · N directed toward + \underline{c} .

for the hydrogen bonds linking adjacent NH_2 groups of the hydrazinium ions. On the assumption of tetrahedral N2-N1-H and H-N1-H angles the proton resonance results would favour the hydrogen bond configuration of Fig. 4-2(b). However the neutron diffraction results, while confirming that the hydrogen bonds are ordered in the crystal, favour the configuration of Fig. 4-2(a).

4.1 C Possible Ferroelectric Mechanisms

Possible theories for ferroelectric behaviour in LiHzS must explain the origin of permanent electric dipole moments along the <u>c</u> direction and the mechanism for reversal of the direction of these moments upon reversal of an applied electric field. Since Pbn2₁ space group has b and n glide planes perpendicular to <u>a</u> and <u>b</u>, the <u>c</u> axis is the only possible direction in which any net dipole moment can occur. The ferroelectricity in LiHzS might arise in one of, or a combination of, three possible ways:

- I The noncentrosymmetric structure may possess a permanent net dipole moment which can be reversed exactly by a change of the crystal to its enantiomorphous (opposite handed) structure.
- II The polar hydrogen bonds between nitrogen atoms can contribute a dipole moment to the structure. This moment could be reversed by an interchange in the roles of the donor and acceptor nitrogen atoms in

each hydrogen bond, i.e. a switch between the two structures shown in Fig. 4-2.

III There may exist some molecule or ion such as the sulfate ion which, because of its own electronic configuration, may possess a dipole moment. These dipoles might be reversed by a change in orientation of the group itself or by a change to another degenerate state of the group in which the polarization direction is different.

4.1 D Difficulties with Mechanisms Assigned to LiHzS

To date there seems to be no conclusive experimental evidence explaining the ferroelectric mechanism in LiHzS. For any ferroelectric crystal, a mechanism of type I above is an obvious choice to consider. The simplest framework change to produce the enantiomorphous structure involves a rotation of about 46° for the sulfate group about an axis close to the S-O2 direction. This involves a change of about 1.1 Å in the position of O1. Simultaneously the enantiomorph would have its N1— H ···N2 hydrogen bonds reversed and the N1 — H ··· O hydrogen bonds would have to change from O4 to what had previously been O1. Other ways of switching to the enantiomorph require even larger motions for the oxygen atoms and seem less probable than the method described. In any case the atomic shifts necessary to reach the enantiomorphous structure are quite large. The mechanism of type I therefore seems unlikely, especially in view of the relatively low coercive field necessary to produce ferroelectric switching in LiHzS (320 volts/cm. at room temperature (33)). Furthermore Niizeki and Koizumi (38) mention dielectric studies which have shown an increase in the saturation polarization with applied electric field. They claim that this phenomenon does not support a mechanism involving a reversible framework polarization, hence making a type I mechanism unlikely.

In ferroelectric crystals known to contain hydrogen bonds, the type II mechanism is another obvious one to examine. If the series of polar hydrogen bonds which connects separate Nl atoms into a chain is an ordered series, it can contribute to a net spontaneous polarization along the c axis. The neutron diffraction work (41) indicates that the series is an ordered one. A reversal in the roles of acceptor and donor nitrogen atoms is equivalent to moving each proton about 1.0 A along the chain (see Fig. 4-2). So far this corresponds to a type II mechanism, but suffers from the objection that the two structures are crystallographically distinct and probably have different energies. Any polarization arising from the framework and N1-H...04 hydrogen bonds does not change when the N1 - H · · · N1 polarization reverses, and therefore asymmetric hysteresis loops might be expected. These have not been reported, and

a simple type II mechanism seems doubtful.

Cuthbert and Petch (34) have discussed an explanation wherein a type II switch triggers a type I mechanism. They suggest that if the N1 — $H \cdot \cdot \cdot N1$ hydrogen bonds reverse from the NMR favoured configuration shown in Fig. 4-2(b), then the assumed tetrahedral N2-N1-H and H1-N1-H2 angles no longer allow nearly linear N1 — $H \cdot \cdot \cdot N1$ and N1 — $H \cdot \cdot \cdot 04$ hydrogen bonds. Cuthbert and Petch suggest that in such circumstances the structure is not in its lowest energy form and the framework must switch as well to its enantiomorph. The net result is a type I mechanism. The following objections may be raised for this compound mechanism:

- (a) The framework reversal still requires large atom shifts and it is uncertain whether the energy of reversing the N1 — H···Nl hydrogen bonds is a large enough triggering energy to induce a framework reversal.
- (b) The NH₂ group hydrogen positions reported in the neutron diffraction study (41) do not confirm that nearly linear N1 — H···N1 and N1 — H···O4 hydrogen bonds are necessary for a stable structure. If one accepts these results, then the assertion is suspect that the framework would choose to reverse in an electric field in order to achieve nearly linear hydrogen bonds.
Van den Hende and Boutin (37) examined a possible mechanism of type III where a polarization might arise from distorted sulfate ions. Their x-ray structure analysis indicated that the S-Ol bond was significantly longer $(1.55 \pm .01 \text{ \AA})$ than the other S-O bonds (mean 1.47 \pm .01 \text{ \AA}), and they considered that the sulfate ion might have a permanent dipole moment. It would be extremely surprising if such a distortion in a SO_4^{-2} ion were real. Brown's refinement (36) indicated that all S-O distances were equal within experimental errors. In fact S-Ol was reported by Brown to be the shortest of the four distances. Padmanabhan and Balasubramanian (41) find a slightly distorted ion with a S-Ol distance of 1.51 + 0.02 Å. However their standard errors cannot definitely confirm that a real distortion has been observed. Krishnan and Krishnan (40) in their Raman scattering experiments have concluded that the sulfate ion has tetrahedral symmetry. Hence a mechanism of type III involving the SO_{1}^{-2} ion seems very unlikely. It is possible that the anomalies seen for S-Ol distances are the result of parameters such as Ol(z) not being ideally suited to refinement by least squares.

An alternative mechanism of type III might involve dipole moments arising from the lithium atom occupying different degenerate sites within its approximately tetrahedral oxygen environment. This proposal is not supported

by arguments based on the ionic radii of lithium and oxygen which suggest that the lithium ion is snugly bound by the four oxygen atoms. The sum of oxygen and lithium radii (2, Table 13-3) is 1.40 Å + 0.60 Å = 2.00 Å compared to a mean Li-O distance of 1.94 Å (36). If such a mechanism did exist it would be a difficult one to detect by x-ray analysis because the weakly scattering Li atom position cannot be as accurately resolved as the larger atoms.

4.1 E Further X-ray Analysis

Since the work of Cuthbert and Petch (34) had suggested the existence of a high temperature polymorph above 160°C, an attempt was made to examine by x-ray analysis the space group and crystal structure above this temperature. The Li⁷ results above 160°C indicated that the orientations of the principal axes of the electric field gradient tensors are coincident with the crystal While this could be just coincidental it suggested axes. that a higher crystallographic symmetry might exist for the Li sites and hence a high temperature space group different from Pbn2, or Pbnm which could be detected by different systematic absences. It is possible that sucha polymorph might be a paraelectric form but since excessive conductivity interferes with ferroelectric measurements above 80[°]C (33), no evidence for a Curie point above this temperature can be obtained directly.

Prior to examining the high temperature structure the two sets of room temperature x-ray data (36)(43) were subjected to further refinement. This seemed advisable since there were significant differences in some features of these two reported structures, particularly the SO_4^{-2} ion distortions.

4.2 Continued Refinements of Room Temperature Structures4.2 A Description and Comparison of Continued Refinements

Additional full matrix least squares refinement was carried out on each of the two room temperature structures. The structure factor data^{*} published by Brown (36) together with his published atomic parameters and cell constants were used as a starting point for one refinement (hereafter referred to as the B refinement). A similar set of data[†](43)(37) was used for the continued refinement of Van den Hende and Boutin's structure (hereafter referred to as the V refinement). In each refinement the atomic coordinates, anisotropic temperature factor components and layer line scaling constants were varied.

In their original refinement, Van den Hende and Boutin assigned a weighting factor of $1/F_0$ to each reflection. As Brown had estimated standard errors (σ) for his data, these were used to give a weighting scheme based on

^{*}Misprints appear in Brown's reflections 941, 951 and 961 for which F_o should appear as <1.4, 2.7 and 2.0.

[†]The observed structure factors (43) of Van den Hende and Boutin are given in Appendix II.

 $\omega = 1/\sigma^2$. Since Brown's standard errors had nearly a constant value for all observed reflections, this weighting scheme was essentially one of unit weights. In order to produce comparable refinements, the present analysis used unit weights ($\omega = 1$) during the continued refinements of the V data.

Table 4-1 gives the atom coordinates and anisotropic temperature factors together with their standard errors as determined in the final cycle of each refinement. The weighted R factor for the B data was reduced from 0.111 to 0.071 and for the V data from 0.164 to 0.124.

Table 4-2 gives the bond distances and angles calculated for the two sets of atom coordinates in Table 4-1. The standard errors in these values take account of standard errors in the coordinates and cell constants. The other entries in Table 4-2 give the differences in the distances and angles, the standard errors in these differences, and the ratio of the difference to the standard error. Here and in other tables in this chapter the following subscript convention denotes atoms related by symmetry to those for which x, y and z appear in the coordinate tables:

Aabc \longrightarrow x + a, y + b, z + c; Babc \longrightarrow $-x + \frac{1}{2} + a$, $y + \frac{1}{2} + b$, z + c; Cabc \longrightarrow x + $\frac{1}{2} + a$, $-y + \frac{1}{2} + b$, $z + \frac{1}{2} + c$; Dabc \longrightarrow -x + 1 + a, -y + 1 + b, $z + \frac{1}{2} + c$.

TABLE 4-1

STRUCTURAL PARAMETERS FOLLOWING CONTINUED REFINEMENTS

Atom	Structure [†]	Cc	ordinates	5	Temperature Factor Components (x 10 ⁴)						
	Factor Data	x	У	Z	^β 11	^β 22	^β 33	^β 12	^β 13	^β 23	
S	В	.1281(3)	.1581(2)	.2500(0)	74(3)	48(2)	74(15)	- 5(3)	2(12)	- 1(7)	
	V	.1285 (4)	.1591(4)	.2500(0)	13(4)	1(3)	37(12)	- 4(3)	-3(10)	-20(9) *	
01	В	.1075 (10)	.1889(9)	.5130(26)	99(12)	79(9)	191(62)	-15(9)	-50(26)	- 4(20)	
	V	.1069 (13)	.1883(14)	.5416(22)	21(15)	43(15)	-71(37)	- 8(12)	10(24)	28(21)*	
02	В	.1537(8)	.0101(6)	.2194(30)	121(11)	39(6)	376(68)	-16(7)	42(31)	18(23)	
	v	.1519 (14)	.0128(12)	.2333(38)	58(18)	9(11)	76(49)		7.(.3.6)	-46(31)*	
03	В	.2598(10)	.2299(7)	.1487(22)	78(10)	78(9)	283(74)	-21(8)	-5(19)	32(18)	
	V	.2566(16)	.2338(12)	.1628(31)	38(16)	10(12)	149(52)	-9(12)	-18(26)	77(26) *	
04	В	.4958(10)	.3021(9)	.5981(23)	86(12)	106(10)	183(54)	-22(10)	-37(19)	35(19)	
	v v v	.4941(17)	.3035(17)	.6061(36)	28(18)	60(17)	231(77)	-3(16)	5 (29)	54(31)	
Nl	В	.4176(10)	.0235(9)	.7492(38)	99(13)	83(10)	330(76)	-30(9)	60(38)	37(37)	
	V	.4188(17)	.0297(17)	.7482(55)	36(19)	46(17)	184(64)	-5(14)	-25(54)	59(50)	
N2	B ·	.2176(9)	.4401(8)	.7384(40)	94(13)	60(8)	279(70)	2(8)	81(36)	49(30)	
	V	.2144(15)	.4448(16)	.7353(47)	23(18)	58(18)	34(51)	-9(13)	7(38)	-66(39)*	
Li	В	.4341(20)	.3306(17)	.2670(66)	89(21)	72(16)	-42(75)	16(18)	-44(62)	-45(44)*	
	V	.4344(49)	.3224(41)	.2377(224)	82(52)	45(44)	842(356)	-24(39)	-103(173)	166(161)	

* Denotes a non positive definite temperature factor matrix. [†] The symbol B refers to the data of Brown (36) , while V refers to that of Van den Hende and Boutin (43)

б5

COMPARISON	OF	BQND	LENGTHS	AND	ANGLES	IN	THE	CONTINUED	REFINEMENTS
------------	----	------	---------	-----	--------	----	-----	-----------	-------------

TABLE 4-2

Bonds (Å)	Refinement B	Refinement V	Δ		Angles (⁰)	Refinement B	Refinement V	Δ	$\frac{\Delta}{\sigma}$
S-01	1.408(13)	1.550 (12)	-0.142 (18)	7.9	01-S-02	109.6 (4)	105.1 (7)	4.5 (8)	5.6
02	1.498 (7)	1.471 (13)	0.027 (15)	1.8	03	110.1 (6)	108.0 (8)	2.1 (10)	2.1
03	1.479 (9)	1.443 (15)	0.036 (18)	2.0		110.5 (7)	110.1 (9)	0.4 (11)	. 4
	1.480(10)	1.467 (10)	0.013 (19)	.7	02-5-03	108.3 (9)	112.1 (20)	-3.8 (22)	1.7
0101		~				109.3 (6)	109.8 (11)	-0.5 (13)	.4
Li-Ol COOI	2.050(28)	1.857 (74)	0.193 (79)	2.4	03-S-04cīoī	109.0 (5)	111.5 (8)	-2.5 (10)	2.5
02 _{B000}	1.966(19)	2.046 (43)	-0.080 (47)	1.7	0101				
03	1.957(22)	1.866 (51)	0.091 (56)	1.6	01 _{COOĪ} -Li-02 _{BOOO}	108.1(15)	111.3 (67)	-3.2 (69)	.5
04	1.825(35)	1.991(113)	-0.166(118)	1.4	03	111.1(30)	125.1(191)	-14.0(193)	.7
					04	1 10.9(24)	107.1(101)	3.8(104)	.4
N1-N2BOĪO	1.472(12)	1.467 (21)	0.005 (24)	.2	02 ₈₀₀₀ -Li-03	95.9 (8)	96.3 (20)	-0.4 (22)	.2
04	2.962(14)	2.899 (25)	0.063 (29)	2.2	04	112.4(10)	101.6 (35)	10.8 (36)	3.0
^{N1} DOĪO	3.021(25)	3.031 (37)	-0.010 (45)	.2	03-Li-04	117.3(21)	112.7 (92)	4.6 (94)	.5
N2-01	2.929(15)	2.905 (22)	0.024 (27)	.9	N2 _{B010} -N1-04	135.4(10)	136.0 (19)	-0.6 (21)	. 3
01 _{B000}	3.155(15)	3.074 (21)	0.081 (26)	3.1	-N1 _{D010}	110.5(14)	108.7 (16)	1.8 (21)	.9
02 _{B000}	3.008(24)	2.944 (30)	0.072 (38)	1.9	-N1 _{DOĪĪ}	106.6(13)	104.0 (16)	2.6 (21)	1,2
028001	2.834(24)	2.925 (30)	-0.091 (38)	2.4	04-N1-N1 _{DOIO}	104.8 (4)	106.7 (6)	-1.9 (7)	2.7
03,001	3.004(19)	3.073 (26)	-0.069 (32)	2.2	-N1 _{DOĪĪ} *	78.6 (4)	81.6 (6)	-3.0 (7)	4.3
04	2.944(14)	2.958 (22)	-0.014 (26)	.5	N1DOIO-N1-N1DOII	118.1(13)	117.4 (16)	0.7 (21)	.3

*This angle should appear in reference (36) as 80°.

The subscript A000 is always deleted.

4.2 B Discussion of Continued Refinements

The bondlengths in Table 4-2 suggest that each set of data refines to a structure with distorted sulfur-oxygen and lithium-oxygen tetrahedra, assuming significant bond differences to exist where the discrepancy is more than twice the standard error. The directions of these distortions do not agree since the B refinement gives a significantly short S-Ol distance of 1.408 $\stackrel{+}{-}$.013 Å compared to the significantly long distance of 1.550 $\stackrel{+}{-}$.012 Å for the same bond in the V refinement. The respective Li-Ol distances are 2.05 $\stackrel{+}{-}$.03 Å and 1.87 $\stackrel{+}{-}$.07 Å.

Such distortions, if real, might suggest some contribution to the ferroelectricity in LiHzS from a mechanism of type III. One could suppose the opposite distortions to represent two possible configurations with opposite permanent dipole moments. If this were true, then both structure analyses must have been carried out on single domain crystals which were by chance spontaneously polarized in opposite directions.

While both sets of data after continued refinement indicate a possible mechanism of type III for both the sulfate ions and the lithium sites, it would be extremely surprising if these effects were real. In particular the indicated shortening and lengthening of a S-O distance in the covalently bonded sulfate ion cannot be explained by any accepted theory of chemical bonding. A change in the S-Ol distance from 1.41 to 1.55 Å could not represent a switch between two states of equivalent energy of the sulfate ion. The large change in the energy of the SO_4^{-2} ion would have to be exactly balanced by a corresponding large energy change elsewhere in the structure. It is much more reasonable to suppose that the S-Ol bondlength discrepancies arise from some systematic errors in the data or that they occur because of unusual behaviour of the least squares refinement. Difficulties in refinement of the z coordinate of Ol would be sufficient to cause the problem. Since the refined z coordinates of Ol and Li are suspect, no conclusive assessment of a type III mechanism for the lithium ion site can be made either.

4.2 C Analysis of Anisotropic Temperature Factors

The anisotropic temperature factors derived during the continued refinements can be analysed to give the root mean square displacement tensors and the direction cosines for their principal axes. This has been done for the B refinement and the results are given in Table 4-3. No such analysis is presented for the V refinement since the temperature factors are non positive definite for the atoms S, Ol, O2, O3, and N2, probably indicating some systematic errors in the data. Non positive definite values are

TABLE 4-3

FIIICIPAL	AXES	Anarysis	TOT	Anisociopic	remperacu	ie ractors
Atom	- <u></u>	R.M.S.	•]	Direction	Cosines
		Displacer	nent	3	With Resp	ect to

Principal Axes Analysis for Anisotropic Temperature Factors

Atom	R.M.S. Displacements	Dir Wi	With Respect to					
•	(Å)	<u>a</u>	b	c				
S	0.166	949	.315	026				
	0.144	316	949	.010				
	0.094	.021	017	999				
01	0.212	.795	481	370				
	0.182	323	852	.413				
	0.128	.513	.209	.833				
02	0.232	691	.040	721				
	0.196	.672	331	662				
	0.120	266	943	.202				
03	0.212	.398	735	549				
	0.176	565	.275	778				
	0.148	723	619	.306				
	0.234	419	.852	314				
	0.170	802	.510	.312				
	0.132	. 425	121	897				
Nl	0.226	730	.229	644				
	0.216	.240	797	555				
	0.124	640	559	.527				
N2	0.232	.630	.313	.710				
	0.168	.586	792	171				
	0.110	509	524	.683				
 Li	0.206	673	686	.279				
	0.162	718	.696	022				
	imaginary	(.178	.215	.960)				

*Non positive definite case.

inconsistent with physically possible motions. Since it is difficult to assess intensity measurements of other workers no further attempts have been made to trace the source of these errors. The B refinement has one atom (Li) with a non positive definite temperature factor but this could be made positive definite by increasing β_{33} by less than its standard error.

The thermal motions described in Table 4-3 are roughly consistent with the motions observed by Brown (36) for the oxygen atoms in a difference electron density projection calculation based on an isotropic temperature factor model. While this projection had indicated a librational motion of the SO_A^{-2} group around an axis parallel to c, the three dimensional motions for the oxygens in Table 4-3 suggest a motion more complicated than a libration about any single axis. The root mean square displacements for the oxygen atoms seem too small to suggest that the crystal might easily be transformed to a centrosymmetric one or completely reversed to its enantiomorph. Ol was seen (Section 4.1 D) to require a motion of 1.1 A in changing the crystal to its enantiomorph whereas the maximum RMS displacements at room temperature are only about 0.23 A. These estimates of RMS displacements are valid provided the refinement of temperature factors has not been greatly influenced by systematic errors in the intensity data. It

is quite unlikely that they could be in error here by a factor of four.

4.2 D Hydrogen Positions

Prior to the recent study of Padmanabhan and Balasubramanian (41) which reports hydrogen positions, some attempts were made to locate these atoms from the x-ray data of Brown (36). One attempt placed a ring of charge density beyond N2 with the plane of the ring perpendicular to the N1-N2 direction. This model was an approximation for the three hydrogen atoms of the NH₃⁺ group reported by Cuthbert and Petch (34) to be rotating at room temperature. Appendix I discusses the modified structure factor formula used in this calculation. An N-H distance of 1.01 Å (6, Table 4.1.2) and tetrahedral N1-N2-H angles were assumed. The R factor decreased by only 0.001 when these atoms were included indicating that the refinement was relatively insensitive to the addition of these hydrogen atoms on a rotating model.

A second attempt placed hydrogen atoms of the NH_2 group in positions calculated from the data of Cuthbert and Petch, again assuming N-H distances of 1.01 Å. The two atoms were placed at the following positions in accordance with the ordered configuration of Fig. 4-2(b):

N1 --- H1···N1; H1 : x = .471 y = .015 z = .923 N1 --- H2···O4; H2 : x = .388 y = .120 z = .712

In addition to refining positions and isotropic temperature factors of H1 and H2, the coordinates of N1 and O4 were allowed to vary from their best values found prior to including H1 and H2. No significant changes occurred for N1 or O4. Since the hydrogen atom temperature factors underwent large fluctuations over several cycles of refinement, it was difficult to assess whether the lowering of R by 0.002 actually indicated that hydrogen atoms were at these places. The refined parameters gave

H1:
$$x = .467$$
 (17) $y = .050$ (15) $z = .887$ (45)
B = 1.1 (4.9)
H2: $x = .353$ (26) $y = .087$ (25) $z = .704$ (103)

H2:
$$x = .353$$
 (26) $y = .087$ (25) $z = .704$ (103)
B = 12.6 (104)

These may be compared to the more recent neutron diffraction results which favour the reversed configuration along the hydrogen bond chain (see Fig. 4-2(a)).

H1: x = .467 (4) y = .036 (4) z = .571 (4) B = 5.15 (34) H2: x = .381 (4) y = ..118 (3) z = .796 (3) B = 3.56 (33)

No further attempts to locate hydrogen positions were made from the x-ray data.

4.3 Structure of High Temperature LiN₂H₅SO₄

4.3 A Experimental

The crystals used were kindly supplied by J. Cuthbert. These crystals were from the same batch used in the NMR experiments (34) and had been prepared by evaporating an aqueous solution of $(N_2H_6)SO_4$ and Li_2CO_3 with purification by one cycle of recrystallization.

Early diffraction experiments at temperatures above about 75°C indicated a rapid decomposition of the crystals was occurring. The decomposition product appeared first on the surface of the crystals and rapidly spread throughout their volume. The effect of the decomposition product remained in the diffraction patterns when the temperature was lowered. It produced Weissenberg diffraction spots typical of a crystal with a large mosaic spread. Cell constants were roughly measured as a = 8.88 Å, b = 8.79 Å, c = 5.30 Å with V = 413 Å³. All axes were parallel to the corresponding axes in LiHzS, at least to the accuracy with which the centres of the broad spots could be determined. No change in systematic absences from those of LiHzS was noticed. The decomposition product was not identified.

In order to slow down this decomposition, silicon oil was used to coat the LiHzS crystal surfaces. Large crystals were necessary in order to achieve reasonable lifetimes even with the coated samples. A coated needle shaped crystal of mean diameter 0.75 mm was mounted with high temperature glue inside a Lindeman glass capillary. This sample was used to obtain intensity measurements with a Nonius Weissenberg camera equipped with apparatus for achieving exposures at high temperatures.

The size of this crystal was quite large compared to what one would normally select for negligible absorption and extinction effects. To overcome the large difficulties of absorption and extinction in a crystal this size, films were double exposed to obtain both the room temperature and high temperature diffraction patterns from the same crystal together on the same film. The film carriage was displaced slightly between exposures to separate the high and room temperature reflections. Since both exposures suffered approximately the same absorption and extinction effects, the ratio of the intensities of the high and room temperature forms would not depend to first order on these These ratios could be measured and applied to effects. a set of room temperature intensities collected under normal conditions, thus giving a true set of high temperature data.

Ni-filtered Cu-radiation was used to obtain double exposures for the layers hk0 and hk1. Because of deterioration in the first crystal, a second one of similar size was used for the hkl photographs. The desired temperature of $180 \stackrel{+}{-} 5^{\circ}C$ was attained during the high temperature exposures by bathing

the crystal mount in a stream of hot air. The air was heated by an electrical element while it flowed through an insulated tube. The exhaust nozzle of this tube was designed to fit inside the end of the Nonius camera layer line screens. The temperature was controlled by adjusting either the air flow rate or the heater voltage. A thermocouple and potentiometer were used to measure the temperature of the air flow close to the position of the crystal. The accuracy of this temperature measuring arrangement was verified prior to the diffraction experiments by mounting a second thermocouple on a goniometer head in the exact crystal position.

The high and room temperature double exposures indicated that the cell constants undergo slight changes due to thermal expansion. Accurate measurements of these increases were not made since the effects were small ones. No changes in systematic absences were observed indicating that the space group must still be either Pbn2, or Pbnm.

For each double exposed reflection, the ratio of the high to low temperature intensity was determined by measuring each intensity visually with a calibrated wedge film. The ratios were then applied to a set of room temperature intensities (hereafter referred to as room temperature data RT) derived by independent measurements of Brown's original hk0 and hk1 photographs. The choice of a set of room temperature intensities is not too critical.

Parameter shifts between the room temperature and high temperature structures are related in a first approximation only to the changes in intensities, and these can be derived from the measured intensity ratios. Hence all that is required is a set of room temperature intensities which adequately describe the room temperature structure.

Table 4-4 gives the measured intensity ratios $(I_{\rm HT}/I_{\rm RT})$, their standard errors, the room temperature intensities, and their standard errors.

Table 4-5 gives the high temperature intensity data and standard errors as calculated from the data of Table 4-4. The high and room temperature data of Tables 4-4 and 4-5 were then corrected for Lorentz and polarization effects for the equi-inclination Weissenberg method (11,Ch. 7). 4.3 B Structure Refinement

Least squares refinement was carried out in the space group Pbn2₁ using the high temperature observed structure amplitudes (HT data). For comparison a similar refinement was done using the room temperature data (RT data). In each case isotropic temperature factors were used since the amount of data was insufficient to allow enough overdeterminacy if an anisotropic model were used. The final weighted R factors for these refinements were 0.129 for the high temperature data and 0.113 for the room temperature data. Since the high temperature structure fit the data just about

TABLE 4-4

Measured Intensity Ratios R \equiv (I_{HT}/I_{RT}) with Standard Errors and Room Temperature Intensities with Standard Errors.

The letters U, L, and G after the ratio column denote the following cases for the reflections on the doubly exposed (HT and RT) films:

- \mathtt{U} both \mathtt{I}_{HT} and \mathtt{I}_{RT} were unobservable,
- \mathtt{L} $\mathtt{I}_{\mathrm{H}\mathrm{T}}$ was unobservable and $\mathtt{I}_{\mathrm{R}\mathrm{T}}$ was observable,
- ${\tt G}$ ${\tt I}_{{\tt H}{\tt T}}$ was observable and ${\tt I}_{{\tt R}{\tt T}}$ was unobservable.

Minus signs after the $I_{\rm RT}$ column denote unobserved reflections on the room temperature films and asterisks denote unreliable $I_{\rm RT}$ measurements which were deleted during least-squares refinement.

TABLE 4-4 (Continued)

н	ĸ	L	R	$\sigma(R)$	I(RT)	$\sigma(I)$		Н	К	L	R	O(R)	I(RI)	(1)
0	2	0	1.15	0.20	756	162		5	3	0	1.15	0.20	261	54
Ō	4	Ó	1.00	0.30	540	108		5	4	0	0.60	0.15	36	6
0	6	Ō	1.00	0.25	972	162		. 5	5	Ō	0.75	0.25	• 1*	*****
Ō	8	Ō	0.90	0.20	25	- 5		5	6	ō	0.40	0.20	9	2
ň	10	ñ	1.20	0.20	30	6	1	5	7	0.	0.50	0.25	3	1
. 0	10	õ	1.20	0 15	108	20				0	0.65	0 15	150	- 36
0	12	0	0.05	0.15	2100	20		2	0	0	0.89		100	14
Ŧ	1	0	1.25	0.25	2106	400	1.1	5	9	0	0.70	0.20	12	- 14
1	2	0	1.15	0.25	2106	486		5	10	0	0.40	0.15	54	9
1	3	0	1.35	0.25	5022	972		5	11	0	U		1	1
1	4	0	1.00	0.20	1458	270		6	0	0	1.60	0•40	20	4
1	5	0	1.05	0.20	729	162		6	1	0.	0.65	0.15	387	72
1	6	0	1.50	0.30	22	4		6	2	0	2.50	0.70	12	2
1	7	õ	1.15	0.20	31	5		6	3	ñ	0.50	0.20	18	4
1	0	õ	1 00	0.20	48	12		Ľ.	1.	õ	0.50	0.30	10	2
1	0	0	1.00	0.20	- -	12		0		0	0.75	0 15	270	63
1	.9	0	0.05	0.15	54	10		6	5	0	0.40	0 20	210	0.5
1	10	0			6	3		6	0	0	0.40	0.20	14	10
1	11	0	0.50	0.15	24	5		6	7	0	0.75	0.20	12	18
1	12	0	U		3	1		6	8	0	U		1-	i o
2	0	0	0.40	0.15	216	36		• 6	9	0	0.50	0.20	16	3
2	1	0	1.30	0.30	4320	1080		- 6	10	0	0.65	0.20	9	3
2	2	С	1.15	0.20	216	36		7	1	0	0.50	0.10	243	54
2	3	0	U		9	2		7	2	0	0.90	0.20	108	36
2	4	õ	1.50	0.40	84	. 18		7	3	0	0.55	0.15	24	5
2	5	õ	0.60	0.15	486	108		7	4	0	0.75	0.15	102	24
2	ć	ñ	1 15	0.20	180	54		7	5	õ	0.40	0.10	66	15
2	~ ~	õ	1 10	0 20	152	24		-7	6	ñ			6	3
2	(0	1.00	0 20	17	50		, 	. 7	0	0 50	0 15	24	6
2	8	0	1.00	0.20	11	4			1	0	1 00	0 25	20	5 S
2	9	0	1.00	0.40		2 7			8	0	1.00	0.35	20	, ,
2	10	0	0.45	0.10	21	5		. 7	9	0 -	0.55	0.10	21	0
2	11	0	0.50	0.10	91	18		7	10	0	1.00	0.25	. 15	5
2	12	0	U		. 3	1		8	0	0	0.60	0.15	243	12
3	1	0	0.55	0.15	486	108	-	8	1	0	U		1-	1
3	2	0	1.15	0.25	1782	486		8	2	0	0.60	0.15	108	27
3	3	0	U		5	2		8	3	0	U		1-	1
3	4	0	1.25G	0.50	2	1		8	4	0	0.60	0.15	17	4
3	5	.0	1.00	0.25	48	9		Ř	5	Õ.	U		1-	1
2	6	Ô	1.00	0.35	12	2		Ř	6	0	0.55	0.10	63	15
2	7	ñ	0 - 80	0.15	261	54		0	7	ñ	11	0 • 1 0	1-	1
2	ן ג	õ	0 75	0.15	138	36		0 Q	ρ β	0	0		<u> </u>	2
2	0	õ	0.95	0 20	12	20		0	0	0		0.15	57	13
2	10	0		0 20	10	5		0		0	0.40	0.17	1_	12
2	10	õ	0.05	0.20	17	2		2	2	0	0.40	0.10	58	12
2	12	ñ			1-	1		á	2	õ	0.65	0.15	99	24
2	12	Š	1 16	0 25	450	ב נס		0	1.	õ	0.40	0.10	32	- 8
4	0	0	1.12	0.25	459	10		. 2	· •+	U	0.40	0.10	22	
4	1	0	L		14	3		9	5	0	0.55	0•20	13	4
4	2	0	1.20	0.25	108	27		9	6	0	0.50	0.20	9	3
4	3	0	0.75	0.20	207	36		9	7	0.	1.00	0.20	14	3
4	4	0	1.00	0.35	216	45		9	8	0	0.50	0.15	· 1×	₩
4	5	0	2.00	0.40	12	3		10	0	0	U		. 1-	1
4	6	Ô	0.80	0.20	594	135		10	1	Ō	0.50	0.15	60	12
	7	õ	0.50	0.15	2/			10	2	ñ		0010	1_	
4		0		0.10	24			10	2	0	0 40	0 16	10	5
4	8	0		0 20	1	1		10	2	0	0.40	0.15	19	ر 1
•4	. 9	0	0.05	0.20	19	5		10	4	0				- <u>1</u>
4	TO	0	V•75	0.20	50 7	./		10	5	Û	0.50	0.15	81	21
4	11	U	U	.	1	1		10	6	0	U	-	1-	1
4	12	0	0.30	0.15	1*	*****		11	1	0	0.40	0.15	20	6
5	1	0	1.10	0.25	48	9		11	2	0	1.00	0•25	2 <u>2</u>	5
5	2	0	0.65	0.15	351	81		11	3	0	L		15	4
								11	4	0	0.50	0.10	1*	*****

TABLE 4-4 (Continued)

н	K	L	R	$\sigma(R)$	I(RT)	$\sigma(I)$. Н	K	L	R	$\sigma(R)$	I(RT)	$\sigma(1)$
0	2	1	1.00	0.20	2754	891		5	1	1	1.00	0.25	120	30
Õ	4	ī	1,00	0.20	252	54	(· · ·	5	2	1	0.65	0.14	108	27
ŏ	6	î	1.30	0.20	· 15	6	• 	5	2	7	0.75	0.15	• 57	12
õ	õ	ī	1.00	0.20	36	9	10 10	5		1	0.80	0.19	6	2
0	10	1	0 67	0.20	50			2		1 1	2 00	0 50	3-	2
0	10	1	0.67	0.20	6	10		5	2	1	2.00	0.50	<u>-</u> د	
0	12	Ţ	0.57	0.20	45	. 12		5	6	1	0.80	0.16	(5	81
1	0	1	1.00	0.25	1944	648		. 5	7	1	0.90	.0.20	15	6
1	1	1	1.00	0.25	1134	324		5	8	1	U		4-	4
1	2	1	1.20	0.20	945	216		5	9	1	0.40	0.15	18	9
1	3	·1	0.75	0.15	15	6		5	10	٦	0.47	0.17	9	3
1	4	1	1.30	0.25	30	· 6		ร์	11	ĩ	0.80	0.20	27	9
ĩ	5	1	0.90	0.20	30	6		6		2	0 75	0 25	21	6
1	6	ĩ	1.00	0.20	162	36		0	1	1			21	6
-	-	4	1.00	0 25	102	12		6	2	T	0.55	0.15	24	
1	1	1	1.00	0.20	- 40	12		6	3	T	1.00	0.25	56	15
1	8	1	0.70	$0 \cdot 14$	21	6		6	4	1	0.55	0.13	6	3
1	9	1	0•42	0•12	12	3		6	5	1	1.00	0.22	9	4
1	10	1	0•90	0•18	6	3		6	6	1	0.55	0.15	4	4
1	11	1	0.75	0.25	9*	****		6	7	1	0.62	0.12	30	9
1	12	1	0.70	0.15	45	12		6	8	1	0.30	0.06	15	6
2	1	1	1.00	0.20	3078	1053		6	9	1	1.00	0.25	9	3
2	2	1	0.70	0.15	198	45		6	10	1			4-	- 4
5	2	ĥ	1 00	0.20	216	45		7	10	ĩ	1.55	0.30	21	6
2	2	1	1.00	0 20	210	10		, 7	,	1	0 75	0 17	108	27
2	4	1	1.11	0.20	90	10		·	Ť		0.15	0.17	100	21
2	5	1	1.00	0.25	162	45		. [2	1	0.90	0.20	23	У,
2	6	1	0.65	0.13	24	6		7	3	1	0.80	0.28	4	4
2	7	1	0.75	0.15	153	36		7	4	1	0.75	0.15	6	4
2	8	1	U		4-	. 4		7	5	1	0.67	0•14	18	6
2	9	1	0.85	0.20	33	9		7	6	1	1.10	0.20	4	4
2	10	1	L		4	4		7	7	1	0.70	0.14	18	6
2	11	1	U		4-	4		7	8	1	L		4-	4
2	12	ī	Ĺ		4	4		7	9	1	L		4-	4
3		1	1.00	0.20	540	108		- 8	1	1	Ū		4-	4
2	1	1	0.83	0.17	337	81		Ř	2	1	0.70	0.14	48	12
2	2	î	1.00	.0.20	234	54		0	2	ī			4	4
2	2	, ,	0 52	0.11	51	12		0	5	7	· 0 02	0 17	30	. 0
2	2	-	1 00		224	21	4	0	4	بد ۱	0.02	U • I I	57	,
2	4	1	1.00	0 15	100	27		8	2	1.	L .		<i>1</i>	-+ /
3	5	1	0.58	0.15	100	21		8	6	Ţ	L		. 4-	4
3	6	1	1.45	0.25	57	12		8	7	1	·		4	4
3	7	1	1.00	0.20	18	6	•	8	8	1	0.67	0•14	36	9
3	8	1	0.75	0.15	9	3		9	0	1	0.50	0.10	54	12
3	9	1	0.65	0.13	33	12		9	1	1	1.10	0.20	9	3
3	10	1	0.55	0.13	21	6		9	2	1	U		4-	4
3	11	1	0.50	0.20	18	6		9	3	1	U		4-	۷4
3	12	1	0.80	0.25	27	9		9	4	1	U		4-	4
4	٦	٦	1.00	0.25	21	6		Q	Fi.	1	0.80	0.18	36	9
1.	ົ້	1	1.00	0.25	162	45		ģ	ĥ	î	0.30	0.12	1-8	ý 9
4	2	1 1	1 76	0 25	102	2		ó	7	7	1.00	0 20	10 6	
4	3	1	1.75		100) / E		7	•	· ⊥ 7		0.20	0*	
-4	4	1	1.00	0.30	180	45		10	1	1	0.02	0.0	9*	× × × × × ×
4	5	1	1.00	0.20	4	4		10	2	T	0		4-	4
4	6	1	0.55	0.11	, 78	▶ 18		10	3	1	0.75	0.18	24	6
4	7	1	U		4-	4		10	4	1	U		4-	4
4	8	1	0.65	0.20	78	18		10	5	1	U		4 -	4
4	9	1	U		4	4		11	0	1	U		4	4
4	10	1	0.75	0.18	9	3		11	1	1	0.67	0,030	9	3
4	11	1	U		4-	4		11	2	1	L		4	4
5	0	1	0.75	0.15	234	54		11	3	1	U		4-	4

TABLE 4-5

High Temperature Intensity Data with Standard Errors.

Minus signs after the $I_{\rm HT}$ column denote that the intensities are less than the value quoted. Asterisks denote unreliable $I_{\rm HT}$ values which were deleted during least-squares refinement.

TABLE 4-5 (Continued)

Н	K	L	I(HT)	$\sigma(I)$
0	2	0	869	338
0	4	0	540	270
0	6	0	972	405
0	8	0	23	10
0	10	0	36	13
õ	12	0	70	29
ĩ		0	2632	112/
1	1	0	2000	1005
1	2	0	2422	1000
1	3	0	6780	2568
1	4	0	1458	562
1	5	0	765	316
1	6	0	33	13
7	7	0	36	12
ī	ģ	ñ	48	22
1 7	0	ñ	40	17
Ţ		0	40	11
1	10	0	6	2
1	11	0	12	6
1	12	0	3*	****
2	0	0	86	47
2	1	0	5616	2700
2	2	0	248	85
2	ົ້	Õ	. 9*	****
2	1.	õ	126	61
2	5	ñ	202	120
2	2	0	292	100
2	5	0	207	70
2	1	0	168	70
2	8	0	17	(
2	9	0	7	6
2	10	0	. 9	4
2	11	0	46	18
2	12	0	3*	****
3	1	0	267	132
3	2	0	2049	1004
2	2	ñ	5*	****
2	2	0	2*	****
2		0		~ ~ 1
3	2	0	48	21
3	6	Ü	12	6
3	7	0	209	82
3	8	0	104	48
3	9	0	10	5
3	10	0	16	8
3	11	0	. 6-	3
3	12	0	2-	2
4	ĪÖ	Õ	528	208
4	1	0	14-	3
<i>.</i>	5	Ô	130	59
4	<i>L.</i>	0	1.50	
4	<u> </u>	0	155	68
4	4	0	216	121
4	5	0	24	11
4	6	0	475	227
4	7	0	12	7
4	Ŕ	0	- 2*	****
1	0	0	10	ፍ
+ ,	7	0	20	12
4	10	0	۲ کا ج	⊂ ⊥ ****
·+ /·	1 7	0	ເ ເມ	****
4	12	0	~ ~ ~	
5	1	0	53	105
5	- 2	0	228	100

	•			·	· · · ·
	H	K	L	I(HI)	0(1)
•	5	3	0	- 300	114
	っ ち	4	0	2Z 1*	9 ****
	5	6	ŏ	4	3
	5	7	0	2	1
	5	8	0	98	46
	5	9	0	50	24
	りち	10	0	<u>کک</u>	⊥∠ ****
	6	0	õ	32	14
	6	1	0	252	105
	6	2	0	30	13
	6	3	0	9	6
	6	45	0	203	
	6	6	õ	6	4
	6	7	0	54	28
	6	8	0	2-	2
	6	9	0	8	5
	0 7	10	0	122	51
	7	2	Õ	97	54
	7	3	0	13	6
	7	45	0	26	دد ۲۱
	7	6	õ	6-	3
	7	7	0	12	7
	7	8	0	20	12
	7	10	0	15	o Q
	8	0	õ	146	80
	8	1	0	2-	2
	8	2	0	65	32
	8	с 4	0	10	2 5
	8	5	Õ	2-	2
	8	6	0	3,5	15
	8	7	0	2-	. 2
	ප ද	8	0	22	14
	9	1	õ	2-	2
	9	2	0	234	11
	9	3	0	64	30
	9	45	Ő	7	5
	9	6	0	5	3
	9	7	0	14	6
	9	8	0	1*	****
	10	0	0	2-	2
	10	1	0	· 30 2-	15
	10	3	0	8	5
	10	4	0	2-	2
	10	5	0	41	23
	17	0	0	2 - 8	2 5
	11	2	Ū.	22	11
	11	3	ġ.	15-	4
	11	7.	12	• ,•	20. 27. 20. 26

TABLE 4-5 (Continued)

K 2 4 6 8		I (HT) 2754 252 20 36	o (1) 1442 104 11-	
10 12 0 1 2	1 1 1 1 1	4 26 1944 1134 1134	3 16 1134 608 448 7	
5 4 5 6 7 8	1 1 1 1 1 1	39 27 162 48 15	15 11 68 24 7	
9 10 11 12 1	1 1 1 1 1	5 5 7* 32 3078	3 4 **** 15 1669	
2 3 4 5 6	1 1 1 1 1	139 216 105 162 16	61 88 39 86 7	J
/ 8 9 10 11 12	1 1 1 1 1	5- 28 5- 5- 5- 5-	50 5 14 5 5 5	
0 1 2 3 4	1 1 1 1	540 280 234 27 324	216 125 101 12 162	
5 6 7 8 9	1 1 1 1	63 83 18 7. 21	32 32 10 4 12	·
10 11 12 1 2 3	1 1 1 1 1 1	12 9 22 21 162 11	7 14 11 86 7	
4 5 6 7 8	1 1 1 1	180 4 43 5- 51	99 5 18 5 27	
9 10 11 0	1 1 1 1	5- 7 5- 176	5 4 5 76	

as well as the Pbn2₁ room temperature structure, Pbn2₁ space group was considered to be the correct one for the high temperature structure. Hence no trial structure in Pbnm needed to be examined. At some stages during the high temperature refinement the Li(z) coordinate oscillated between 0.20 and 0.30 with R as low as 0.139. By setting it at the mean value 0.25 and refining it further, it stayed nearly fixed and R decreased to the 0.129 value quoted above.

The atom parameters from the high (HT) and room temperature (RT) refinements are compared in Table 4-6 and their calculated bond distances and angles are compared in Table 4-7.

Table 4-8 gives the differences in the coordinates in Å units for the two structures. Since the standard errors for the high temperature structure are a composite of the errors present in the room temperature structure together with the errors in the intensity ratios, the standard errors in the differences of Table 4-8 are calculated according to $\sigma_D^2 = \sigma_{HT}^2 - \sigma_{RT}^2$. Table 4-9 gives the differences in bond lengths and angles between the two structures with standard errors calculated in the same way. Here also ratios of differences to standard errors are given.

In Figure 4-3 the dots show the room temperature atom positions as projected down [001]. The directions of the observed shifts for the high temperature structure are

• 83

TABLE 4-6

Atom	Structure	x	У	Z	B
S	HT	.1256 (4)	.1594 (4)	.2500 (0)	2.49(11)
	RT	.1286 (3)	.1582 (3)	.2500 (0)	1.62 (5)
01	HT	.0995(18)	.1911(19)	.5071(153)	4.62(52)
	RT	.1053(11)	.1909(10)	.5189(119)	3.16(29)
02	HT	.1563(13)	.0153(12)	.2036(154)	3.96(29)
	RT	.1539 (8)	.0099 (7)	.2134(121)	2.48(16)
03	HT	.2570(15)	.2324(11)	.1384(136)	3.72(29)
	RT	.2585 (8)	.2294 (6)	.1468(117)	2.42(16)
04	HT	.4952(20)		.5904(135)	4.54(37)
	\mathbf{RT}	.4954(10)	.3057 (8)	.5866(109)	2.67(17)
Nl	HT	.4141(17)	.0223(16)	.7272(191)	4.60(38)
	RT	.4166(11)	.0242 (9)	.7299(164)	2.63(20)
N2	HT	.2145(16)	.4394(15)	.7171(210)	3.82(31)
	RT	.2187(10)	.440,0 (9)	.7338(190)	2.40(17)
Li	HT	.4347(41)	.3386(27)	.2558(500)	3.72(59)
	RT	.4294(27)	.3338(18)	.2596(403)	2.80(43)

Comparison of HT and RT Refinement Parameters

TABLE 4-7

Comparison of Bond Distances and Angles from HT and RT Refinements

Bonds (A)	H T	RT	Angles (^O)	НТ	ŖT
S-01	1.389 (76)	1.445 (60)	01-S-02	114.0 (14)	113.3 (7)
02	1.479 (18)	1.504 (11)	03	113.1 (33)	111.0 (24)
03	1.502 (30)	1.466 (23)	⁰⁴ cīoī	110.8 (40)	111.9 (30)
⁰⁴ cīoī	1.470 (42)	1.509 (33)	02-5-03	105.0 (14)	107.9 (10)
Li-01 _{COOĪ}	1.986(178)	2.029(136)		105.5 (11)	106.4 (7)
02 _{B000}	1.956 (48)	1.919 (34)	03-S-04 cīoī	107.8 (30)	108.2 (23)
03	2.008 (88)	1.944 (69)	Olaco-Li-O2page	110.9 (78)	109.7 (65)
04	1.841(2 53)	1.816(202)	03 03	108.6(153)	111.5(140)
N1-N2 _{BOIO}	1.421 (22)	1.477 (13)	04	111.5(167)	107.5(144)
04	3.021 (35)	2.980 (28)	02 _{BOOO} -Li-03	95.6 (16)	98.1 (12)
NIDOIO	3.048(119)	3.031(103)	04	113.5 (67)	112.5 (57)
N2-01	2.888 (55)	2.900 (46)	03-Li-04	115.8(145)	117.2(132)
01 _{BOOO}	3.200 (51)	3.156 (43)	$N2_{DO} - N1 - O4$	137.2 (23)	137.0 (16)
02 _{B000}	2.998(120)	3.011(105)		111.1 (70)	107.8 (55)
02 _{B001}	2.876(119)	2.823(103)		107.2 (68)	109.2 (56)
03 _{A001}	3.024 (95)	3.015 (82)			
04	2.914 (37)	2.925 (32)	04-NI-NI DOĨO	102.4 (18)	
				/9.4 (18)	80.0 (14)
		•	NI DOIO ^{-NI-NI} DOII	116.4 (67)	LL/.4 (54)

	· .	•	
Atom	∆X (Å)	۵¥ (A)	∆Z (A)
S	032 (3)	.012 (5)	.000 (0)
01	052(13)	.002(16)	061 (50)
02	.022 (9)	.054(10)	051 (50)
03	013(11)	.030 (9)	044 (36)
04	002(15)	.028(12)	.020 (41)
Nl	022(12)	019(13)	014 (51)
N2	038(12)	006(12)	087 (47)
Li	.048(28)	.048(20)	020(153)

TABLE 4-8

Coordinate Changes from RT to HT Refined Structure

TABLE 4-9

Bond Length and Angle Changes From RT to HT Refined Structure

Bonds	∆(À)	Δ/σ	Angles	Δ (⁰)	Δ/σ
S-01	-0.056 (47)	-1.2	01-S-02	2.7(12)	2.3
02	-0.025 (14)	-1.8	03	2.1(23)	1.2
03	0.036 (19)	1.9	04	-1.1(26)	-0.4
	-0.039 (28)	-1.4	02-S-03	-2.9(10)	-2.9
6101			04	-0.9 (9)	-1.0
Li-Olcool	-0.043(114)	-0.4	03-S-04	-0.4(19)	-0.2
02 _{B000}	0.037 (34)	1.1		·	
03	0.064 (55)	1.2	01-Li-02	1.2(44)	0.3
04	0.025(152)	0.2	03	-2.9(62)	0.5
·			O4 ·	4.0(85)	0.5
NI-N2 _{BOĪO}	-0.056 (18)	-3.1	02-Li-03	-2.5(11)	-2.3
04	0.041 (21)	2.0	04	1.0(33)	0.3
^{N1} DOIO	0.017 (60)	0.3	03-Li-04	-1.4(60)	-0.2
N2-Ol	-0.012 (30)	-0.4	$N2_{n} = -N1 - 04$	0.2(17)	0.1
Ol _{BOOO}	0.044 (27)	1.6	BOIO Nl	3.3(43)	0.8
02 _{B000}	-0.013 (58)	-0.2	DOLO	-2.0(38)	-0.5
02 _{B001}	0.053 (60)	0.9	O4-NI-NI -	-1 7(11)	-1 5
03 ₂₀₀₁	0.009 (48)	0.2	DO10	-0.6(11)	-0.5
04	-0.011 (19)	-0.6	N ¹ DOII N1 _{DOIO} -N1-N1 _{DOII}	-1.0(40)	-0.3



Observed atom shifts in [001] projection between room temperature positions (dots) and high temperature positions (crosses). Arrows show schematically the shift directions and are scaled ten times longer than the actual shifts. U or D at a vector tip denotes a significant shift up or down the c direction.

shown schematically by vectors which have a length scaled ten times larger than the actual observed shift in the projection. The letters "U" and "D" at the vector tip denote significant shifts up or down the c axis respectively.

Another attempt to display these shifts was made by calculating a [001] difference electron density projection using $(F_{HT} - F_{RT})$ and the sign of F_{calc} as the Fourier coefficients in eqn. [2-1]. No definite shifts could be seen in the plot of this function since they were masked by the differences in temperature factors.

4.3 C Conclusions from High Temperature Analysis

Systematic absences indicate that the high temperature space group is either Pbn2₁ or Pbnm. The refinement of the available high temperature data indicates that at 180[°]C the space group of LiHzS remains Pbn2₁. This result fails to explain on the basis of any change to a higher crystallographic symmetry why the electric quadrupole coupling tensors at all four lithium sites are identical in magnitude and orientation as reported in the nuclear magnetic resonance studies of Cuthbert and Petch (34). Such a high symmetry would not be required crystallographically even if the space group did change to Pbnm.

The slight increase in cell constants at high temperatures is due to thermal expansion. The small magnitudes observed for atom shifts when the temperature

is raised to 180°C suggest that no significant changes occur for the heavy atoms in the crystal structure. If there is a distinctly different structure above 160°C it must differ primarily in the hydrogen configurations which were not seen, or possibly in the nitrogen and lithium z coordinates the latter of which was the least accurately determined parameter in this analysis.

The increase in all the temperature factors reflects the general decrease of the intensities observed on the . films and results from increased thermal motion of the atoms at higher temperatures. An oxygen isotropic temperature factor of $B = 4.6 \text{ Å}^2$ in the high temperature refinement suggests isotropic root mean square thermal displacements of 0.24 Å (see eqn.[2-5]) assuming that no large systematic effects are influencing the temperature factors. Although this is an isotropic or average estimate of the 0 motions it is still below the value 1.1 Å estimated in Section 4.1 D as being necessary for easy excursion of the structure to its enantiomorph.

4.3 D Discussion of Experimental Difficulties and Possible Improvements

This high temperature analysis might be criticized on the grounds that the refinement has used only a limited amount of three dimensional data. This limitation might explain the oscillations of the lithium z coordinate at certain stages of the refinement, but even here the excursions

. 90

did not exceed the range of the standard error given for the parameter. However, since a similar quantity of data for the room temperature form refined to a structure which agrees with that found using Brown's full set of data, the available high temperature data was expected to give a structure that would agree within its limits of error with a more accurate refinement.

Greater criticism can probably be directed at the accuracy of the film data which was collected. The absorption effects for large crystals, while not directly influencing the ratio method of intensity measurement, did produce film spots of irregular shapes sometimes making accurate comparisons with the wedge film quite difficult. Hence the general accuracy of the measurements was probably decreased even though the method eliminated the large systematic error of absorption. The spot shape problem was enhanced by the surface decomposition product which contributed diffraction spots with a large mosaic spread to certain of the high temperature low angle reflections. The amount of decomposition was observed to increase during each high temperature exposure, thus introducing a systematic error into the comparison of low and high temperature exposures.

It was felt, however, that if prominent structural differences did occur for the heavy atoms above 160°C then an analysis using this data would at least indicate their presence. Certainly a change to any symmetry higher than

Pbnm would be visible as a change in the systematic absences. Since no such indications were found, further efforts to improve the x-ray diffraction experiments seemed unjustifiable.

If further x-ray work could be justified it would seem advisable to solve first the problem of keeping small crystals stable for extended time periods at high temperatures.

CHAPTER 5 THE CRYSTAL STRUCTURE OF TRICLINIC POTASSIUM DICHROMATE

5.1 Introduction

Potassium dichromate $K_2Cr_2O_7$ is one of the most familiar crystalline solids. As early as 1833 Mitscherlich (44) observed that it undergoes a phase transition close to 250°C. This was one of the first solid state phase transitions to be noted in the scientific literature. In spite of continued interest since that date in its crystallography, the structure of even its room temperature phase had never been solved. In 1959, Klement and Schwab (45) reviewed what was then known about potassium dichromate and concluded that it exists in at least three different forms, namely a triclinic room temperature phase, a monoclinic high temperature phase, and a metastable monoclinic room temperature phase. The similarity found for the unit cells of these forms suggests a similarity in their structures and indeed a similarity with other structures such as ammonium dichromate and potassium pyrosulfate. Details concerning these and other related structures will be described in later sections.

Although no structure had been proposed for triclinic $K_2Cr_2O_7$, there was considerable controversy through the years as to whether the triclinic space group is noncentrosymmetric

(P1) or centrosymmetric (P1). Brief reviews of the controversy appear in the papers of Klement and Schwab (45) and Rao (46). After reviewing conflicting evidence from crystal growth and etch figure experiments on the one hand and the absence of any observable piezoelectric effect on the other, Klement and Schwab declare themselves in favour of P1. Rao (46) also favours P1 on the additional basis of his statistical analysis of the x-ray diffraction intensity data. On the other hand the recent Russian studies of crystal growth and etch figures by Podisco (47), and Parvov and Shubnikov (48) continue to favour the noncentrosymmetric P1 choice. An obvious step toward resolving this controversy would be to determine the crystal structure.

A structure determination was considered of value also for determining accurate distances and angles for the dichromate ion. Some values had previously been reported in the paper describing the structure of $(NH_4)_2Cr_2O_7$ (49) but these were not very accurate. The unexpected large discrepancies reported there among apparently equivalent Cr-O distances were difficult to explain chemically and were possibly due to large parameter errors in the structure determination. More accurate studies of the dichromate ion might be of value in assessing the applicability of Cruickshank'ş theories (1) to chromium in tetrahedral arrangements. In particular a comparison to the pyrosulfate ion, $S_2O_7^{-2}$,

is of interest.

There has also been recent interest in the geometry of groups of the type X_2O_7 (50),(51),(52) and in the variety of structures they can form. An accurate knowledge of the dichromate ion geometry would add valuable information to the study of these groups.

At an advanced stage in the writing of this thesis a structure determination of triclinic $K_2Cr_2O_7$ was published by Kuzmin, Iliukhin, and Belov (53). While they reported essentially the same structure as had been determined by this author, their refinement accuracy was not as great. In comparison to the more accurate results given here, their determination of the dichromate ion stereochemistry is somewhat misleading. Consequently no extensive changes in this thesis have been made aside from pointing out their different cell convention and comparing the final atom parameters.

5.2 Experimental

5.2 A General Crystal Data

Crystals of triclinic potassium dichromate were grown by slowly evaporating at room temperature a saturated solution of technical grade potassium dichromate in distilled water. The clear orange seed crystals which formed, while occasionally platelike, were more frequently needle shaped along [010]. Several large crystals were grown with dimensions up to 2 cm from plate and needle seeds and all of these large samples had the characteristic habit shown in Fig. 5-1. The choice of axis senses and face names in Fig. 5-1 corresponds to those of the actual crystal which was indexed by the diffraction photographs. Table 5-1 gives the transformations between this convention and those of other workers.

Accurate cell parameters were measured using precession camera photographs taken with Zr-filtered Mo-radiation. The films were calibrated by recording on them an exposure from a single crystal of rutile (59), (a = 4.59373 + 5, c = 2.95812 + 5Å). A pycnometer calibrated for ρ (water) = 1 gm. cm.⁻³ at 0°C was used to measure the density of a mixture of carbon tetrachloride and bromoform in which $K_2Cr_2O_7$ crystals neither sank nor floated. The choice of PI as the correct space group is described in detail in a later section. The crystal data are given in Table 5-2. 5.2 B Intensity Data

The crystal selected for intensity measurements was of typical shape and approximated a cylinder with mean diameter of 0.25 mm and with length 0.46 mm along <u>b</u>. An integrating precession camera was used to obtain exposures of 1, 3, 9 and 27 integration cycles for each of the layers hk0,hk1, hk2, hk3, $0k\ell$, $1k\ell$, and $2k\ell$. All photographs were taken with Zr-filtered Mo-radiation. The integrated intensities were measured from these films by
FIGURE 5-1



Characteristic Habit of Triclinic Potassium Dichromate Crystals. Other Small Faces Occasionally Present are (001), (210), and (110).

TABLE 5-1

		-		
	(hkl) ¹ x	(hkl) ² x	(hkl) ² x	(hkl) ⁴ x
_		0 0-1	001	010
$(hkl)^{1} =$	1	0-1 0	100	0 0-l [.]
	•.	-1 0 0	010	-1 0 0
	0 0-1	· ·	0-1 0	100
$(hkl)^2 =$	0-1 0	1	-1 0 0	001
	-1 0 0		0 0-1	0-1 0
	0 1 0	0-1 0		0 0-1
$(hkl)^3 =$	001	-1 0 0	1	-1 0 0
	100	0 0-1	• •	010
	0 0-1	100	0-1 0	
$(hkl)^4 =$	100	0 0-1	001	1
	0-1 0	010	-1 0 0	

Transformations Among Various Unit Cell Conventions **

Superscripts denote the conventions of various authors:

1. Present work.

- Parvov and Shubnikov 1964 (48), Shubnikov 1911 (54), 1931 (55).
- 3. Klement and Schwab 1960 (45).
- 4. Groth 1908 (56),

Stedehouder and Terpstra Fig. 3(a) 1930 (57).

*Kuzmin, Iliukhin, and Belov (53) use convention 3 but minus signs and origin shifts become necessary in converting their diagrams of the structure to those of the present work.

[†]The present work confirms that Gossner and Mussnug (58) have an error in one of their angle measurements.

TABLE 5-2

Crystal Data for Triclinic K2Cr207

,					
System		Triclinic			
Space Group		РĨ			
Cell Constants	a	13.367	(11)	Å	
	b	7.376	(5)		
	c	7.445	(6)		
	α	90.75	(5)	0	
	β	96.21	(7)		
	γ	97.96	(5)		
Unit Cell Volume	2	722.3 A	3		
Reciprocal Cell	Constants				

0.07601 (6) A⁻¹ а 0.13696 b (9) 0.13517 (10) С (5) 0 88.37 α * 83.63 (5) β * 81.91 (5) γ $2.66 \stackrel{+}{-} .05 \text{ gm cm}^{-3}$ Density Measured 2.704^{+} .003 gm cm⁻³ Calculated Number of Formula Units 4 per Unit Cell 42.4 cm^{-1} X-ray Absorption Coefficient (MoKα)

using a recording photomicrodensitometer. The individual film intensities were scaled and averages taken for each reflection. A standard error was estimated for each intensity for use in weighting the data during least squares refinement.

Unobserved intensities were labelled and were assigned the local minimum observable intensity value. Unreliable intensity measurements (e.g.cases with beamstop interference, cases close to the edge of the film, etc.) were labelled to allow assignment of zero weights (i.e. deleted during least squares refinement). The full set of data consisted of 3221 measured reflections of which 617 were classified as unreliable and 324 had intensities too small to be observed. During the last stages of refinement an additional 25 low angle reflections suspected of showing extinction effects were classified with the unreliable ones so that they would not contribute in the final refinement.

The intensity data and their estimated standard errors were then corrected for Lorentz and polarization effects (12,Ch. 11). Absorption corrections were not considered necessary since µR was only 0.5 (5, Sec. 5.3). 5.2 C Attempts to Determine Space Group by Direct Experiment

Toward the final stages of the refinement, it became clear that the structure was quite close to being centrosymmetric. Anomalous dispersion experiments (6, Sec. 3.3.2), (8, Ch. 14) were performed to resolve this question.

MILLS MEMORIAL LIBRARY MCMASTER UNIVERSITY

Calculations performed with the best refined Pl parameters (isotropic model, R = .0754, see Sec. 5.3) and with complex scattering factors for Cr and K species (6, Sec. 3.3.2) indicated that appreciable intensity differences between hkl and \overline{hkl} should be observable for some reflections with Co or Cu-radiation if the space group were Pl. Precession camera photographs were taken for the hk0 and 0kl layers with Fe-filtered Co-radiation. Weissenberg photographs were taken of the h01 layer with Ni-filtered Cu-radiation. The Weissenberg films were double exposed in a way which gave the reflections $h0\ell$ and $\overline{h}0\overline{\ell}$ close to one another on the film for easier comparison of their intensities. Visual comparison of the pairs hkl and hkl indicated no marked intensity differences among the pairs as expected from the calculations. Some small intensity differences were observed, but these were systematic effects attributable to different crystal absorption in the two reflecting positions. These observed inequalities had a random direction compared to the directions of the calculated inequalities. Hence the anomalous dispersion experiments were interpreted as favouring Pl.

At the suggestion of Dr. C. V. Stager and with his kind cooperation in performing the experiments, nuclear magnetic resonance techniques were used in an effort to determine the number of crystallographically distinct sites for Cr and K atoms. These attempts failed to detect any signals from

either the 9.5% abundant Cr⁵³ isotope or from the 93% K³⁹ isotope, and hence this experiment was inconclusive. 5.3 Solution and Refinement of the Structure

A Patterson function was calculated using the hk0 intensity data. This function is shown in Fig. 5-2. About half of the large Cr atoms were located by identifying Patterson peaks which correspond to the Cr-Cr interatomic vectors in the same projection of the monoclinic ammonium dichromate structure (49). This comparison to an ammonium dichromate Patterson projection illustrated that the Cr-Cr vectors appear as satellite peaks at the edges of larger compound peaks. Trial solutions choosing Cr-Cr vectors at the centres of these large peaks had previously failed to yield a promising structure, but with the satellite positions and several cycles of electron density and structure factor calculations, the x and y coordinates for the remaining atoms were found.

The z coordinates were then determined from a Patterson function calculated with the 0kl data and a trial three dimensional structure was formulated in space group Pl with 44 independent atoms in the unit cell. This trial structure possessed approximate centres of symmetry but further refinement was performed without imposing any such constraints.

A three dimensional full matrix least squares



[001] Projection of Patterson Function for Triclinic K2^{Cr20}7

computer program was used to refine the atom coordinates and isotropic temperature factors together with separate scale constants for the seven layers of data. The coordinates of Crl were held fixed in this Pl refinement and $\omega = 1/\sigma^2$ weights were used. Unobserved reflections in agreement (F(calc) \leq F_{min}, the local minimum observable value) were given zero weight. Those calculating larger than F_{min} were refined as though F_o was equal to F_{min}. The best weighted agreement index (R) obtained in Pl space group with isotropic temperature factors was 0.0754. This Pl isotropic model had 180 variable parameters and approximately 2300 reflections contributed to the refinement with non zero weights. Examination of the refined structure revealed an approximate centrosymmetric arrangement. Consequently refinement was also performed in PI space group giving a final R of 0.0963 using isotropic temperature factors. This PI isotropic model had 95 variable parameters and approximately 2300 reflections contributed with non zero weight.

The coordinates and their standard errors suggested that the Pl and Pl structures were different particularly for the potassium and oxygen positions. Hamilton's significance test (19), when applied to the R factors for these two models, indicated less than 0.5% chance of the Pl refinement being correct. However anomalous dispersion experiments (see Sec.5.2 C) failed to show any of the large differences between the hkl and $h\bar{k}\bar{l}$ intensities which had been expected from calculations based on the Pl coordinates. A second problem which arose if Pl were accepted as correct was that of understanding the systematic features of the distortions from Pl. There are four nonequivalent dichromate groups in Pl but each deviated from C_{2v} symmetry in a different way.

Detailed comparison of results from the Pl and $P\overline{l}$ isotropic refinements led to a suggestion which resolved the problem in assigning a space group. Pseudo-centrosymmetric O-Cr-O bond angles in Pl were found to differ markedly (about 7°) from each other while their mean value was very close to the corresponding angle found in Pl. This was consistent with pairs of the pseudo-centrosymmetric oxygen atoms in Pl having positions displaced in random but opposite directions from their Pl positions. The question then arises whether the isotropic Pl model might have simply compensated for anisotropic thermal motion of both the oxygen and potassium atoms. The mathematics of the problem was appropriate for such a situation to arise; the insertion in Pl of two atoms almost related by a centre of symmetry gives nearly the same intensity as inserting in $P\overline{1}$ two half atoms each slightly displaced in opposite directions from their mean position (see Appendix III for proof). This latter situation is analogous to the physical case where an atom undergoes anisotropic thermal motion.

It was proposed that even though the isotropic Pl refinement had resulted in a significantly improved R factor compared to the isotropic Pl model, the Pl structure was incorrect because it was using extra degrees of freedom to fit anisotropic thermal effects in the data.

Three tests were investigated to show this proposal to be correct. In the first test a PI refinement was performed with anisotropic temperature factors for the oxygen and potassium atoms. This particular model was chosen since with 185 variables it could be closely compared to the best fit allowed by the isotropic PI model with 180 variables. The chosen anisotropic PI refinement gave a decrease in R from 0.0963 to 0.0633 in the first cycle, thus verifying the new PI model to be better than the isotropic PI (R = 0.0754) with a similar number of variables. Further refinement cycles adding anisotropic temperature factors for chromium atoms gave a final $1/\sigma^2$ weighted R index of 0.054 in PI.

The second test involved checking the least squares correlations (see Sec. 2.3) to confirm the suspected situation truly existed in the mathematics of the Pl model. Indeed large positive elements (0.6 to 0.9) were found in the Pl correlation matrix for pairs of coordinates related by the pseudo-centre of symmetry. Hence the Pl model had been adjusting the atoms in pairs in the manner suspected, keeping the members of each pair on opposite sides of the

PI positions. Correlations in the anisotropic PI model were no larger than 0.3 among atom coordinates indicating this to be a more suitable model for refinement.

As a third test of the $P\bar{I}$ anisotropic model, the temperature factor ellipsoids were examined to see if they corresponded to any physically reasonable type of thermal motion. This was indeed found to be the case, and details concerning the thermal parameter analysis are presented in Section 5.4 D. Hence triclinic $K_2Cr_2O_7$ is found within the accuracy of this structure analysis to be centrosymmetric.

The possibility of extending the model to test an anisotropic Pl structure seems inadvisable. The large correlations expected during least squares refinement would cast doubt on any results, and the refinement with existing computer memory size could only be performed in block diagonal matrix fashion. Furthermore the agreement (R = .054) obtained in Pl anisotropic seems to be approaching closely the expected limits available with the intensity data used. The rest of this chapter will describe only the Pl structure.

The atomic coordinates and anisotropic temperature factors are given in Table 5-3 for the final refinement (R = 0.054). Also given are the independently determined Pl coordinates of Kuzmin, Iliukhin, and Belov (53) with R = 0.161. The latter have been converted from the published values to the convention of this author by moving their origin to

Atom	x	y	Z
Kl	.15845 (7)	.16251(10)	.91463(16)
	.159	.160	.916
К2	13591 (8)	.19591(12)	.65275(19)
	136	.198	.656
К3	.64056 (7)	.60346(12)	.66946(18)
	.639	.604	.668
K4	.34939 (8)	.75019(11)	.76701(16)
	.348	.749	.768
Crl	.11332 (5)	.31682 (7)	.42610(11)
	.113	.318	.426
Cr2	08334 (5)	.31361 (7)	.15240(11)
	083	.312	.154
Cr3	.60718 (5)	.09201 (7)	.76914(11)
	.608	.092	.768
Cr4	.41379 (5)	.29304 (7)	.80714(11)
	.414	.293	.808
OBl	.02283(21)	.42955(30)	.29483(52)
	.024	.433	.303
011	.19970(22)	.47632(34)	.51664(57)
	.199	.453	.517
012	.16358(25)	.18614(36)	.29483(54)
	.168	.199	.295
013	.06054(25)	.19409(40)	.57663(58)
	.064	.194	.584
021	14893(28)	.45840(36)	.06270(62)
	145	.463	.067
022	15170(24)	.17519(33)	.27537(54)
	150	.176	.279

<u>TABLE 5-3</u> Refined Pl Coordinates and Temperature Factors Compared to Transformed Values of Kuzmin et al.

(continued next page)

Atom	x	У	Z
023	04319(24)	.19264(39)	00185(56)
	043	.187	005
OB 3	.52748(23)	.20950(37)	.89187(55)
	.522	.210	.893
031	.70143(26)	.05349(40)	.91201(61)
	.696	.050	.905
032	.64874(29)	.22010(38)	.61033(57)
	.651	.209	.613
033	.54493(26)	09817(34)	.68346(62)
	.546	083	.673
041	.36029(28)	.36600(38)	.97283(58)
	.365	.364	.975
042	.33655(26)	.13702(36)	.69261(61)
	.340	.142	.701
043	.44272(24)	.46064(34)	.67255(57)
	.443	.470	.675

TABLE 5-3 (Continued)

Refined Pl Coordinates and Temperature Factors Compared to Transformed Values of Kuzmin et al.

Refined Temperature Factor Components* (x 10 ⁵)

Atom	β.	11	^β 22	^β 33	βj	2	^β 13	^β 23
Kl	286	(4)	916(11)	879(19)	99	(6)	-17(12)	-28(12)
К2	302	(5)	1364(14)	1111(22)	90	(7)	32(14)	393(16)
КЗ	253	(4)	1376(14)	1124(23)	71	(6)	87(13)	-244(16)
K4	309	(4)	1274(13)	931(20)	221	(7)	35(13)	-125(15)
Crl	198	(3)	738 (8)	667(13)	30	(4)	.15 (8)	-54 (9)
Cr2	206	(3)	654 (7)	668(13)	87	(4)	l7 (8)	22 (8)
Cr3	198	(3)	723 (8)	753(13)	103	(4)	52 (8)	68 (9)

(continued next page)

Atom	β ₁₁	^β 22	^β 33	β12	β13	^β 23
Cr4	195 (3)	696 (8)	725(13)	89 (4)	76 (8)	73 (9)
OBl	288(14)	735(34)	1093(66)	42(18)	-55(39)	104(40)
011	276(15)	1049(40)	1375(76)	18(21)	-45(42)	-215(49)
012	354(16)	1263(43)	1043(69)	208(23)	128(45)	-333(49)
013	347(17)	1585(52)	1241(76)	65(26)	95(48)	629(57)
021	448(18)	1214(48)	1737(95)	289(25)	-115(50)	130(56)
022	326(15)	1026(41)	1149(75)	-1(21)	198(44)	136(47)
023	305(16)	1619(51)	1027(71)	121(24)	18(45)	-398(53)
OB3	319(16)	1539(50)	918(65)	363(24)	36(43)	51(51)
031	349(15)	1717(51)	1265(80)	373(26)	-83(46)	146(58)
032	468(20)	1255(46)	1242(78)	70(26)	114(55)	331(53)
033	397(17)	993(42)	1731(93)	14(23)	41(49)	-75(53)
041	420(18)	1442(48)	1177(76)	213(25)	269(50)	88(53)
042	368(17)	1182(44)	1496(84)	-29(24)	36(47)	-259 (<u>5</u> 3)
043	313(15)	1085(41)	1358(77)	75(21)	173(43)	371(48)

TABLE 5-3 (Continued)

Refined Temperature Factor Components * (x 10 5)

*Kuzmin et al. used the isotropic values $B_{K} = 1.4 \text{ }^{\circ}\text{A}^{2}$, $B_{Cr} = 1.1 \text{ }^{\circ}\text{A}^{2}$, and $B_{0} = 1.7 \text{ }^{\circ}\text{A}^{2}$

TABLE 5-4

Observed and calculated structure factors (F_0 and F_c) in units of 1/10 electron per unit cell with estimated relative standard errors (σ) in F_0 . A minus sign following F_0 indicates an unobserved reflection; an asterisk indicates an unreliable F_0 measurement which was not used in the least-squares refinement; an x indicates a reflection which was suspected of showing extinction effects and was therefore not used during the final stages of refinement.

112

TABLE 5-4 (Continued)

TABLE 5-4 (Continued)

<u>1</u>13

t FØ FG o нк FC σ

 Image: State of the state FØ FC ĸ HKL FØ FC o HKL 93675050047999323142061708790947997733888682003193169507392363782828996 1111771****6537106*026785599988509993300917917*633**344555367601452*501151370630694359271***0*6*4956*8512514331992047711332*024498****3011954771****6537*0636494359271***0*6*4956*851254331992047711332*024498*****30

FC FØ

TABLE 5 - 4(Continued)

114

σ

TABLE 5-4 (Continued)

2

115

σ

FR FC 3079577121046 113049109911221 FR -20577695797112166 113022422323232323232323232323232323232323	C 77	H 22344 22379 22344 22344 22344 H 12455 12455 12455 12455 12471 12473 H 22344 1449 12477 12474 12473 12474 12473 K L 12464 12477 12474 12473 12474 12473 12474 12474 K L 12477 12474 12477 12474 12477 12474 124777 124777 124777 124777 124777 124777 1247777 1247777 12477777 124777777 124777777777777777777777777777777777777	C 4.86699 FC 0.74864 F8 -74767 F8 -747767 F8	FG 7 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 -
--	--	---	--	--

•

TABLE 5-4 (Continued)

116 .

1, $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{2}$ and relabelling their $-\underline{b}$, $-\underline{c}$ and $-\underline{a}$ as \underline{a} , \underline{b} and \underline{c} . This gives x, y, z in terms of their coordinate tables as $\frac{1}{2} - y$, $\frac{1}{2} - z$, and 1 - x. This author's choice of axis labels has been preferred because of close comparisons with known monoclinic structures.

Table 5-4 gives the observed structure amplitudes (Fo) and their standard errors (σ) together with the structure factors calculated using the parameters of this author in Table 5-3. The atomic scattering factors for these calculations were taken from (6, Table 3.3.1A): K⁺ ref. SX-21(39); Cr⁺⁺⁺ ref. SX-67A; and O⁻ ref. SX-31A. The complex scattering factors used during anomalous dispersion calculations were obtained by modifying the above values according to (6, Section 3.3.2).

5.4 Description of the Structure

5.4 A Structure of the Dichromate Ions

The $\operatorname{Cr}_2 \operatorname{O}_7^{-2}$ ion may be thought of as two CrO_4 tetrahedra sharing one corner oxygen atom. The bridging Cr-O distances are equal to each other but are longer than the terminal Cr-O distances. The latter are also equivalent within experimental error. The two crystallographically distinct dichromate ions occur in similar but not identical environments. Fig. 5-3 shows side and end views for each of these ions. The former are perpendicular to the Cr-OB-Cr planes and the latter are parallel to the Cr-Cr vectors.



Side and End Views for the Two Crystallographically Distinct Dichromate Ions

Table 5-5 lists their bond lengths and angles. Values for important distances are quoted both before and after applying corrections for thermal motion assuming that the oxygen atoms are riding on the heavier chromium atoms (21). The standard errors quoted take account of the standard errors in the atom coordinates calculated by least squares refinement and the standard errors in the cell constants. Direction cosines for these bonds with respect to the unit cell axes appear in Sec.5.4 D for comparison with the directions of the principal axes of the thermal ellipsoids. The mean thermally corrected Cr-O (bridge) distance is $1.786 \stackrel{+}{=} .008 \stackrel{\circ}{A}$ and the mean corrected Cr-O (terminal) distance is $1.629 \stackrel{+}{=} .010 \stackrel{\circ}{A}$.

The dichromate ions do not quite have an exact C_{2v} or even C_2 symmetry. The projections along the Cr-Cr vectors in Fig. 5-3 indicate a twisting of each dichromate ion away from an exactly eclipsed C_{2v} geometry. The decrease of one of the angles from tetrahedral in each ion (OB1-Cr1-Oll and OB3-Cr3-O31) appears to be a real effect and destroys an exact C_2 symmetry. None of the other O-Cr-O angles differ too significantly from tetrahedral.

The values 124.0° and 127.6° for the bridging angles are significantly different as are the Cr-Cr distances. The twisting away from C_{2v} symmetry is about 5° for the ion containing Crl-Cr2 and about 10° for the ion containing Cr3-Cr4. This twisting occurs in the same sense for each

Interatomic Distances and Angles for the Two Crystallographically Distinct Dichromate Ions

Distances Uncorrecte	ed Thermally Corrected	Distances	Uncorrecte	d Thermally Corrected
Crl-Cr2 3.144(2) Å	3.144 Å	Cr3-Cr4	3.189(2) Å	3.189 Å
Crl-OB1 1.776(3) Cr2-OB1 1.784(3) Mean Corr	1.781 1.790 rected Cr-0 (Br:	Cr3-OB3 Cr4-OB3 idge) = 1.7	l.780(3) l.775(3) 786(8) A	1.788 1.784
Crl-Oll 1.614(3) 012 1.622(3) 013 1.610(4) Cr2-O21 1.583(3) 022 1.632(3) 023 1.625(3) Mean Corre	1.624 1.634 1.626 1.602 1.642 1.638 ected Cr-O (Term	$\begin{array}{r} Cr3-031 \\ 032 \\ 033 \\ Cr4-041 \\ 042 \\ 043 \\ minal) = 1. \end{array}$	1.618(4) 1.620(4) 1.614(3) 1.613(4) 1.604(3) 1.633(3) 629(10) Å	1.633 1.634 1.629 1.627 1.619 1.643
OB1-O112.71O122.77O132.79O212.75O222.77O232.78O11-O122.64O132.67O12-O132.64O21-O222.64O22-O232.64O12-O233.35O13-O223.41		$\begin{array}{c} 0B3-031\\ 032\\ 033\\ 041\\ 042\\ 043\\ 031-032\\ 033\\ 032-033\\ 041-042\\ 043\\ 042-043\\ 032-043\\ 032-043\\ 033-042\\ \end{array}$	2.72 2.78 2.78 2.77 2.79 2.76 2.65 2.66 2.65 2.63 2.66 2.63 2.66 2.62 3.54 3.49	
Angles		Angles .		· · · · ·
Crl-OB1-Cr2	24.0(1)	Cr3-OB3-Cr	:4	127.6(2)0
OB1-Cr1-O11 1 O12 1 O13 1 O11-Cr1-O12 1 O13 1	.06.1(1) .09.4(1) .10.8(1) .09.5(1) .11.7(1)	OB3-Cr3-O3 O3 O31-Cr3-O3 O3	31 32 33 32 33	106.6(2) 109.7(1) 110.1(1) 109.8(2) 110.6(1)
012-Cr1-013	.09.2(2)	032-Cr3-03	33	110.1(1)
OB1-Cr2-O21 1 O22 1 O23 1 O21-Cr2-O22 1	.09.6(1) .08.5(1) .09.5(1) .10.2(1)	OB3-Cr4-04 04 041-Cr4-04	1 2 3 2	109.7(1) 111.2(2) 108.4(1) 109.7(2)
023 1 022-Cr2-023 1	.10.6(1) .08.4(1)	04 042-Cr4-04	3	109.9(2) 107.9(1)

ion with respect to their similar environments. Likewise the unique angles OB1-Cr1-Oll and OB3-Cr3-O31 are in analogous positions for the two ions. Details of the environments of the two dichromate ions appear in Tables 5-6 and 5-7. Further discussion of the dichromate ion stereochemistry is given in Sec. 5.5 D.

5.4 B Ionic Packing to Form the Structure

The structure consists of a three dimensional array of $K^{\pm 1}$ and $\operatorname{Cr}_2 \operatorname{O}_7^{-2}$ ions. The dichromate ion orientations in the array are described by reference to the "backbone" of the group (consisting of the bridging oxygen and the two terminal oxygen atoms which form a line nearly parallel to the Cr-Cr vector), and by reference to the "feet" of the group (consisting of the remaining four oxygen atoms).

Fig. 5-4 shows the arrangement of K^+ and $Cr_2O_7^{-2}$ ions projected down <u>c</u>. Atom labels correspond to those of Table 5-3. Atoms with primes are related to the unprimed ones by inversion in the centres of symmetry at $O \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}$ or $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}$. Roman numerals denote layers in the structure parallel to the plane of <u>b</u> and <u>c</u>. These layers are described later in the text.

The groups containing Crl-Cr2 in each unit cell form a row (A) of dichromate ions whose members repeat by the translation along \underline{c} (out of the plane of Fig. 5-4). The potassium ions Kl and K2 lie between successive dichromate ions





Structure of Triclinic K2Cr207 projected down [001].

of row A and are approximately coplanar with the four feet oxygen atoms of the dichromate ions. The arrangement of such a row is shown schematically in Fig. 5-5. The groups containing Crl -Cr2 together with Kl and K2 form a similar row (B) along the c direction related to row A by inversion through the centre of symmetry at 0 $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$. The B row backbones fit into the troughs between the backbones of two adjacent dichromate groups in row A and vice versa. The backbones of one row do not rest exactly in the centre of the troughs of the other row, but instead are displaced such that any dichromate ion in one row is paired more closely to one particular dichromate ion in the adjacent row. The groups Crl-Cr2 and Crl -Cr2 in Fig. 5-4 are a close pair. The pairing may be thought of as a distortion from an exactly centred arrangement by sliding the backbones of one row along the trough direction of the interlocking row and translating one row relative to the other along the row direction.

Applying the <u>b</u> translation to these interlocking rows, a layer (I) is generated parallel to the plane of <u>b</u> and <u>c</u>. This layer contains the sequence of rows ABAB...etc. The contact A:B is between interlocking backbones; the contact B:A is between the flat planes of oxygen feet and potassium ions of the two rows, and occurs so that the oxygen feet of one row straddle the potassium ions of the other.





FIGURE 5-5

Schematic Diagram Showing a Row Formed by Potassium and Dichromate Ions. The vector denotes the unit cell translation by which members of the row repeat. The text gives further description of these rows and a description of how they pack next to each other to form layers in the structure. The two layers are crystallographically distinct. However, the layer marked II in Figure 5-4 has nearly the same construction as layer I. The rows C and D which form layer II are found to run along the <u>b</u> direction whereas the analogous rows (A and B) in layer I run along the <u>c</u> direction. In layer II an example of the analogous close paired dichromate ions are Cr3-Cr4 in row D and Cr3'-Cr4' OIl in row C.

The failure of the layers to be strictly identical cannot be pictured as a small distortion of any crystallographic symmetry relationship between them. This is because the transformation necessary to generate layer II and then layer I (100) from the original layer I cannot correspond to a possible space group symmetry operation. The actual generation can be pictured as: 1) a rotation of $+90^{\circ}$ about \underline{a}^* and a translation of $\frac{1}{2} \underline{a} + \frac{1}{2} \underline{b} + \frac{1}{2} \underline{c}$ giving II from I, and 2) a rotation of -90° about \underline{a}^* and a translation of $\frac{1}{2} \underline{a} - \frac{1}{2} \underline{b} - \frac{1}{2} \underline{c}$ giving I(100) from II.

Fig. 5-6(a) and (b) show the unit cell contents viewed down the <u>c</u> and <u>b</u> axes. Here the dichromate ions are schematically drawn as space filling tetrahedra. The 90° rotation of one layer relative to the next is evident from these two diagrams. These figures together with Fig. 5-4 show how the atoms 011 and 031 protrude somewhat outside



(b)







their respective layers, suggesting that forces between adjacent layers may be the cause of the decrease from tetrahedral for the angles OB1-Cr1-Oll and OB3-Cr3-O31 (see Section 5.4 A).

5.4 C Structural Environments

The K^+ ions are surrounded by oxygen atoms in the structure. Table 5-6 gives the interatomic distances for the four crystallographically distinct K^+ ions and their oxygen neighbours. The table is constructed to allow comparison of analogous contacts in the similar layers I and II.

For reference the K atoms in contact with each dichromate group are listed below.

1) Cr ₂ 0 ₇	4	group	Cr1-Cr2	:
-----------------------------------	---	-------	---------	---

_ 2

		Kl	K1 00Ī	Kl'	KI OĪO
		К2	K2 00Ī	к2	к2' оІо
		кз'			
		К4	к4'Іоо		
2)	Cr207	-2 group	Cr ₃ -Cr ₄ :		
		Kl	кі ііі		
		K2			
		К3	кз оїо	кз	кз оо1
		к4	к4 010	к4	K4 001

The distances may be derived from Table 5-6.

TABLE 5-6

Kl	K2	кз	К4	
Intralayer Dis	tances (À):			
011 3.82	021 001 3.63	031 010 3.70	041 3.25	
012 001 2.83	022 2.80	032 2.88	042 010 2.94	
013 2.74	023 001 2.73	033 010 2.70	043 2.74	
023 001 2.87	013 2.75	043 2.71	033 010 2.83	
021' 2.82	011' 2.93	041'001 2.67	031'001 2.97	
022'010 2.83	012'010 2.83	042' 3.34	032' 2.82	
023'010 2.97	013'010 3.64	043' 2.68	033'	
OB1 001	OB1 3.86	OB3 3.59	OB3 010 3.90	
OB1'	OB1' 2.96	OB3'001	OB3'001 2.86	
Pseudo 2 Fold	Related Pairs	Pseudo 2 Fold	Related Pairs	
t	t		+	
Analogous Pairs In Each Layer				
Interlayer Dis	° tances (A):			
041 2.89	031 1 00 3.14	011'100 2.79	021' 3.29	
042 3.07	032 100 2.89	012'100 2.84	022' 2.76	
031'011 2.84	041'001	021 101	011 3.09	

Oxygen Environments of Potassium Ions*

Blank entries indicate distances are >4.00 Å.

In addition there are some O-O distances between neighbouring dichromate groups comparable with some of the K-O distances listed above. Such O-O distances less than 3.3 Å are given in Table 5-7. There are other values in the range 3.30 to 3.40 Å too numerous to list. 5.4 D Anisotropic Thermal Parameter Analysis

The anisotropic temperature factors given in Table 5-3 have been analyzed to determine the directions and magnitudes of the atomic motions along the three principal axes of the thermal ellipsoids. The results are given in Table 5-8. The table shows that the Cr atoms undergo almost isotropic thermal motion. Comparing the directions of the Cr-O bonds with the directions of the principal axes of vibration for the oxygen atoms, it can be seen that the smallest thermal displacements are generally coincident with the bond directions. The largest displacements occur in directions which suggest that the dichromate ions are librating about their Cr-Cr axes. Estimates of the RMS libration angle give about 7° which is in agreement with the corresponding maximum librational modes found in analogous structures (e.g. 6.4° in $K_2S_2O_7$ (3); 5.7° in $K_2CH_2(SO_3)_2$ (24); and 6.8° in $K_2NH(SO_3)_2$ (60).). 5.5 Discussion and Conclusions

5.5 A Comparison of Cell Constants and Space Groups for Related Structures

Table 5-9 gives the crystal data found in the literature for several compounds which might have structures

Oxygen-Oxygen Distances	Between Dichromate Ions*
OB1 - 013'	3.30 Å
011 - 032'	3.04
011 - 022'	3.16
012 - 031'0Ī0	3.19
013 - 013'0Ī0	3.22
013 - 022'0Ī0	3.29
021 - 041'Ī00	3.25
022 - 042'110	3.17
022 - 031 Ī0Ī	3.21
023 - 023'011	3.21
031 - 041'010	3.24
032 - 033'0Ī0	3.22
033 - 033'010	3.30
043 - 043'	3.15

TABLE 5-7

*Only one member of each pair of symmetry related distances is listed.

TABLE 5-8

Atom	R.M.S. Displącements (A)	Associated Direction	Direction Cosines (x10 ³) With Respect To		
			a	b	c
Kl	0.171 0.154 0.147		-684 343 -643	-331 -941 66	671 -270 -690
К2	0.211 0.165 0.151		193 -913 -360	-792 -238 563	-600 286 747
К3	0.207 0.162 0.147		- 91 211 973	832 525 -179	-564 758 -328
K4	0.198 0.159 0.147		-418 -471 777	-796 2 -606	354 -821 -446
Crl	0.146 0.138 0.126	Crl-Cr2	107 -783 -613 -765	-847 364 -387 117	540 640 -547 -558
Cr2	0.142 0.135 0.125		-690 177 -701	-395 560 728	612 747 -260
Cr3	0.148 0.140 0.124	Cr3-Cr4	257 -431 -865 -885	567 -557 607 576	701 713 - 22 170
Cr4	0.147 0.134 0.124	· ·	-340 192 -921	-489 727 482	-712 -658 244
OBl	0.189 0.149 0.139	Crl-OBl Cr2-OBL	-601 794 - 87 -686 665	212 93 973 570 361	845 476 -243 -483 502
011	0.207 0.172 0.143	Crl-Oll	-241 684 689 569	-362 -804 471 624	916 -190 352 331

Principal Axes Analysis for Anisotropic Temperature Factors

(continued next page)

Atom	R.M.S. Displacements (Å)	Associated Direction	Direction Cosines (x10 ³)		
			<u>a</u>	<u>b</u>	<u><u> </u></u>
021	0.238 0.202		-605 474	- 87 634 768	842 451
	0.130	Cr2-021	-602	768 757	-371
012	0.206		201	788	-572
	0.120		818	42	458
	0.129	Cr1-012	561	-644	-639
023	0.225	an an air an ann a fhannair air ann air a na <u>air an </u>	52	867	-495
	0.163		-998	194	102
	0.149	Cr2-023	- 22 482	-459	-863
013	0.236		181	-793	-599
	0.175		-966	109	-150
	0.145	Cr1-013	-184 -435	-599 -510	787
022	0.191		-622	154	-710
	0.177		422	-861	-428
	0.142	Cr2-022	-534	-486 -555	630
OB3	0.219		460	815	- 72
	0.160		-161	102	993
	0.135	Cr3-OB3	8/3 -722	-570	98 572
		Cr4-OB3	866	-470	267
031	0.229		470	805	-155
	0.199		-381	334	908
	0.133	Cr3-031	732	-292	576
041	0.213		634	463	450
	0.190		309	-854	469
	0.132	Cr4-041	-572	385	808
032	0.207	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	659	-658	-540
	0.202		/4U 132	272	462
	0.100	Cr3-032	341	545	-703

TABLE 5-8 (Continued)

(continued next page)
Atom	R.M.S. Displącements	Associated Direction	Direction Cosines (x10 ³) With Respect To			
	(A)		<u>a</u>	<u>b</u>	<u>c</u>	
043	0.209 0.168 0.146		111 859 500	492 595 635	820 97 -565	
		Cr4-043	198	732	-649	
033	0.221 0.192 0.160	Cr3-033	193 938 -287 -352	99 -441 -892 -792	-991 52 -121 -328	
042	0.216 0.192 0.157	Cr4-042	-102 870 -482 -487	540 -479 -692 -621	-840 -415 -348 -453	

TABLE 5-8 (Continued)

Principal Axes Analysis for Anisotropic Temperature Factors

TABLE 5-9

Comparison of Cell Constants and Space Groups								
Material	Space Group	o a(A)	b (Å)	c (Å)	α(⁰)	β (⁰)	γ (⁰)	Reference
K ₂ Cr ₂ 0 ₇	_							
Room Temp.	$P\overline{1}$ (C_{i}^{1})	(13.37	7.38	7.44	90.75	96.21	97.96	This Work
	1	13.47	7.41	7.49	90.85	96.22	98.00	K and S (45)
		(13.40	7.40	7.52	90.84	96.17	98.00	K,I and B (53)
High Temp. ≥260°C	$P_{1}^{n(C_{2h})}$	13.45	7.52	7.55	90	91.68	90	K and S (45)
Room Temp. Metastable	$C2/c$ (C_{2h}^{o})	13.06	7.37	7.43	90	91.85	90	K and S (45)
Z & P Form	P2 ₁ /a(C ⁵ _{2h})	12.94	7.35	7.47	90	91.92	90	Z and P (61)
(NH ₄) 2 ^{Cr20} 7	C2/c (C ⁶ _{2h})	13.26	7.54	7.74	90	93.20	90	B and W (49)
^K 2 ^S 2 ^O 7	C2/c (C ⁶ _{2h})	12.35	7.31	7.27	90	93.12	90	L and T (3)
^K 2 ^{CH} 2 ^{(SO} 3)2	$C2/c$ (C_{2h}^{6})	12.56	7.77	7.25	90	90.50	90	т (24)
$K_2^{NH}(SO_3)_2$	C2/c (C ⁶ _{2h})	12.43	7.46	7.18	90	91,18	90	C and J (60)
Ph Cr O								
$^{\text{KD}}2^{\text{CL}}2^{\text{C}}7$	- 1.							
Room Temp.	$P1 (C_{\underline{i}})$	13.49	7,65	7.74	86.13	98,43	91.00	K and S (45)
Room Temp.	$P_{1}^{n(C_{2h}^{5})}$	13.62	7.62	7.67	90	93.37	90	K and S (45)
CapP_0_								134
22/ β-Form	$P4_1 (C_A^2)$	24.14	6.68	6.68	90	90	90	W (62)

related to triclinic K₂Cr₂O₇. Structures have now been determined for all but P21/n and C2/c K2Cr207, and the two Rb₂Cr₂O₇ forms. Detailed comparisons of the known structures suggest possible forms for those of other symmetries yet to be solved. The solved C2/c structures are all quite similar and it is probable that the unsolved C2/c form of $K_2 Cr_2 O_7$ is isostructural with the known ones. The K₂Cr₂O₇ room temperature structure determined by Zhukova and Pinsker (61) for thin film crystals using electron diffraction is completely different from any other known structure in the table. If their structure, cell, and space group are correct, this might correspond to a fourth form of K₂Cr₂O₇. Since there is a systematic pattern in all the other known structures, the Zhukova and Pinsker structure is somewhat suspect. Because of its dissimilar nature it is not a useful example to discuss in the comparisons which follow.

5.5 B Relation to the Monoclinic C2/c Structures

Five of the structures listed in Table 5-9 have space group C2/c. Fig. 5-7 compares the symmetry elements in C2/c to three other centrosymmetric subgroups useful in the following discussions. These include monoclinic $P2_1/n \ (C_{2h}^5)$, and triclinic CI (C_i^1) and PI (C_i^1) .

Fig. 5-8 compares the [001] and [010] projections of a typical C2/c structure with similar projections of



FIGURE 5-7

Space group comparison. The International Table symbol convention (4, Tables 4.1.6 and 4.1.7) has been used to describe those symmetry elements present in each case.



(b)





 $P\bar{1} K_2 Cr_2 O_7$. Both structures can be described in terms of rows of cations and anions interlocking backbones to form layers which stack perpendicular to \underline{a}^* . This has been the descriptive approach used in Sec. 5.4 B and it can be followed again to describe the C2/c structure.

Layer I in C2/c is formed by two rows, A and B, which interlock backbones in a manner similar to PI. Each row of anions and cations is similar to the row shown in Fig. 5-5. However in C2/c the two halves of each anion in a row are related by a 2 fold symmetry axis with the bridging atom restricted to lie on the symmetry axis. These 2 fold axes also relate pairs of cations in each row. When two of these rows A and B interlock backbones, there is a c glide operation as well as a centre of symmetry relating the two rows. The 2 fold axes and c glide planes in C2/c ensure that each row is centred in the plane of b and c, and also ensure that the backbones of one row fit exactly in the centre of the troughs between the backbones of the next row. Hence no pairing of anions is possible in C2/c. This is in contrast to $P\overline{I}$ where there is a sliding of the backbones of one row along the trough direction and a translation along the row direction (compare layers I for Figs. 5-8 (b) and (d)). The essential difference between $P\overline{I}$ layer I and C2/c layer I is that C2/c has 2 fold axes and c glide planes which PI does not have. Only the inversion centres within the layer are common to C2/c

and $P\overline{I}$ (see Figs. 5-7 (a) and (d)).

In C2/c there is a second layer, II, which is related to layer I by the C centering. The C centering requires that layer II be identical to layer I. It also requires that the rows which interlock backbones to form layer II must run along the same direction as those rows forming layer I. The PĪ layer II, while quite similar to layer I, is not identical by symmetry to layer I and the rows forming layer II run approximately at right angles to those forming layer I. The PĪ layer arrangement does not even exhibit an approximate C centering. Hence the arrangement of adjacent layers is quite different for the C2/c and PĪ structures and seems surprising in view of their many similarities. An explanation follows of how this large difference can occur between the layer arrangements of the C2/c and PĪ structures.

It has already been pointed out above that the 2 fold axes and c glide planes in C2/c produce small but distinct differences between the C2/c and PI type layers. Fig. 5-9 (a) shows the appropriate views of the PI layers for comparison with the [001] C2/c projection, and Fig. 5-9 (b) shows those for comparison with the [010] C2/c projection. The latter comparison especially illustrates how the absence of 2 fold axes and c glide planes in both of the PI layers results in a close pairing of $Cr_{2}O_{7}$ ions. This close pairing observed for _ both of the crystallographically distinct PI layers is a key point in explaining how the 90° relationship between





0 C2/C DOWN

1-0-

FIGURE 5-9 (continued)

Comparison of C2/c and P1 Layers



adjacent layers can occur.

Fig. 5-10 illustrates qualitatively how the packing of adjacent layers can occur so differently in the C2/c and PI structures. These diagrams show projections perpendicular They show for each of (a) C2/c and (b) $P\overline{l}$: to the layers. (i) how the atoms are arranged on the front face of layer I, and (ii) how these are overlapped by the atoms on the back face of layer II. Each layer face consists of an approximately planar arrangement of red oxygen and green potassium atoms. Those oxygen atoms belonging to the same dichromate ion appear in contact. Each such oxygen pair contains one terminal backbone oxygen and one foot oxygen. The remaining feet and bridging oxygen atoms of the anions lie within the layers and are not shown.

Fig. 5-10 (a) (i) shows the front face of layer I for C2/c. The rows A and B which run along \underline{c} are marked. The contact A:B shows the interlocking backbones while the contact B:A shows the arrangement of adjacent planes of potassium atoms and feet oxygen atoms. It is important here to notice that across the contact B:A there is formed along \underline{c} a zig-zag chain of equally spaced K atoms related by one of the c glide planes. Between such chains are parallel zig-zag chains of equally spaced oxygen atom pairs belonging to interlocking dichromate groups, again related by a c glide plane. In C2/c layer II is identical to layer I and

(a) C2/c

(i) Projection down \underline{a}^* showing front face of layer I



(ii) Back face of layer II overlapping front face of Layer I



FIGURE 5-10

Comparison of C2/c and P1 adjacent layer packing

the back face of layer II is identical to the inversion of the front face shown for layer I. Fig. 5-10 (a) (ii) shows how layer II overlaps layer I with the zig-zag chains of equally spaced K atoms on the back face of layer II fitting over the zig-zag chains of equally spaced oxygen atom pairs in the front face of layer I, and vice versa. This overlap arrangement is a reasonable one since one expects to find contacts between potassium ions and the oxygens of the dichromate ions when the two layers pack adjacent to one another. Since the two types of zig-zag chains must be parallel when they overlap, the orientation of layer II is the same as that of layer I in the C2/c crystal structure.

Quite a different situation arises in $P\overline{I}$. Fig. 5-10 (b) (i) shows the front face of $P\overline{I}$ layer I for comparison with Fig. 5-10 (a) (i). Similar zig-zag chains of K atoms and of oxygen atoms running along <u>c</u> are formed across the row contacts. However in $P\overline{I}$ the close pairing allowed through the absence of the 2 fold axes and c glide planes results in one member of any chain being displaced closer to one of its neighbouring members. With such displacements it becomes possible to pick out other zig-zag chains of unequally spaced K and O atoms running along b.

Since layer II is nearly identical to layer I, it

too will possess on its faces two different directions in which zig-zag chains can be found. Assuming that $P\overline{I}$ layer II will make contact with layer I by aligning zig-zag K atom chains over chains of oxygen atoms, there are now seen to be two orientations for which layer II might accomplish this. Briefly, these two ways are: (A) K chains along <u>c</u> over oxygen chains along <u>c</u>, and (B) K chains along <u>b</u> over oxygen chains along c.

Case (A) would result in at least an approximate C centering relation between layers I and II. Case (A) could also arise with an n glide relation since the approximate c glide within the PI layers plus an n glide combine to give an approximate C centering.

The structure analysis of $K_2Cr_2O_7$ at room temperature indicates that case (A) is not observed. Case (B) on the other hand would give the PI structure an apparent interchange in the roles of the unit cell <u>b</u> and <u>c</u> axes for the two different layers. This approximate 90[°] relation is found in the PI $K_2Cr_2O_7$ structure determination. Fig. 5-10 (b) (ii) shows this observed overlap arrangement. The comparison of the two different layer structures has led to an understanding of how two quite different overlap arrangements can occur, and these ideas will be used in Sec. 5.5 C to speculate on the structures of other phases of $K_2Cr_2O_7$.

The differences between the C2/c and PI structures can be summarized as an absence in PI of the following C2/c symmetry elements: 2 fold axes, c glide planes, C centering, n glide planes, 2_1 fold screw axes, and the second class of inversion centres (i.e. the ones between layers, see Fig. 5-7). Only the first class of inversion centres remains. The absence of the last four elements in this list result in quite drastic changes in the way layer II is arranged with respect to layer I. The absence of 2 fold axes and c glide planes produce less drastic differences within individual layers, but their absence nevertheless results in the close pairing which in turn allows adjacent PI layers to stack with different orientations.

While case (B) contacts are observed in triclinic $K_2Cr_2O_7$, it is certainly possible that similar triclinic compounds might show case (A) contacts with C or n symmetry relating adjacent layers. One other example of case (B) contacts has been found in the structure of β -Ca $_2P_2O_7$ (62) which has the noncentrosymmetric tetragonal space group P4₁. Here, four layers per cell stack adjacent to one another, each at right angles to the next in accord with the 4₁ screw axis. Case (A) contacts occur for all the known C2/c structures of Table 5-9. The choice of layer contact scheme is probably in delicate balance with the extent to which the c glide planes and 2 fold axes are missing within the

layers, which in turn reflects the specific anion cation interactions that form the layers.

5.5 C Speculation on the Structures of Other $K_2Cr_2O_7$ Phases

Klement and Schwab (45) have identified a monoclinic $K_2Cr_2O_7$ phase which is metastable at room temperature and has space group C2/c (C_{2h}^6) or Cc (C_s^4). They favour C2/c on the basis of expected similarity to the structures of $K_2S_2O_7$ and $(NH_4)_2Cr_2O_7$, and there is no evidence arising from this present work to invalidate this choice. One might expect C2/c, the highest symmetry, to be the highest temperature phase but this need not be so. The C2/c phase is probably isostructural with $K_2S_2O_7$ and $(NH_4)_2Cr_2O_7$.

Klement and Schwab have also studied the high temperature ($\geq 260^{\circ}$ C) K₂Cr₂O₇ phase and report monoclinic P2₁/n (C⁵_{2h}) symmetry. This space group is a subgroup of C2/c obtained by removing 2 fold axes, c glide planes and one set of inversion centres (see Fig. 5-7). The C centering which occurs as a combination of the c and n glide planes is also absent.

Assuming that the $P2_1/n$ structure also has rows of $Cr_2O_7^{-2}$ and K^+ ions interlocking backbones to form layers which stack up <u>a</u>^{*}, one can speculate what the structure looks like using packing and symmetry arguments. In $P2_1/n$ the arrangement within the layers is not restricted by any c glide planes or 2 fold axes and the $P2_1/n$ layers can be distorted

from the C2/c configuration. The n glide planes and 2₁ screw axes still relate the layers I and II and ensure that the rows forming adjacent layers are parallel,i.e. a type (A) contact between the zig-zag oxygen and potassium chains in adjacent faces.

It is therefore proposed that adjacent interlocking rows in P2₁/n will show a sliding of rows along the trough direction and a translation along the row direction. This will give a close pairing of dichromate ions and potassium ions like that seen in the PĪ layers. The extent of these distortions from the equally spaced C2/c arrangement is expected to be less than that observed in PĪ, and the choice of type (A) contacts between layer faces is favoured with n glide and 2₁ screw axes relating adjacent layers. Verification of these proposals must await a solution of the P2₁/n K₂Cr₂O₇ high temperature structure, or alternatively that of room temperature P2₁/n Rb₂Cr₂O₇ since these two are expected to be isostructural.

A fourth possible centrosymmetric space group allowing an analogous two layered structure might be non primitive triclinic $C\overline{l}$ ($C_{\underline{i}}^{1}$). The only symmetry elements remaining from C2/c are the C centering and the two sets of inversion centres (see Fig. 5-7). With the absence of c glide planes and 2 fold axes within the layer, close pairing would be possible. The C centering ensures that the rows forming

adjacent layers would be parallel. However, when close pairing occurs, as for $P\overline{I}$ and as speculated for $P2_1/n$, the zig-zag chains on the layer faces begin to resemble zig-zag ridges and valleys due to the sliding of the backbones of one row along the trough direction of the interlocking If any sliding is present, the C centering tends to put zig-zag ridge of layer II on top of zig-zag ridge of layer I and valley opposite valley. This would produce open regions between adjacent layers and would not be a favourable packing arrangement. The n glide relation as in $P2_1/n$ does allow ridges to overlap valleys and seems preferable to any CI form. If this objection to CI were overcome by limiting the amount of sliding, the structure reapproaches the high symmetry C2/c type of arrangement. Hence the speculated CI structure, while possible, seems less likely than either the proposed $P2_1/n$ form or the observed $P\overline{1}$ form. No reports on the existence of any CI form are known to the author.

A comparison of the packing schemes in $P\bar{1} K_2 Cr_2 O_7$ and in $P4_1 \beta - Ca_2 P_2 O_7$ (62) shows considerable similarity. The structure of $\beta - Ca_2 P_2 O_7$ also has layers formed by rows of Ca and nearly eclipsed pyrophosphate ions interlocking backbones. These layers are reported to have local non crystallographic centres of symmetry. The layers are related to one another by a 4_1 screw axis giving an exact 90° rotation between adjacent layers. Because the 4_1 screw axis requires four layers

per unit cell, the <u>a</u> axis is twice as long as in the corresponding two layer packing arrangements (see Table 5-9). In view of the similarities in their general packing schemes, it might even be possible for a dichromate structure to occur with the β -Ca₂P₂O₇ P4₁ type arrangement, but no form with this space group has yet been reported. 5.5 D Discussion of the Dichromate Ion

A preliminary description of the $\operatorname{Cr}_{2}O_{7}^{-2}$ ions and their symmetry appears in Sec. 5.4 A. It remains to discuss the observed stereochemistry for the dichromate ion in $P\overline{1}$ $K_2 Cr_2 O_7$ and to compare it with the pyrosulfate ion, $S_2 O_7^{-2}$, as found in C2/c K₂S₂O₇. This comparison is not ideal since the data comes from two structures with different symmetries and packing arrangements. The dichromate ion in C2/c (NH₄)₂Cr₂O₇ (49) with C₂ crystallographic symmetry is unfortunately not known with sufficient accuracy to make its inclusion in the comparison very meaningful. Some points of comparison may also be made between the dichromate ion and the pyrophosphate ion $P_2 O_7^{-4}$ geometry found in β -Ca₂P₂O₇ (62). The latter comparison however cannot be representative of all pyrophosphate ion geometries since they have been found with quite different configurations in other structures (63).

The bond lengths and angles in $\operatorname{Cr}_2^{-2}_7$ have been listed in Table 5-5. The two crystallographically distinct

dichromate ions have been found with twists of 5° and 10° away from an exactly eclipsed configuration when viewed along the Cr-Cr directions (see Fig. 5-3). In C2/c the $S_2O_7^{-2}$ ion only has crystallographic symmetry C_2 but is within experimental error of being exactly eclipsed and having C_{2v} symmetry. The pyrophosphate ions in β -Ca $_2P_2O_7$ are found with slight twists away from an exactly eclipsed configuration.

It is difficult to say with certainty whether the twisting of the dichromate ion is a property of the free ion itself, or whether the effect is a distortion away from an eclipsed configuration caused by external forces on the ion in the crystal packing. The fact that the K-K vectors do not coincide with the backbone directions in Fig. 5-9 (a) and (b) might explain the twisting of the dichromate groups. By the same argument one might expect the same twisting for the ions in a C2/c structure. None is found for the C2/c x-ray structures involving sulfur compounds since they show C_{2v} symmetry within experimental error. The ammonium dichromate structure is not accurate enough to examine this proposal for a C2/c dichromate ion. Although no free ion data is available for $Cr_{2}O_{7}^{-2}$ a crystal packing explanation seems necessary to explain the two different angles of twist observed for two distinct dichromate ions. Certainly the pyrophosphate ion twisting is variable among

[†]Some work has been done (67) but no data on twisting is reported.

different structures. Chlorine heptoxide molecules, Cl_2O_7 however show a twist of about 15° from an eclipsed configuration even in the gaseous state (51). O-O and Cl-O repulsions between opposite halves of the molecule are suggested as the cause of this effect in Cl_2O_7 .

The dichromate ion has been observed with Cr-O-Cr bridging angles of 124.0 \pm 0.1° and 127.6 \pm 0.2° compared to 124.2 \pm 0.5° for the S-O-S bridge angle, and 130.5 \pm 0.8° and 137.8 \pm 0.8° in the β -Ca₂P₂O₇ pyrophosphate ions. The two different angles for the dichromate ions again probably arise from different forces in the crystal packing.

For each dichromate ion, the two bridge Cr-O bonds are equal within experimental error (mean $1.786 \pm .008 \text{ Å}$) as are the terminal Cr-O bond distances (mean $1.629 \pm .010 \text{ Å}$). The bridge S-O distances in the pyrosulfate ion are equivalent by symmetry and again the terminal S-O bonds seem equal within experimental error. Comparison of the bond angles, however, reveals some different features for the stereochemistry of these two ions.

Table 5-10 compares these angles along with data for other C2/c structures with analogous ions containing sulfur, namely $CH_2(SO_3)_2^{-2}$ (24) and $NH(SO_3)_2^{-2}$ (60). The first three sets of angles involve the bridge atom and all show a decrease from tetrahedral in the pyrosulfate type ions, whereas they remain close to tetrahedral for the

TABLE 5-10

Analogous Angle Names Used in This Work	Cr ₂ ^{PI}	PĪ Cr ₂ 07 II	C2/c S ₂ 0 ₇	C2/c CH ₂ (SO ₃) ₂	C2/c NH(SO ₃) ₂
OBi-Cri-Oil	106.1	106.6]	101.3	102.4	102.9
OBi-Crj-Ojl	109.6	ل 109.7			
OBi-Cri-Oi2	109.4	[109.7	106.2	106.3	106.5
OBi-Crj-Oj2	108.5	111.2			
OBi-Cri-Oi3	110.8	(110.1	106.1	107.3	107.0
OBi-Crj-Oj3	109.5	108.4			
0il-Cri-Oi2	109.5	ר 109.8	113.6	113.2	112.8
0jl-Crj-0j2	110.2	109.7			
0il-Cri-0i3	111.7	110.6 1	115.5	113.8	114.0
Ojl-Crj-Oj3	110.6	109.9			
0i2-0xi-0i3	100 2	ר ו חוו	112 0	112 0	110 3
0j2-Crj-0j3	109.2	107.9	112.0	112.0	112.5
Cri-OBi-Crj	124.0	127.6	124.2	119.7	125.5

Comparison of Angles (^O) for Related Anions Involving Sulfur and Chromium dichromate ions. The one exception for the dichromate cases is the backbone angle of about 106° which has been suggested as due to packing forces since it occurs only on the one end of the $\operatorname{Cr}_2 \circ_7$ ions which protrudes the most out of the layers. The pyrosulfate angles analogous to this one exception both decrease for the two halves of the ion more than the other O-S-O angles to about 102° possibly for the same reason since each half of the ion receives equal forces from the adjacent layers in C2/c. On the other hand, McDonald and Cruickshank (52) have recently suggested that these distortions are of intraionic origin.

The second three sets of angles in Table 5-10 involve only terminal oxygen atoms. These all open from tetrahedral for the pyrosulfate types whereas they remain quite close to tetrahedral for chromium cases. The opening of the terminal O-S-O angles (and consequent decrease in the OB-S-O angles) has been suggested (3) as due to repulsion between the three charged oxygen atoms when the fourth oxygen is more distant. The fact that the terminal O distances are longer for Cr than for S (1.63 Å compared to 1.44 Å) might account for such repulsions not being as effective in opening the terminal O-Cr-O angles in $\operatorname{Cr}_2O_7^{-2}$ ions. Weaker repulsive forces are expected since the terminal O-O distances are about 2.65 Å in $\operatorname{Cr}_2O_7^{-2}$ compared to about 2.43 Å in $s_2O_7^{-2}$. The sum of O-O van der Waals radii (2, Table 7-20)

is 2.80 Å. Similar data for the pyrophosphate ion in β -Ca₂P₂O₇ shows an opening of terminal O-P-O angles with terminal O-O distances of about 2.53 Å.

In Cruickshank's theory of bonding in tetrahedral arrangements (1) the presence of such angle distortions can result in a further increase in the π -bonding strength and hence a slight shortening of the bond from its value in a purely tetrahedral environment. This tendency has been described in connection with X_nSO_{4-n} type ions in Chapter 3, particularly Table 3-5. The mean S-O (terminal) distance of 1.437 $\stackrel{+}{=}$.004 Å (3) in the S₂O₇⁻² type ions is a shortening from the SO_4^{-2} ion S-O distance of 1.49 Å (1) as expected with the angle distortions present. However the mean Cr-O (terminal) distance of 1.629 - .010 Å suggests that much less of a shortening occurs here from the reported 1.65 Å value for the CrO_A^{-2} ion (65). A much smaller shortening, if any, would be expected here since no appreciable angle changes have occurred from terminal oxygen repulsions. The 0.02 Å shortening itself may be in doubt since not much accurate data is available for Cr-0 distances in CrO_{4}^{-2} ions. In any case the observed opening of terminal O-S-O angles in $S_2 O_7^{-2}$ ions contrasts with the nearly tetrahedral values for terminal O-Cr-O angles and is a significant difference in the stereochemistries of these analogous sulfur and chromium ions.

The great similarity seen for the configurations of the $\operatorname{Cr}_2 \operatorname{O_7}^{-2}$ and $\operatorname{S_2 \operatorname{O_7}}^{-2}$ ions would suggest that Cruickshank's theory of π -bonding in tetrahedral complexes is applicable as well to chromium in tetrahedral arrangements. A reason why terminal O-Cr-O angles do not open appreciably from tetrahedral has been suggested. The fact that they do not deviate appreciably from tetrahedral means that arguments favouring any increases in the π -bonding strength are not as applicable for chromium-oxygen cases as for sulfur-oxygen cases.

It can be questioned whether the closing of the OB-S-O and OB-Cr-O angle values for the backbone oxygen atoms results in any significant decrease in the S-O or Cr-O bonds. In the C2/c structures these values (102°) decrease from tetrahedral even more than do the OB-S-O (feet) angles (106.5°) suggesting that additional distortions may be present. Indeed, if any terminal oxygen atoms should be unique in the symmetry of the bonding, one would expect it to be the terminal backbone oxygens since they lie in the same plane as the longer bridge bonds connecting the two halves of the ion. A slight shortening has been detected for the unique terminal oxygen bond length in the pyrophosphate ion in β -Ca₂P₂O₇ (1.497 \pm .011 Å compared to 1.529 - .016 Å). Similar differences may also exist in the K₂S₂O₇ pyrosulfate ion, but experimental errors make any such trend in the data uncertain. No significant

differences among the terminal Cr-O bond lengths are noted. The short Cr²-O2l distance of 1.602 Å seems unique but this can be explained by the fact that O2l only has one potassium ion contact less than 3.25 Å.

The occurrence of angle distortions for these unique oxygen atoms solely for one half of each dichromate ion (angles OBI-Cr1-Oll and OB3-Cr3-O31) correlates with the fact that Oll and O31 protrude from the layers while O21 and O41 do not. This suggests that the angle effect is due to external forces arising from the crystal packing rather than internal forces of bonding within the ion. From analogy with the gaseous Cl_2O_7 results (51), McDonald and Cruickshank (52) have suggested these distortions to be intraionic effects. They describe the distortion as a tilt of the 3 fold axis of the SO_3^- group away from the OB-S direction, and cite this as an example of bent X-O (bridge) bonds (64).

The less accurate structure determination of triclinic $K_2Cr_2O_7$ recently reported by Kuzmin, Iliukhin, and Belov (53) gives misleading information about the dichromate ion geometry. While their bridging angles of 122° and 127° compare reasonably well with the present results, they report bridging Cr-O distances of 1.72 Å and 1.85 Å in one ion, and 1.74 Å and 1.84 Å in the other. Terminal Cr-O distances likewise show wide spreads of 1.53 Å to 1.68 Å in one ion, and 1.51 to 1.63 Å in the other. Similar wide

spreads among bond lengths were observed in early stages of the present refinement, even with an agreement index R as low as 0.12 or so, and particularly when refinement was attempted with only portions of the intensity data included. Hence these discrepancies in $\operatorname{Cr}_2\operatorname{O_7}^{-2}$ ion stereochemistry may be attributed simply to the lower accuracy available in the structure refinement of these other authors.

CHAPTER 6 SUMMARY

Cesium methylsulfonate crystallizes in space group Pnma with cell constants a = 9.526, b = 6.264, and c = 8.692 Å. Three dimensional x-ray diffraction intensity data have been collected photographically and the solved structure has been refined by least-squares procedures to give a weighted agreement index (R) of 0.12. All but the hydrogen positions were determined in the structure analysis. The structure is related to, but is not identical with, that of the isoelectronic compound barium sulfate. A comparison of these two structures has indicated the differences in crystal packing arising from the differences between the methylsulfonate and sulfate ions. The methylsulfonate ion has been found within the accuracy of this analysis to have C_{3x} symmetry with S-O = 1.47 $\stackrel{+}{-}$ 0.02 Å, S-C = 1.85 $\stackrel{+}{-}$ 0.04 Å (both corrected for thermal motion), $O-S-O = 112 \stackrel{+}{-} 1^{\circ}$, and $O-S-C = 107 \stackrel{+}{-} 2^{O}$. The stereochemistry of the methylsulfonate ion has been compared with that of a series in which methyl groups are substituted for the oxygen atoms of a sulfate ion. The results for the methylsulfonate ion and for other members of this series are in accord with the predictions of Cruickshank (1) about the nature of the bonding in groups of this type with sulfur as the central atom. This work on

the structure determination of cesium methylsulfonate has recently been published elsewhere (31).

A rerefinement of two independently measured sets of room temperature intensity data for lithium hydrazinium sulfate failed to resolve some slight differences between the two reported x-ray structures. In addition to allowing for anisotropic thermal motion of all the large atoms, some attempts were made to refine hydrogen atom positions with the x-ray data but these latter efforts were inconclusive. Above 160°C the observed systematic absences together with the structure analysis show that the space group is Pbn2,, and hence remains the same as that of the room temperature structure. The high temperature structure refinement indicated that no very significant changes occur from the room temperature structure for the heavy atom positions. Although sample deterioration at high temperatures prevented the collection of very accurate intensity data, the accuracy available ought to have shown any changes which might occur above 160⁰C in the positions of these large atoms. If the structure above 160°C should be distinctly different from the room temperature structure, it must differ primarily in the hydrogen configurations, which could not be observed, or possibly in the nitrogen or lithium atom z coordinates which could not be too accurately determined with the available high temperature data.

The crystal structure of triclinic potassium dichromate has been solved using single crystal x-ray diffraction techniques. The cell constants are a = 13.367, b = 7.376, c = 7.445 Å, α = 90.75°, β = 96.21°, and γ = 97.96° with four formula units per cell. Anomalous dispersion experiments and least squares refinement of three dimensional intensity data to an agreement index R of 0.054 have confirmed the space group to be centrosymmetric P1. The structure can be described in terms of rows of potassium and dichromate ions fitting together to form layers which stack next to one another parallel to the (100) face. The solved structure is similar in some ways to monoclinic C2/c structures like ammonium dichromate and potassium pyrosulfate, but distinct differences are observed particularly in the way in which adjacent layers in the two types of structure stack next to one another. Through detailed examination of the C2/c and $P\overline{1}$ layers, an explanation has been proposed as to how both the C2/c layer arrangement and the PI layer arrangement (with its 90° relation between layers) can each occur. Ideas arising from this explanation suggest possible structures for other phases of potassium dichromate and some predictions about these forms have been The dichromate ion has been described as two CrO, given. tetrahedra sharing one corner oxygen atom. Small distortions have been detected which prevent the ion from having exact

 C_{2v} or even C_2 symmetry. The Cr-O (bridge) bonds are equivalent (1.786 - 0.008 Å) as are the Cr-O (terminal) bonds (1.629 $\stackrel{+}{-}$ 0.010 Å) within experimental errors. The Cr-O-Cr bridging angles are $124.0 \pm 0.1^{\circ}$ and $127.6 \pm 0.2^{\circ}$ for the two crystallographically distinct ions. The O-Cr-O angles are essentially tetrahedral (109.5°). A comparison has been made with other similar ions where sulfur occurs in place of chromium. A discussion is presented on the possibility that Cruickshank's theory, which has previously been used to explain the bonding in these ions involving sulfur, might also be applicable for cases involving chromium. A preliminary report of this work on the structure of triclinic potassium dichromate has previously been presented elsewhere (66).

APPENDIX I

THE SCATTERING FACTOR FOR A SPHERICALLY SYMMETRIC ATOM ROTATING ABOUT AN AXIS

In cesium methylsulfonate and lithium hydrazinium sulfate, contributions to the structure factors have been calculated for hydrogen atoms using a dynamic model for the CH₃ groups and the NH₃ portion of the N₂H₅ groups. The structure factor contribution from each such hydrogen atom rotating about an axis at radius r from a centre (x_c, y_c, z_c) is (5, Section 6.3.3.6)

 $F_{H}(hkl) = f_{H}(hkl) J_{O}(2\pi tr) \exp 2\pi i(hx_{C} + ky_{C} + lz_{C})$

where t is the distance in the reciprocal lattice from the point (h,k,l) to the axis through the origin parallel to the axis of rotation, and $f_{H}(hkl)$ is the usual scattering factor for a hydrogen atom. $J_{O}(x)$ is the zeroth order Bessel function of the first kind given by

$$J_{n}(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{k} x^{n+2k}}{2^{n+2k} k! (n+k)!} (n=0,1,2...)$$

i.e.
$$J_{O}(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{k} x^{2k}}{2^{2k} (k!)^{2}}$$

Hence the contributions from these rotating hydrogen atoms may be included in eqn.[2-3] by replacing the scattering factor $f_i(hk\ell)$ by $f_H(hk\ell) J_O(2\pi tr)$ with the desired values of t

and r, and using the coordinates $(x_{c}y_{c}z_{c})$ in the exponential factor.

Padmanabhan and Balasubramanian (41) for their dynamic model of rotating NH₃ groups in LiHzS report using the hydrogen atom structure factor contribution

$$F_{H}(hkl) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} f_{j}(hkl) J_{O}(x_{j})$$

where

$$\mathbf{x}_{j} = \frac{4\pi r}{\lambda} \sin \theta \sin \alpha$$

and where α is the angle between the plane containing the rotating atoms and the plane of reflection. Their Bessel function argument x, so defined agrees with the argument 2π rt used above. However, the factor

 $\exp 2\pi i (hx_c + ky_c + lz_c)$

is missing in both of their quoted expressions and they fail to define any coordinates for the centre of the rotating group. Such an omission in the actual calculations would mean that the rotating groups had been incorrectly centred at the unit cell origin. On the other hand, this omission could well be a misprint.

APPENDIX II

OBSERVED LIN2H5SO4 STRUCTURE FACTOR DATA OF

VAN DEN HENDE AND BOUTIN (43)

HKLF	О́Н	KLFO	нк	L FO	нкс	FO H	KLFO
H K L F 0 2 0 2 0 0 4 0 3 1 0 6 0 5 1 1 1 0 3 1 1 1 1 0 3 1 1 1 1 0 0 1 1 1 1 0 0 1 1 1 1 0 0 1 1 1 1 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 0 0 1 1 1 0 1 2 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 2 0 0 1 1 0 1 2 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	O 025450862039975195789826654580201078605 H 444455555555666666666677777788888888999999	$ \begin{array}{c} K & 6790 \\ 0015 \\ 1000 \\ 1233 \\ 456789 \\ 0000 \\ 0000 \\ 155 \\ 1000 \\ 155 \\ 1000 \\ 1100 \\ \mathsf$	H 7 1 3 5 2 4 6 8 0 0 1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 0 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 0 1 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	L FO 0 6 0 20 0 10 1 8 1 29 1 11 1 20 1 41 1 20 1 41 1 20 1 41 1 22 1 14 1 22 1 14 1 22 1 14 1 22 1 14 1 29 1 27 1 28 1 40 1 27 1 40 1 37 1 14 1 22 1 16 1 29 1 22 1 28 1 29 1 22 1 28 1 29 1 25 1	H 334444444445555555555555556666666666666	FOH1281082382382382492592592592592592592592592592592192592192592192592192592010161117116117116117112115220252	$\begin{array}{c} K L FO \\ 1 1 2 \\ 2 1 30 \\ 3 1 7 \\ 4 1 19 \\ 5 1 10 \\ 8 1 22 \\ 0 1 33 \\ 1 1 10 \\ 8 1 22 \\ 0 1 33 \\ 1 1 12 \\ 2 1 33 \\ 1 1 12 \\ 2 1 3 \\ 1 1 22 \\ 0 1 33 \\ 1 1 12 \\ 2 1 3 \\ 1 1 12 \\ 2 1 3 \\ 1 1 9 \\ 3 1 19 \\ 4 1 3 \\ 5 1 6 \\ 0 2100 \\ 2 239 \\ 4 2 226 \\ 3 2 100 \\ 2 28 \\ 1 2 100 \\ 2 28 \\ 1 2 100 \\ 2 28 \\ 1 2 2100 \\ 2 28 \\ 1 2 2100 \\ 2 28 \\ 1 2 2100 \\ 2 28 \\ 1 2 2100 \\ 2 28 \\ 1 2 2100 \\ 2 28 \\ 1 2 2100 \\ 2 28 \\ 1 2 2100 \\ 2 28 \\ 1 2 2100 \\ 2 28 \\ 1 2 2100 \\ 2 28 \\ 1 2 2100 \\ 2 28 \\ 1 2 2100 \\ 2 28 \\ 1 2 2100 \\ 2 28 \\ 1 2 2100 \\ 2 28 \\ 1 2 2100 \\ 2 28 \\ 2 29 \\ 2 29 \\ 2 29 \\ 2 29 \\ 2 20 \\ 20 \\ 20 20 \\ 20 \\ 20 20 \\ 20 \\ 20 20 \\ 20 20 \\ 20 20 \\ 20 \\ 20 20 \\ 20 20 \\ 20 20 \\ 20 20 \\ 20 20 \\ 20 20 \\ 20 20 \\ 20 20 \\ 20 20 \\ 20 20 \\ 20 20 \\ 20 20 \\ 20 20 \\ 20 20 \\ 20 $

APPENDIX III

VERIFICATION OF A RESULT USED IN SECTION 5.3

This appendix will show the approximate equivalence for small Δ_1 , Δ_2 of the intensities from the following:

I The Pl structure factor summation function for the two arguments $\underline{X}_1 = \underline{x} + \underline{A}_1$ and $\underline{X}_2 = -\underline{x} + \underline{A}_2$ each with unit weight

and

II The PĪ structure factor summation function for the two arguments $\underline{X}_1' = \underline{x} + \underline{A}_1$ and $\underline{X}_2' = \underline{x} - \underline{A}_2$ each with 1/2 weight.

Comparison will be made of the intensities arising in these two cases and that from a simple $P\overline{1}$ case with argument $\underline{x}_1 = \underline{x}$.

Proof

The Pl function is

 $F(\underline{h}) = A + iB = \sum_{i} \omega_{i} [\cos 2\pi X_{i} \cdot \underline{h} + i \sin 2\pi X_{i} \cdot \underline{h}] .$ The Pl function is

$$F(\underline{h}) = A = \sum_{i} \omega_{i} [2 \cos 2\pi \underline{X}_{i} \cdot \underline{h}] .$$

Case I gives

 $F(\underline{h}) = \cos 2\pi (\underline{x} + \underline{A}_{1}) \cdot \underline{h} + i \sin 2\pi (\underline{x} + \underline{A}_{1}) \cdot \underline{h} + \cos 2\pi (-\underline{x} + \underline{A}_{2}) \cdot \underline{h} + i \sin 2\pi (-\underline{x} + \underline{A}_{2}) \cdot \underline{h} .$
Case II gives

$$F(\underline{h}) = \cos 2\pi (\underline{x} + \underline{A}_1) \cdot \underline{h} + \cos 2\pi (\underline{x} - \underline{A}_2) \cdot \underline{h}$$

Since $\cos z = \cos(-z)$ the difference between the two cases is

 $i [\sin 2\pi (\underline{x} + \underline{A}_1) \cdot \underline{h} + \sin 2\pi (-\underline{x} + \underline{A}_2) \cdot \underline{h}]$

= i $[\sin \underline{x} \cdot \underline{h}] (\cos \underline{A}_1 \cdot \underline{h} - \cos \underline{A}_2 \cdot \underline{h})$

+ $\cos \underline{x} \cdot \underline{h} (\sin \underline{A}_1 \cdot \underline{h} + \sin \underline{A}_2 \cdot \underline{h})]$.

When both Δ_1 and Δ_2 are small $\cos \underline{\Delta_1} \cdot \underline{h} \approx \cos \underline{\Delta_2} \cdot \underline{h}$, $\sin \underline{\Delta_1} \cdot \underline{h} \approx \underline{\Delta_1} \cdot \underline{h}$, and $\sin \underline{\Delta_2} \cdot \underline{h} \approx \underline{\Delta_2} \cdot \underline{h}$ giving a difference of only

 $i (\underline{A}_1 + \underline{A}_2) \cdot \underline{h} \cos \underline{x} \cdot \underline{h}$

which is small when Δ_1 and Δ_2 are small. Hence the two cases differ by only a small imaginary term. They give rise to nearly equivalent intensities since the small difference occurs for B and the square makes little difference to the expression I = ($A^2 + B^2$) when B is small itself as in a pseudo-centrosymmetric structure.

The simple $P\overline{I}$ case for the argument $X_{1}' = \underline{x}$ with unit weight gives $F(\underline{h}) = A = 2 \cos 2\pi \underline{x} \cdot \underline{h}$ which differs only in the A term from cases I and II by a factor of $\frac{1}{2} (\cos 2\pi \underline{A}_{1} \cdot \underline{h} + \cos 2\pi \underline{A}_{2} \cdot \underline{h})$. While this factor is close to unity for small A_{1}, A_{2} , the difference in $F(\underline{h})$ occurs now in the A term. The intensity $I = (A^{2} + B^{2})$ is sensitive to even small changes in A since A is usually not small itself.

Hence cases I and II give nearly identical intensities. For non identically zero Λ_1, Λ_2 , both cases have intensities similar to but probably noticeably different from the simple case corresponding to the isotropic PI model. These proofs have bearing on the arguments of Section 5.2 C.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1.	D. W. J. Cruickshank. J. Chem. Soc. 5486 (1961).
2.	L. Pauling. The Nature of the Chemical Bond. Cornell
	University Press, Ithica, New York. 1960.
3.	H. Lynton and M. R. Truter. J. Chem. Soc. 5112 (1960).
4.	International Tables for X-ray Crystallography.
	Vol. I. Kynoch Press, Birmingham, England. 1952.
5.	International Tables for X-ray Crystallography.
	Vol. II. Kynoch Press, Birmingham, England. 1959.
б.	International Tables for X-ray Crystallography.
	Vol. III. Kynoch Press, Birmingham, England. 1962.
7. _.	R. W. James. The Optical Principles of the Diffraction
	of X-rays. G. Bell and Sons Ltd., London. 1962.
8.	H. Lipson and W. Cochran. The Determination of Crystal
	Structures. G. Bell and Sons Ltd., London. 1962.
9.	M. J. Buerger. X-ray Crystallography. John Wiley and
	Sons Inc., New York. 1942.
10.	M. J. Buerger. <u>Vector Space</u> . John Wiley and Sons Inc.,
	New York. 1959.
11.	M. J. Buerger. Crystal-structure Analysis. John Wiley
	and Sons Inc., New York. 1960.
12.	M. J. Buerger. The Precession Method. John Wiley and

Sons Inc., New York. 1964.

- C. Kittel. Introduction to Solid State Physics.
 John Wiley and Sons Inc., New York. 1956.
- 14. A. L. Patterson. Z. Krist. 90, 517 (1935).
- 15. E. A. Robinson. Private Communication.
- 16. V. Silberberg. M. A. Thesis. University of Toronto. 1962.
- 17. J. A. Bearden. <u>X-ray Wavelengths</u>. U. S. Atomic Energy Commission, Div. of Tech. Information Extension, Oak Ridge, Tennessee. 1964.
- 18. R. J. Blume. Rev. Sci. Instr. 32, 598 (1961).
- 19. W. C. Hamilton. Acta Cryst. 18, 502 (1965).
- 20. M. Merrington and C. M. Thompson. Biometrica 33, 73 (1946).
- 21. W. R. Busing and H. A. Levy. Acta Cryst. 17, 142 (1964).
- 22. M. A. James and W. A. Wood. Proc. Roy. Soc. London, Ser. A, 109, 598 (1925).
- 23. Chu Chia-hsuan, Cheng Yu-fen, and Shen Chin-chuan.

Sci. Sinica Peking, 14, 1541 (1965).

- 24. M. R. Truter. J. Chem. Soc. 3393 (1962).
- 25. A. I. M. Rae and E. N. Maslen. Acta Cryst. 15, 1285 (1962).
- 26. S. R. Hall and E. N. Maslen. Acta Cryst. 18, 301 (1965).
- 27. C. J. Brown and D.E.C. Corbridge. Acta Cryst. <u>21</u>, 485 (1966).
- 28. D. E. Sands. Z. Krist. 119, 245 (1963).
- 29. C. L. Coulter, P. K. Gantzel, and J. D. McCullough. Acta Cryst. <u>16</u>, 676 (1963).

- 30. I. C. Zimmermann, M. Barlow, and J. D. McCullough. Acta Cryst. <u>16</u>, 883 (1963).
- 31. J. K. Brandon and I. D. Brown. Can. J. Chem. <u>45</u>, 1385 (1967).
- 32. F. Sommer and K. Weise. Z. anorg. allgem. Chem. <u>94</u>, 51 (1916).
- 33. R. Pepinsky, K. Vedam, Y. Okaya, and S. Hoshino. Phys. Rev. <u>111</u>, 1467 (1958).
- 34. J. D. Cuthbert and H. E. Petch. Can. J. Phys. <u>41</u>, 1629 (1963).
- 35. R. Blinc, M. Schara, and S. Poberaj. J. Phys. Chem. Solids 24, 559 (1963).
- 36. I. D. Brown. Acta Cryst. 17, 654 (1964).
- 37. J. H. Van den Hende and H. Boutin. Acta Cryst. <u>17</u>, 660 (1964).
- 38. N. Niizeki and H. Koizumi. J. Phys. Soc. Japan <u>19</u>, 132 (1964).
- 39. J. Vanderkooy, J. D. Cuthbert and H. E. Petch. Can. J. Phys. 42, 1871 (1964).
- 40. R. S. Krishnan and K. Krishnan. Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. 61A, 122 (1965).
- 41. V. M. Padmanabhan and R. Balasubramanian. Acta Cryst. 22, 532 (1967).
- 42. W. D. MacClement, M. Pintar, and H. E. Petch. (in press, Can. J. Phys.).

44. E. Mitscherlich. Ann. Physik 28, 116 (1833).

43.

- 45. U. Klement and G. Schwab. Z. Krist. 114, 170 (1960).
- 46. G. S. Rao. J. Indian Inst. Sci. 41A, 47 (1959).
- 47. V. S. Podisko. Tr. Inst. Kristallogr. AN SSSR 9, 327 (1954).
- 48. V. F. Parvov and A. V. Shubnikov. Kristallografiya <u>9</u>,
 435 (1964). (Translation in Soviet Physics-Cryst. <u>9</u>,
 361 (1964).).
- 49. A. Bystrom and K. Wilhelmi. Acta Chem. Scand. 5, 1003 (1951).
- 50. G. A. Barclay, E. G. Cox, and H. Lynton. Chemistry and Industry, 178 (1956).
- 51. B. Beagley. Trans. Faraday Soc. 61, 1821 (1965).
- 52. W. S. McDonald and D. W. J. Cruickshank. Acta Cryst. 22, 43 (1967).
- 53. E. A. Kuzmin, V. V. Iliukhin, and N. V. Belov. Doklady Akad. Nauk SSSR <u>173</u>, 1078 (1967). (Translation in Soviet Physics - Doklady. To be Published. 1967).
- 54. A. V. Shubnikov. Z. Krist. 50, 19 (1911).
- 55. A. V. Shubnikov. Z. Krist. 76, 469 (1931).
- 56. P. Groth. Chemische Kristallographie 2, 586 (1908).
- 57. P. L. Stedehouder and P. Terpstra. Physica <u>10</u>, 113 (1930).
- 58. B. Gossner and F. Mussgnug. Z. Krist. 72, 476 (1930).
- 59. M. E. Straumanis, T. Ejima, and W. J. James. Acta Cryst. 14, 493 (1961).
- 60. D. W. J. Cruickshank and D. W. Jones. Acta Cryst. <u>16</u>, 877 (1963).

- 61. L. A. Zhukova and Z. G. Pinsker. Kristallografiya <u>9</u>,
 44 (1964). (Translation in Soviet Physics-Cryst. <u>9</u>,
 31 (1964).).
- 62. N. C. Webb. Acta Cryst. 21, 942 (1966).
- 63. B. E. Robertson. Ph.D. Thesis. McMaster University, 1967.
- 64. F. L. Hirshfeld. Israel J. Chem. 2, 87 (1964).
- 65. G. Collotti, L. Conti, and M. Zocchi. Acta Cryst. <u>12</u>, 416 (1959).
- 66. J. K. Brandon and I. D. Brown. Bull. Am. Phys. Soc. <u>12</u>, 671 (1967).
- 67. R. G. Kidd. Can. J. Chem. 45, 605 (1967) .