


**Figure 2.10.36**
Diffraction pattern from a silicon-wafer zero-background holder, smears of Vaseline and Corning high-vacuum grease, and the surface treated with hairspray.

of options to find the one with the lowest background and fewest non-Bragg reflections. An unusual alternative is hairspray, which produces a tacky surface when applied correctly whilst having a minimal effect on the resulting diffraction pattern. The medium chosen may also depend on whether the sample must be recovered intact, as contamination with grease might not be acceptable. The effect on the background of different adhesion materials can be seen in Fig. 2.10.36. The Vaseline and vacuum grease smears add broad reflections at approx. 19 and 11° $2\theta$, respectively, with Cu $K\alpha$ radiation. Where data collection starts above the main portion of the peak the effect may be hardly noticeable, but could be problematic when starting at low $2\theta$ angles. Such broad patterns are straightforward to model with a Debye (diffuse scattering) function, and it is not necessary to subtract them from the raw data.

Should the instrument have parallel-beam geometry, an alternative approach is to use a fixed incident-beam angle, more commonly known as grazing-incidence geometry. In this way the volume of sample illuminated is constant with angle, so in the absence of secondary diffractometer optics the relative intensities will match those expected with conventional geometry. An unfortunate effect of conventional grazing-incidence geometry with long slits is that the peak widths degrade significantly at lower incident angles (Toraya & Yoshino, 1994). It is possible to model the peak broadening in a Rietveld refinement (Rowles & Madsen, 2010) but it is not straightforward. Use of an appropriate secondary optic can avoid the peak-broadening problem but introduces a complex, geometry-dependent intensity correction (Toraya *et al.*, 1993).

### 2.10.1.4.2. *Transmission sample holders*

Transmission geometry of any type is best suited to samples with low absorption such as organics and polymers, and is preferred for such samples when available. Transmission geometry has advantages when data are required at low diffracting angles. While the beam often has to be stopped-down in reflection geometry to avoid overspilling the sample, this undesired attenuation of the beam is not required for transmission geometry. Another advantage common to both the foil and capillary transmission techniques is that a small quantity of a powdered sample is usually sufficient. Samples small enough to be problematic with reflection geometry will often be perfectly adequate for transmission.

Data collection in transmission geometry is best done with either a parallel-beam or focusing geometry; the focus should be at the detector. Data can be collected using a divergent-beam setup, but the intensities obtained are very low and the resolution is usually poor. Parallel-beam geometry has the advantage that it is able to perform reflection and transmission measurements equally well.

#### *2.10.1.4.2.1. Flat foils*

Although less commonly used with modern diffractometers, the foil-type transmission sample mounting was quite common in some older-style X-ray cameras. Sprinkling powders onto single-sided Scotch tape was sometimes used with instrumentation such as Hägg–Guinier cameras, but care should be taken as the quality of the tapes as diffraction substrates can vary wildly; the crystallinity of the polymer can be high or low, and the adhesive sometimes contains mineral inclusions, such as talc. In the modern diffractometer, foil-type transmission data can sometimes be collected using the same rotating sample stage as for reflection measurements. Simply turning the stage by 90° and using a different holder can be sufficient if the optical configuration is suitable for both reflection and transmission. For solid organic samples such as polymers this foil transmission geometry has significant advantages because of the lack of transparency effects. It is worth noting, however, that the processing of polymers can induce significant texture, such that the data collected from a film in reflection geometry will not necessarily be identical to those collected in transmission. Should a reproducible pattern independent of geometry be required, then steps should be taken to reduce the sample to a true random powder and/or a 2D detector should be used.

With powder samples the technique requires the use of a transparent substrate, usually in the form of a thin polymer film or foil. In an analytical laboratory the easiest place to find such a substrate is the X-ray fluorescence laboratory, where very thin X-ray transparent polymer films are used for both sample supports and covers for liquid cells. Some of the materials used in these applications are familiar in the diffraction community as windows, *i.e.* Mylar and Kapton, but others such as polypropylene are not. The substrate will obviously add to the background, but a good substrate from a diffraction standpoint combines transparency with a lack of sharp features in the diffraction pattern. This makes fitting the background much easier. Any holder must be capable of stretching or holding the film flat across an opening for the X-ray beam. A commercial version of a foil-type holder is shown prior to assembly in Fig. 2.10.37. Example data from three different XRF films are shown in Fig. 2.10.38, together with that from a thicker Kapton foil commonly used as window material. It is notable that, despite the two 7.6 µm Kapton films being almost twice as thick as the Mylar or polypropylene films, the scattering from them is almost identical. The lack of any distinctive, sharp features above 6° $2\theta$ in the Kapton films makes them attractive in this region, but for low-angle data Mylar is probably the better choice. Although giving a generally higher background, the thicker 50 µm Kapton foils can be used very successfully (see Fig. 2.10.39). Despite the greater attenuation they are much easier to handle, as their greater stiffness and weight makes them less susceptible to static electricity.

One advantage of transmission foil mounts is the small amount of sample required. In a similar way to producing smear mounts

  references