

AD-A036 442

ARMY MATERIALS AND MECHANICS RESEARCH CENTER WATERTO--ETC F/G 20/2
THE EFFECT OF THE K ALPHA DOUBLET DIFFRACTED PEAK POSITION ON T--ETC(U)
NOV 76 C P GAZZARA


UNCLASSIFIED

AMMRC-TR-76-37

NL


| OF |

AD
A036442



END

DATE
FILMED
3-77



ADA 036442

AMMRC TR 76-37

1
6
P.S.

AD

THE EFFECT OF THE K_{α} DOUBLET DIFFRACTED PEAK POSITION ON THE PRECISION OF THE LATTICE CONSTANT

CHARLES P. GAZZARA
METALS RESEARCH DIVISION

November 1976

DDDC
MAR 7 1977
C

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

ARMY MATERIALS AND MECHANICS RESEARCH CENTER
Watertown, Massachusetts 02172

The findings in this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position, unless so designated by other authorized documents.


Mention of any trade names or manufacturers in this report shall not be construed as advertising nor as an official indorsement or approval of such products or companies by the United States Government.

DISPOSITION INSTRUCTIONS

Destroy this report when it is no longer needed.
Do not return it to the originator.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER ④ AMMRC-TR-76-37 ✓	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER ⑨
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) ⑥ THE EFFECT OF THE K_{α} DOUBLET DIFFRACTED PEAK POSITION ON THE PRECISION OF THE LATTICE CONSTANT. <i>alpha</i>	5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Final Report	
7. AUTHOR(S) ⑩ Charles P. Gazzara	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER	
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Army Materials and Mechanics Research Center ✓ Watertown, Massachusetts 02172 DRXMR-EM	8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) ⑪⑫	
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS U. S. Army Materiel Development and Readiness Command, Alexandria, Virginia 22335	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS D/A Project ⑬ 1T161102AH42 AMCMS Code: 611102.11.H4200	
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) ⑭ 13p.	12. REPORT DATE November 1976	
	13. NUMBER OF PAGES 11	
	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified	
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.	15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE	
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Presented at the 25th Annual Denver X-Ray Conference, Denver, Colorado, 5 August 1976.		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) X-ray diffraction Yttrium aluminum garnet (YAG) Lattice parameters Precision Silicon powder		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) (SEE REVERSE SIDE) 403105		

Block No. 20

ABSTRACT

 $K_{\alpha 1} - K_{\alpha 2}$

The effect of the position of the X-ray unresolved $K_{\alpha 1} - K_{\alpha 2}$ line doublets, diffracted from powder specimens, on the precision of the calculated lattice constant has been determined using a least-squares analysis. An analytical procedure to synthesize CuK_{α} doublet X-ray diffraction peaks with X-ray characteristic lines (half widths ranging from 0.1° to $0.4^{\circ} 2\theta$) has been applied in correcting the weighted wavelength of the doublet peak position. A series of correction curves was established from which the true 2θ peak position of the weighted K_{α} wavelength could be determined from the measured 2θ peak position.

Data taken from silicon powder and an yttrium aluminum garnet (YAG) powder standard to calculate the lattice constants indicate:

a. A loss in precision of approximately one part in 25,000 in determining the lattice constant is obtained when calculated using doublet 2θ peak positions applied in the conventional manner (λ weighted = 1.54178 Å, at peak, for copper).

b. An increase in precision is obtained by using low as well as high 2θ angle diffraction peaks for calculating the lattice constant.

The effect of the measured characteristic line width, simulated by modifying the slit system, on the calculated lattice constant was determined in the case of the YAG powder specimen.

Suggestions to increase the precision of the lattice constants determined from X-ray diffraction powder samples are presented.

ACCESSION for	Write Section	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Both Section	<input type="checkbox"/>
NTIS		
G.G.		
UNANNOUNCED		
JUSTIFICATION		
BY	DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY CODES	
Dist.	AVAIL.	and/or SPECIAL
A		

INTRODUCTION

The determination of the lattice constant a_0 of a unit cell, using the positions of characteristic X-ray lines diffracted from a powder sample, has been treated by many investigators. Calculations of the lattice constant made by extrapolating d values against various functions of the Bragg angle θ have been made using a least-squares analysis. A summary of the systematic error functions associated with an X-ray diffractometer has been presented by Vassamillet and King (1), who found that the best precision to be expected using a commercial diffractometer is approximately 1:20,000.

A comprehensive procedure that has been developed by Mueller, Heaton and Miller (2) (MHM method) involves varying the systematic error functions and computing the change in d for each systematic error function, or combination of functions, until the error in the computed lattice constant has been reduced to an acceptable level.

In a study (3) of the systematic errors involved in the computation of a_0 for yttrium aluminum garnet powder $Y_3Al_5O_{12}$ (YAG), it was found that the precision of the computed lattice constant was a function of the following.

(1) The slope of the least-squares straight line of the a_i values, where a_i is the lattice constant computed for each diffraction line, versus $\cot\theta_i$. A slope value of 0 indicated that the systematic errors had been adequately corrected for and yielded the most precise a_0 values.

(2) A statistical error term, i.e., standard error, absolute average deviation, rms deviation of functions of a_i and $\sin\theta_i$ from their computed functions or other error terms. A comparison of these error functions ultimately yield the same lattice constant. Whereas a difference was seen between error functions, their relative values were useful in establishing the same most precise a_0 values.

(3) The number and selection of the diffraction peaks. Using all 35 diffraction peaks (unresolved $K_{\alpha_1} - K_{\alpha_2}$ doublets and high-angle resolved peaks) yielded the highest error. Restricting the analysis to the 12 highest 2θ angle peaks resulted in a reduction of 8% in error. Taking the 20 highest 2θ angle peaks increased the precision, reducing the error 28%. The fourth case gave the highest precision (42% reduction in error term), and occurred when 23 high- and low- 2θ angle peaks were chosen, eliminating those doublet peaks in mid- 2θ range, along with the diffracted peaks of low intensity.

1. VASSAMILLET, L. F. and KING, H. W. *Precision X-Ray Diffractometry Using Powder Specimens* in *Advances in X-Ray Analysis*, W. M. Mueller et al., ed., v. 6, Plenum Press, New York, 1963, p. 142-157.
2. MUELLER, M. H., HEATON, L., and MILLER, K. T. *Determination of Lattice Parameters with the Aid of a Computer*. *Acta Cryst.*, v. 13, 1960, p. 828-829.
3. GAZZARA, C. P. *The Effect of Systematic Errors on the Measurement of Lattice Constants*. Army Materials and Mechanics Research Center, AMMRC TR 70-29, September 1970.

Recently, in an attempt to relate the peak height to the integrated intensity of X-ray diffracted K_{α} doublets by convoluting the characteristic peaks, it was found that the weighted K_{α} wavelength approximation was inaccurate except at very low Bragg angles (4). It therefore seemed appropriate to determine what the effect of this doublet peak position error would be in computing the lattice constant of a material whose lattice constant was known and to afford a means for correcting for the doublet position.

PROCEDURE

A doublet peak position correction curve could be generated for $\text{Cu}K_{\alpha}$ radiation from the curve shown in Figure 1 (4), relating the value of the positional parameter X_1 of the analytical expressions describing the K_{α_1} and K_{α_2} lines to a , the function defined as the $K_{\alpha_1} - K_{\alpha_2}$ peak separation in terms of the wavelength dispersion. Note that it is only in the linear portion of the curve, that the weighted K_{α} peak position approximation is valid (i.e., $X_1 = a/3$).




Figure 1. Plot of positional parameter X_1 versus $\text{Cu}K_{\alpha_1} - \text{Cu}K_{\alpha_2}$ diffracted peak separation a , assuming Gaussian and Gaussian plus Cauchy distribution.

4. GAZZARA, C. P. *Peak Height Approximation for X-Ray Diffracted Integrated Intensity* in *Advances in X-Ray Analysis*, R. W. Gould, C. S. Barrett, J. B. Newkirk, and C. O. Ruud, ed., v. 19, Kendall Hunt, Iowa, 1976, p. 735-748.

The solid curve in Figure 1 was generated assuming a Gaussian distribution of the K_{α_1} and K_{α_2} diffraction peaks as a function of θ . The dashed curve was computed by fitting a computed characteristic K_{α_1} peak to an experimental CuK_{α_1} (531) Si diffraction peak, where the upper half was assumed to be Gaussian and the lower half to have a Cauchy distribution (Gaussian and Cauchy).

It can be shown that the equation relating the change in wavelength to a or X_{1a} is:

$$\Delta\lambda = \lambda a \omega_{h_{1/2}} / 4.72 \tan\theta$$

where $\omega_{h_{1/2}}$ is the characteristic peak width at half peak height. Values of $\omega_{h_{1/2}}$ can be obtained from Figure 2 from the measured peak width at half height of the unresolved K_{α} peak doublet $\omega_{T_{1/2}}$. A series of curves was generated, see Figure 3, relating the 2θ doublet peak position to the t correction term whereby

$$2\theta_{\text{corrected}} = 2\theta_{\text{measured}} + t.$$




Figure 2. $\omega_{h_{1/2}}$ versus $\omega_{T_{1/2}}$ curves calculated for various levels of 2θ from 20° to 55° assuming Gaussian and Cauchy peak distributions.

Figure 3 is also made up of solid lines relating to Gaussian diffraction peaks while the dashed curves were calculated assuming a Gaussian and Cauchy characteristic diffraction line.

To determine the effect such a t correction would have on the lattice constant precision, CuK_{α} diffraction peak positions of silicon powder were measured. A CuK_{α} powder pattern of silicon powder with a particle size of less than 30 microns was taken with a 0.05° receiving




Figure 3. Plots of peak correction term t versus observed diffracted 2θ peak position of $\text{CuK}\alpha$ doublets for constant values of $\omega_{h_{1/2}}$.

slit. A scanning speed of $0.10^\circ (2\theta)/\text{min}$ and a $1^\circ (2\theta)$ beam slit was used on a G.E. XRD-5 X-ray diffractometer. For the first three diffraction peaks an $\omega_{h_{1/2}}$ value of approximately $0.13^\circ 2\theta$ was determined from Figure 2 and applied in deriving the t correction in Figure 3. A least-squares extrapolation procedure utilizing a systematic error term, $\cot\theta$, and a weighting factor, $\tan\theta$, was employed.

The plane of the Si powder, characterized as a thin specimen (less than $0.002''$ thick), was adjusted with respect to the distance perpendicular to the plane of the specimen. The purpose for this operation was to minimize the slope ($\text{slope} = \Delta a_i / \Delta \cot\theta_i$), and thereby increase the precision of the a_0 measurement. Values of a_i are shown plotted versus θ in Figure 4 for three specimen settings. For position A, which represents the ideal alignment for an infinitely thick specimen, the extrapolated value of a_0 at $\theta = 90^\circ$ is too high. The plotted values and computed curves applying the t correction are shown below the uncorrected curves. The specimen was moved inward $0.005''$ to position B, and the effects of the least-squares computation are shown in Figure 4. Next, the calculated slope values for positions A and B were plotted versus a_0 (see Figure 5) and, following a known procedure (3), the correct a_0 value was determined for slope = 0. Using this value of a_0 , position C was found by varying the specimen position until the (111) $\text{CuK}\alpha$ peak was maximized at the proper 2θ value for slope = 0. Plotting values of a_i for position C are shown in Figure 4 and the respective calculated values of a_0 are shown in Figure 5. The computed results of this procedure are summarized in Table 1.

Since a prior study of lattice constant measurements was performed with YAG powder, it was next deemed appropriate to ascertain the effects of the t correction on a YAG powder, where:

Table 1. SILICON LATTICE CONSTANT VALUES MEASURED FROM THIN SPECIMEN AS A FUNCTION OF SPECIMEN DISPLACEMENT

(Powder Size Less Than 30 μM , 0.05° Receiving Slit, 1° Beam Slit, 0.10°/Min Scan Speed)

Specimen Position	Number of Diffracted Peaks	t Correction	a_0 , Å	Slope	Weighted RMS Deviation
A (aligned for thick specimen)	12	None	5.4323	-0.0038	0.00130
	12	Gaussian	5.4325	-0.0044	.00120
	12	Gaussian & Cauchy	5.4325	-0.0045	.00124
	9 High Angle	-	5.4322	-0.0035	.00083
B (specimen displaced 0.005" inwards)	12	↓	5.4310	0.0043	0.00083
	12		5.4312	.0036	.00070
	12		5.4312	.0036	.00073
	9 High Angle		5.4310	.0043	.00028
C (specimen in optimum alignment)	12	↓	5.4315	0.0008	0.00072
	12		5.4317	.0002	.00049
	12		5.4317	.0002	.00051
	9 High Angle		5.4316	.0007	.00034

- a. many more diffraction peaks are available (12 Si \rightarrow 35 YAG);
- b. an accurate value of the lattice constant was available for the YAG powder;
- c. the effect of ω_{h_1} and the lattice constant could be found by varying the receiving slit width, from 0.05° 2 θ to 0.10° 2 θ to 0.20° 2 θ ;
- d. the case of using only the high angle diffraction peaks could be examined; and
- e. unresolved K_α doublets beyond the 2 θ correction range could be eliminated (this case denoted as m). For a 0.05° receiving slit, peak $\Sigma h^2 = 52$ was eliminated; for a 0.10° slit, peaks $\Sigma h^2 = 52, 54, 56$ were removed; and for a 0.20° slit peaks $\Sigma h^2 = 52$ to 88 were taken out of the least-squares analysis. The results of the analysis of the thin YAG powder specimen are summarized in Table 2.

RESULTS

The effect of the error in assigning a CuK_α wavelength of 1.54178 Å to the unresolved characteristic line doublet peak position, on the calculated lattice constant of either silicon or YAG always lowers the true value of a_0 by approximately one part in 25,000 (see Figure 5). It can also be seen from Table 1 and Figure 4 that the t correction is practically the same whether the K_{α_1} and K_{α_2} lines are considered to be Gaussian or Gaussian and Cauchy. It is also evident that with a t correction, the error terms decrease and the slope decreases when the systematic error function is properly treated. Table 1 and Figure 5 show the effect on the analysis resulting from eliminating the first three CuK_α silicon powder diffraction peaks and using the remaining nine higher angle peaks.




Figure 4. Values of lattice constant a_i calculated from diffracted peak position of family of planes $\{hkl\}_i$ versus Bragg angle θ for a thin silicon powder specimen.




Figure 5. Lattice constant a_0 versus slope term for thin silicon powder specimen showing effect of t correction and the use of high angle diffraction peaks only.

The data points in Figure 5 are approximately the same as those obtained using all the diffraction peaks, without the t correction, in agreement with earlier work (3).

From Figure 4, notice the effect of improperly treating the systematic error in extrapolating to a_0 . In this case an error of one part in 5000 in a_0 is possible, indicative of the importance of considering the slope term, unless a procedure such as the MHM method is employed.

The lattice constants computed from the experimental data obtained from the YAG powder may be seen in Table 2 and in the plot of Figure 6. The value of the lattice constant at slope = 0 was determined from an earlier MHM analysis to be 12.0107 Å (3).

In the case of YAG, it can be seen that the most precise values of a_0 are obtained with a 0.05° receiving slit, progressing from using the uncorrected K_α doublet peaks, to employing the t correction, to using the high angle peaks alone. These results represent the only conditions where the high angle data gave the best results, in conflict with earlier work (3). The lowest lattice constant values are obtained with the intermediate size receiving slit (0.10°) when only the high angle peaks are utilized. For both cases, however, the change in lattice constant with slope moves along the same line shown in Figure 6. For the 0.10° receiving slit, when eight additional mid- 2θ angle diffraction peaks are removed from the analysis, the change in lattice constant with slope departs from the curve. For the 0.20° receiving slit, the slope values increase, indicating a further change in the magnitude of the systematic

Table 2. YAG LATTICE CONSTANT VALUES MEASURED AS A FUNCTION OF RECEIVING SLIT SIZE
(Powder Size Less Than 30 μ M, 1° Beam Slit, 0.10° /Min Scan Speed)

Receiving Slit ($2\theta^\circ$)	Number of Diffracted Peaks	t Correction	$a_0, \text{Å}$	Slope	Weighted RMS Deviation
0.05	35	None	12.0068	0.0063	0.00347
	34(m)	None	12.0069	.0060	.00330
	35	Gaussian	12.0071	.0056	.00329
	34(m)	Gaussian	12.0072	.0053	.00305
	23 High Angle	-	12.0075	.0047	.00195
0.10	35	↓	12.0052	0.0081	0.00380
	32(m)		12.0054	.0076	.00357
	35		12.0055	.0075	.00401
	32(m)		12.0057	.0070	.00371
	21 High Angle		12.0050	.0085	.00233
0.20	35		12.0064	0.0126	0.00417
	26(m)		12.0068	.0113	.00277
	35		12.0066	.0123	.00428
	26(m)		12.0070	.0108	.00280
	15 High Angle		12.0068	.0113	.00187

errors, with a displacement of the points from the curve. The error terms shown in Table 2 indicate no unusual behavior between cases except that in treating the 0.20° receiving slit case, the sensitivity of removing the mid-range diffraction peaks seems to be more severe. This is expected when one considers that the doublet correction t has not been taken into account, since these corrections occur beyond the angular range considered in Figure 3.

CONCLUSIONS

1. A correction for the 2θ X-ray diffracted peak position of CuK_α unresolved doublets results in an increase in lattice constants, calculated from a least-squares extrapolation procedure, of one part in 25,000 for silicon and YAG powder.

2. The same peak position of the unresolved K_α doublet results from assuming either a Gaussian or a Gaussian plus Cauchy distribution of the CuK_{α_1} and CuK_{α_2} X-ray diffraction lines.




Figure 6. Lattice constant a_0 versus slope term for thin YAG powder specimen showing the effect of t correction and the use of high angle diffraction peaks only.

3. In the absence of an extensive procedure such as that of MHM (2), an extrapolation procedure utilizing a plot of a_0 versus slope can be applied to minimize the effect of systematic errors and increase the precision in a_0 .

4. The most precise values of a_0 are usually obtained when high- and low- 2θ angle diffraction peaks are employed in a least-squares analysis. This is particularly true when few diffraction peaks are available, i.e., silicon powder with $\text{CuK}\alpha$. High precision can also be achieved when many diffraction peaks are available, i.e., YAG case, utilizing only the high 2θ angle diffraction peaks.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author wishes to thank Mr. T. Sheridan for assisting with the operation of the X-ray diffractometer.

DISTRIBUTION LIST

No. of Copies	To
2	Metals and Ceramics Information Center, Battelle Columbus Laboratories, 505 King Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43201
12	Commander, Defense Documentation Center, Cameron Station, Building 5, 5010 Duke Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314
	Office of Chief of Research and Development, Department of the Army, Washington, D. C. 20310
1	ATTN: CRDPES
1	Commander, Army Research Office, P. O. Box 12211, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27709
	Commander, U. S. Army Material Development and Readiness Command, 5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22333
1	ATTN: DRCQA
2	DRCQA-E
2	DRCQA-P
1	DRCLDC, Mr. R. Zentner
1	DRCRL
1	DREDE-EA
1	DRCDE-E
1	DRCRP-OIP
	Commander, U. S. Army Electronics Command, Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703
2	ATTN: DRSEL-CB
1	DRSEL-PP-PO
1	DRSEL-WM
1	DRSEL-RD-GT
1	DRSEL-PA-C
	Commander, U. S. Army Missile Command, Redstone Arsenal, Alabama 35809
2	ATTN: DRSMI-RBLD, Redstone Scientific Information Center
1	DRSMI-RSM, Mr. E. J. Wheelahan
1	DRSMI-RTR, Mr. H. T. Lawson
2	DRSMI-Q
1	DRSMI-M
	Commander, U. S. Army Mobility Equipment Research and Development Command, 4300 Goodfellow Boulevard, St. Louis, Missouri 63120
1	ATTN: DRSME-Q
1	DRSME-QP
1	DRSME-QR
1	DRSME-QE
1	DRSME-M
1	DRSME-P
1	DRSME-R
	Commander, U. S. Army Armament Command, Rock Island, Illinois 61201
1	ATTN: DRSAR-SC, Dr. C. M. Hudson
1	DRSAR-PPW-PB, Mr. Francis X. Walter
2	Technical Library

No. of
Copies

To

2 Commander, U. S. Army Natick Research and Development Command,
Kansas Street, Natick, Massachusetts 01760
1 ATTN: DRXNM-QE
1 DRXNM-GE

Commander, U. S. Army Tank-Automotive Research and Development Command,
28251 Van Dyke Avenue, Warren, Michigan 48090
1 ATTN: DRDTA-RXMT, Mr. J. Dudzinski
1 DRDTA-RXMT, Mr. F. Lemmer
1 DRDTA-RXMT, Mr. W. Wulf
1 DRDTA-RGD, Mr. O. Renius
2 DRDTA-QEE, Mr. P. Duika

Commander, U. S. Army Test and Evaluation Command, Aberdeen Proving Ground,
Maryland 21005
2 ATTN: DRSTE-TA-A

Commander, Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland 21005
1 ATTN: STEAP-MT, Mr. J. M. McKinley
1 STEAP-TL

Commander, Edgewood Arsenal, Edgewood, Maryland 21010
1 ATTN: SAREA-TSP
1 SAREA-QAE
1 SAREA-QAI
1 SAREA-QAP
1 SAREA-QAIP

Commander, U. S. Army Foreign Science and Technology Center,
220 7th Street, N. E., Charlottesville, Virginia 22901
1 ATTN: DRXST-SD2

Commander, Frankford Arsenal, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19137
1 ATTN: SARFA-P3300
1 SARFA-C2500
1 SARFA-Q1000
2 SARFA-Q2100
1 SARFA-N3100-202-1, Mr. E. Roffman
1 SARFA-Q6120-64-1, Mr. W. Shebest
1 SARFA-Q6130-64-1, Mr. G. Norwitz
1 SARFA-A2000
2 SARFA-F6000
1 SARFA-L300, Mr. J. Corrie

1 Commander, Harry Diamond Laboratories, 2800 Powder Mill Road,
Adelphi, Maryland 20783
2 ATTN: DRXDO-EDE

Commander, Picatinny Arsenal, Dover, New Jersey 07801
1 ATTN: SARPA-RT-S
1 SARPA-VA6, Mr. H. DeFazio
1 SARPA-VC2, Mr. T. M. Roach, Jr.
1 SARPA-VG, Mr. A. Clear
1 SARPA-ND 1, Mr. D. Stein
1 SARPA-FR-M-D, A. M. Anzalone, Bldg. 176

No. of Copies	To
	Commander, Rock Island Arsenal, Rock Island, Illinois 61201
1	ATTN: SARRI-L, Dr. Royce Beckett
1	SARRI-LEQ
2	SARRI-LRM
	Director, U. S. Army Production Equipment Agency, Rock Island Arsenal, Rock Island, Illinois 61201
1	ATTN: DRXDE-MT
	Commander, U. S. Army Aeronautical Depot Maintenance Center, Corpus Christi, Texas 78419
1	ATTN: SSMAC-Q
	Commander, U. S. Army Ammunition Procurement and Supply Agency, Joliet, Illinois 60436
2	ATTN: SMUAT-E
2	Commander, U. S. Army Mobility Equipment Research and Development Command Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060
1	ATTN: Technical Documents Center, Bldg. 315
1	DRXFB-P
1	DRXFB-M
1	DRXFB-X
1	DRXFB-A
1	DRXFB
1	DRXFB-B
1	DRXFB-H
1	DRXFB-J
1	DRXFB-F
1	DRXFB-MM
1	DRXFB-Q
1	DRXFB-QQ
1	DRXFB-QE, Mr. Jacob K. Mauzy
1	DRXFB-MW, Dr. J. W. Bond
2	Commander, Watervliet Arsenal, Watervliet, New York 12189
1	ATTN: SARWV-QA, Mr. J. Miller
1	SARWV-QA, Quality Assurance Office
	Commander, Anniston Army Depot, Anniston, Alabama 36202
1	ATTN: AMXAN-QA
	Commander, Atlanta Army Depot, Forest Park, Georgia 30050
1	ATTN: AMXAT-CSQ
	Commander, Letterkenny Army Depot, Chambersburg, Pennsylvania 17201
1	ATTN: AMXLE-CQ
1	AMXLE-NSQ
	Commander, Lexington-Bluegrass Army Depot, Lexington, Kentucky 40507
1	ATTN: AMXLX-QA
	Commander, New Cumberland Army Depot, New Cumberland, Pennsylvania 17070
1	ATTN: AMXNC-256
	Commander, Pueblo Army Depot, Pueblo, Colorado 81001
1	ATTN: AMXPU-BF

No. of Copies	To
1	Commander, Red River Army Depot, Texarkana, Texas 75502 ATTN: AMXRR-QAO
1	Commander, Sacramento Army Depot, Sacramento, California 95801 ATTN: AMXSA-QA
1	Commander, Savanna Army Depot, Savanna, Illinois 61074 ATTN: AMXSV-QAO
1	Commander, Seneca Army Depot, Romulus, New York 14541 ATTN: AMXSE-AXI
1	Commander, Sharpe Army Depot, Lathrop, California 95330 ATTN: AMXSH-CQ
1	Commander, Sierra Army Depot, Herlong, California 96113 ATTN: AMXSI-QA
1	Commander, Tobyhanna Army Depot, Tobyhanna, Pennsylvania 18466 ATTN: AMXTO-Q
1	Commander, Tooele Army Depot, Tooele, Utah 84074 ATTN: AMXTE-QAD
1	Commander, Umatilla Army Depot, Hermiston, Oregon 97838 ATTN: AMXUM-QA
1	Chief, Bureau of Naval Weapons, Department of the Navy, Washington, D. C. 20390
1	Chief, Bureau of Ships, Department of the Navy, Washington, D. C. 20315
1	Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, D. C. 20390 ATTN: Dr. J. M. Krafft - Code 6305
2	Dr. G. R. Yoder - Code 6382
2	Commander, Wright Air Development Division, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 45433 ATTN: ASRC
1	AFML/MBC/Mr. Stanley Schulman
1	Commander, U. S. Army Aviation Systems Command, St. Louis, Missouri 63166 ATTN: DRSAV-R-R
1	DRSAV-R-EGE
1	DRSAV-A-L
1	DRSAV-LE
1	DRSAV-A-LV
1	DRSAV-A-V
2	Director, Army Materials and Mechanics Research Center, Watertown, Massachusetts 02172 ATTN: DRXMR-PL
1	DRXMR-AG
1	Author

Army Materials and Mechanics Research Center,
Watertown, Massachusetts 02172

THE EFFECT OF THE K_{α} DOUBLET DIFFRACTED
PEAK POSITION ON THE PRECISION OF THE
LATTICE CONSTANT - Charles P. Gazzara

AD

UNCLASSIFIED
UNLIMITED DISTRIBUTION

Key Words

Technical Report AMMRC TR 76-37, November 1976, 11 pp -
111us-tables, D/A Project 11161102AH42,
AMCMs Code 611102.11.H4200

X-ray diffraction
Lattice parameters
Silicon powder

The effect of the position of the X-ray unresolved $K_{\alpha 1} - K_{\alpha 2}$ line doublets, diffracted from powder specimens, on the precision of the calculated lattice constant has been determined using a least-squares analysis. An analytical procedure to synthesize CuK_{α} doublet X-ray diffraction peaks with X-ray characteristic lines (half widths ranging from 0.1° to $0.4^{\circ} 2\theta$) has been applied in correcting the weighted wavelength of the doublet peak position. A series of correction curves was established from which the true 2θ peak position of the weighted K_{α} wavelength could be determined from the measured 2θ peak position. Data taken from silicon powder and an yttrium aluminum garnet (YAG) powder standard to calculate the lattice constants indicate: a) A loss in precision of approximately one part in 25,000 in determining the lattice constant is obtained when calculated using doublet 2θ peak positions applied in the conventional manner (x weighted = 1.54178 A, at peak, for copper). b) An increase in precision is obtained by using low as well as high 2θ angle diffraction peaks for calculating the lattice constant. The effect of the measured characteristic line width, simulated by modifying the slit system, on the calculated lattice constant was determined in the case of the YAG powder specimen. Suggestions to increase the precision of the lattice constants determined from X-ray diffraction powder samples are presented.

Army Materials and Mechanics Research Center,
Watertown, Massachusetts 02172

THE EFFECT OF THE K_{α} DOUBLET DIFFRACTED
PEAK POSITION ON THE PRECISION OF THE
LATTICE CONSTANT - Charles P. Gazzara

AD

UNCLASSIFIED
UNLIMITED DISTRIBUTION

Key Words

Technical Report AMMRC TR 76-37, November 1976, 11 pp -
111us-tables, D/A Project 11161102AH42,
AMCMs Code 611102.11.H4200

X-ray diffraction
Lattice parameters
Silicon powder

The effect of the position of the X-ray unresolved $K_{\alpha 1} - K_{\alpha 2}$ line doublets, diffracted from powder specimens, on the precision of the calculated lattice constant has been determined using a least-squares analysis. An analytical procedure to synthesize CuK_{α} doublet X-ray diffraction peaks with X-ray characteristic lines (half widths ranging from 0.1° to $0.4^{\circ} 2\theta$) has been applied in correcting the weighted wavelength of the doublet peak position. A series of correction curves was established from which the true 2θ peak position of the weighted K_{α} wavelength could be determined from the measured 2θ peak position. Data taken from silicon powder and an yttrium aluminum garnet (YAG) powder standard to calculate the lattice constants indicate: a) A loss in precision of approximately one part in 25,000 in determining the lattice constant is obtained when calculated using doublet 2θ peak positions applied in the conventional manner (x weighted = 1.54178 A, at peak, for copper). b) An increase in precision is obtained by using low as well as high 2θ angle diffraction peaks for calculating the lattice constant. The effect of the measured characteristic line width, simulated by modifying the slit system, on the calculated lattice constant was determined in the case of the YAG powder specimen. Suggestions to increase the precision of the lattice constants determined from X-ray diffraction powder samples are presented.

Army Materials and Mechanics Research Center,
Watertown, Massachusetts 02172

THE EFFECT OF THE K_{α} DOUBLET DIFFRACTED
PEAK POSITION ON THE PRECISION OF THE
LATTICE CONSTANT - Charles P. Gazzara

AD

UNCLASSIFIED
UNLIMITED DISTRIBUTION

Key Words

Technical Report AMMRC TR 76-37, November 1976, 11 pp -
111us-tables, D/A Project 11161102AH42,
AMCMs Code 611102.11.H4200

X-ray diffraction
Lattice parameters
Silicon powder

The effect of the position of the X-ray unresolved $K_{\alpha 1} - K_{\alpha 2}$ line doublets, diffracted from powder specimens, on the precision of the calculated lattice constant has been determined using a least-squares analysis. An analytical procedure to synthesize CuK_{α} doublet X-ray diffraction peaks with X-ray characteristic lines (half widths ranging from 0.1° to $0.4^{\circ} 2\theta$) has been applied in correcting the weighted wavelength of the doublet peak position. A series of correction curves was established from which the true 2θ peak position of the weighted K_{α} wavelength could be determined from the measured 2θ peak position. Data taken from silicon powder and an yttrium aluminum garnet (YAG) powder standard to calculate the lattice constants indicate: a) A loss in precision of approximately one part in 25,000 in determining the lattice constant is obtained when calculated using doublet 2θ peak positions applied in the conventional manner (x weighted = 1.54178 A, at peak, for copper). b) An increase in precision is obtained by using low as well as high 2θ angle diffraction peaks for calculating the lattice constant. The effect of the measured characteristic line width, simulated by modifying the slit system, on the calculated lattice constant was determined in the case of the YAG powder specimen. Suggestions to increase the precision of the lattice constants determined from X-ray diffraction powder samples are presented.

Army Materials and Mechanics Research Center,
Watertown, Massachusetts 02172

THE EFFECT OF THE K_{α} DOUBLET DIFFRACTED
PEAK POSITION ON THE PRECISION OF THE
LATTICE CONSTANT - Charles P. Gazzara

AD

UNCLASSIFIED
UNLIMITED DISTRIBUTION

Key Words

Technical Report AMMRC TR 76-37, November 1976, 11 pp -
111us-tables, D/A Project 11161102AH42,
AMCMs Code 611102.11.H4200

X-ray diffraction
Lattice parameters
Silicon powder

The effect of the position of the X-ray unresolved $K_{\alpha 1} - K_{\alpha 2}$ line doublets, diffracted from powder specimens, on the precision of the calculated lattice constant has been determined using a least-squares analysis. An analytical procedure to synthesize CuK_{α} doublet X-ray diffraction peaks with X-ray characteristic lines (half widths ranging from 0.1° to $0.4^{\circ} 2\theta$) has been applied in correcting the weighted wavelength of the doublet peak position. A series of correction curves was established from which the true 2θ peak position of the weighted K_{α} wavelength could be determined from the measured 2θ peak position. Data taken from silicon powder and an yttrium aluminum garnet (YAG) powder standard to calculate the lattice constants indicate: a) A loss in precision of approximately one part in 25,000 in determining the lattice constant is obtained when calculated using doublet 2θ peak positions applied in the conventional manner (x weighted = 1.54178 A, at peak, for copper). b) An increase in precision is obtained by using low as well as high 2θ angle diffraction peaks for calculating the lattice constant. The effect of the measured characteristic line width, simulated by modifying the slit system, on the calculated lattice constant was determined in the case of the YAG powder specimen. Suggestions to increase the precision of the lattice constants determined from X-ray diffraction powder samples are presented.

