

3. METHODOLOGY

$$P(x - x_0) = \frac{a}{\Gamma} \left[1 + b \left(\frac{x - x_0}{\Gamma} \right)^2 \right]^{-m}.$$

Here m is a parameter that governs the line shape (essentially the strength of the wings *versus* the peak), and the numerical parameters $b = 4(2^{1/m} - 1)$ and $a = (b/\pi)^{1/2} \Gamma(m)/\Gamma(m - 1/2)$. (Note the gamma function in the definition of a ; the FWHM does not appear in that expression.) The Pearson-VII function with $m = 1$ is a Lorentzian, and it is a Gaussian in the limit $m \rightarrow \infty$.

It must be emphasized that none of these functions has any theoretical justification whatsoever. However, in loose powders size broadening is almost always Lorentzian, while Gaussian size broadening is more commonly observed in dense polycrystalline specimens (such as bulk metals).

The Lorentzian and Gaussian functions are also plotted in the same figure for comparison to the actual powder-diffraction line shape of a spherical particle. It can be seen that the correct function has stronger tails than the Gaussian, but the Lorentzian line shape seriously overestimates the intensity in the wings. Both the Gaussian and the Pearson VII fail to capture the general feature that any compact object with a sharp boundary will give a diffraction line shape with tails that asymptotically decay as $(x - x_0)^{-2}$.

One approach to obtaining a more accurate phenomenological description to diffraction line shapes is the Voigt function, which is a convolution of a Gaussian and Lorentzian,

$$V(x - x_0) = \int dx' G(x' - x_0)L(x - x').$$

The presence of two shape parameters, the independent widths of the Gaussian and Lorentzian functions, provide independent parameters to control the width and the strength of the wings in the Voigt line shape. The Voigt is more computationally expensive than any elementary function, and so a commonly used approximation is the pseudo-Voigt,

$$PV(x - x_0; \Gamma) = \eta L(x - x_0; \Gamma) + (1 - \eta)G(x - x_0; \Gamma),$$

which is a mixture of Gaussian and Lorentzian functions of the same width. The parameter η controls the shape (strength of the wings) of the pseudo-Voigt line-shape function, independent of its width. There is a computationally convenient approximate relation between Voigt line-shape parameters Γ_L and Γ_G and the pseudo-Voigt Γ and η (Thompson *et al.*, 1987).

3.2.2.3.2. Strain

An individual crystal in a sample may be subject to lattice deformation, either due to forces external to that crystal, or to internal factors such as substitutional disorder and dislocations. A comprehensive treatment of microstructural properties and their effects on powder-diffraction peak shapes is given in Chapter 3.6 of this volume; this section gives a general overview from a phenomenological basis.

The simplest description of strain broadening imagines an ensemble of independent crystallites with different lattice parameters. If the crystallites have an isometric distribution of lattice parameters with a fractional width $\delta a/a$, that will be reflected in the range of d -spacings for each reflection. In an angle-dispersive measurement, this will lead to an angular width $\delta 2\theta = 2 \tan \theta \delta a/a$ (radians).

Physically plausible mechanisms for a distribution of strains in a powder sample include random inter-grain forces arising during crystallization and the elastic response to internal defects such as dislocations. In practice, these effects often give rise to peak

widths which likewise grow as $\tan \theta$. However, there is no *a priori* basis for expecting any particular functional form for that distribution. Frequent practice is to assume a Gaussian, Lorentzian, Voigt, or pseudo-Voigt form for an isotropic strain broadening, with an adjustable parameter ε representing the FWHM of the strain distribution. The FWHM Γ of the chosen functional form is then $\Gamma_{2\theta} = 2\varepsilon \tan \theta$ for angle-dispersive measurements, $\Gamma_E = \varepsilon E$ for energy-dispersive X-ray measurements and $\Gamma_t = \varepsilon t$ for neutron time-of-flight measurements.

3.2.2.3.3. Instrumental contributions

The instrument used to collect diffraction data affects the observed line shape in many ways. A complete discussion is beyond the scope of this article (but see Chapter 3.1, and would have to consider many different diffraction geometries separately. One approach, generally known as fundamental parameters, is to model the effect of every optical element on the peak shape. The instrumental response function is then the convolution of all of these individual contributions.

The simplest (and most widely successful) application of fundamental parameters arises from the analysis of Caglioti *et al.* (1958, 1960) on the instrument response function of a step-scanning powder diffractometer at a reactor neutron source. Neutrons pass through a parallel-blade collimator to a monochromator crystal, through a second collimator to the sample, and then through a third collimator into the detector. It is a fair approximation to assume that the transmission functions of the collimators and the mosaicity of the monochromator are all Gaussians. In that case, the instrument response function produces diffraction peaks which are also Gaussians, with a width that depends on the diffraction angle as

$$\Gamma = (U \tan^2 \theta + V \tan \theta + W)^{1/2}, \quad (3.2.13)$$

where the parameters U , V and W can be expressed in closed form as functions of the collimator acceptances and monochromator angle and mosaicity (Caglioti *et al.*, 1958, 1960). Indeed, it was this simple form of the line-shape function that allowed Rietveld and co-workers to develop the important methodology of data analysis commonly known as the Rietveld or profile method (Loopstra & Rietveld, 1969; Rietveld, 1969).

The functional form used to describe the shape of the pulse that emerges from the moderator of a spallation neutron source, and the numerical values of the parameters which go into it, determine the peak shapes observed in the powder diffractometer at such an instrument. The treatment of such matters lies beyond this introduction; documentation of the widely used GSAS software includes a detailed description (Larson & Von Dreele, 2004; see also Chapter 3.3).

Analytical treatment of the resolution of X-ray diffractometers is generally complicated by the fact that the various contributions are more difficult to model, especially in the case of the parafocusing Bragg-Brentano geometry most commonly used in laboratory X-ray diffractometers. In the diffractometer, one generally considers factors that affect the line shape separately in the equatorial plane (the plane containing the source, sample and detector) and the axial direction (perpendicular to the equatorial plane, *i.e.*, parallel to the diffractometer axis). In the equatorial plane the resolution is primarily governed by the divergence of the X-ray beam illuminating the sample and by the width of the receiving slit, but there are numerous contributions to the diffraction peak width and shape from such factors as non-conformance of the flat sample surface to the focusing circle,