JUN 7 *1 96 -2* $LIBRAR$

THE CRYSTAL **STRUCTURE** OF

POTASSIUM HEXATITANATE, $K_2 Ti_6 O_{13}$.

by

HILDA CID-DRESDNER

Profesora de Estado en Matematicas **y** Fisica

University of Chile

(1958)

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL **FULFILLMENT**

OF THE **REQUIREMENTS** FOR THE

DEGREE OF MASTER OF **SCIENCE**

at the

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF **TECHNOLOGY**

June, **1962**

Signature of Author Department of Geology, May 19, 1960. Certifiedby. **.** Thesis Supervisor. Accepted by Chairman, Departmental Committee on Graduate

Students.

The Crystal Structure of Potassium Hexatitanate, $K_2 Ti_6 O_{13}$

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{X}}$

Hilda Cid-Dresdner

Submitted to the Department of Geology on May **15, 1962,** in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science.

Abstract

Crystals **of** potassium hexatitanate synthesized **by** melting TiO2 and K ² CO 3 were used. Unit cell and space group were determined **by** means of precession, simple Weissenberg and precision Weissenberg photographs. The cell constants were adjusted **by** least-squares. The unit cell dimensions are:

The space group is C 2/m, and the cell contains $2(K_2Ti_6O_{13})$.

Three-dimensional intensity data were recorded by means of a single-crystal geiger counter diffractometer and the intensities were corrected for Lorentz-polarization factor and absorption. In later stages of the structure determination the three Ti were corrected for anomalous scattering.

A three-dimensional Patterson synthesis suggested a structure based on Ti octahedra with their axes parallel to the 2-fold axis, and a trial model, which gave the correct number of oxygens in this symmetry, was tested by vector methods, which confirmed it.

This structure, consisting of chains of Ti octahedra sharing edges and corners, with some tunnels where the K ions occur, was refined primarily by successive three-dimensional Fourier syntheses and finally **by** least-squares methods, leading to a discrepancy factor R of 12.4% for all reflections. Individual temperature factors and interatomic distances are in agreement with reported values.

> Thesis Supervisor: Martin **J.** Buerger Title: Professor of Mineralogy and Crystallography

L

Table of Contents

 $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$

 $\hat{\theta}$:

 $\bar{\tau}$

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$

 \sim μ .

 $\bar{\beta}$

 \sim \sim

 \sim \sim

List of figures

 $\bar{\gamma}$

 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$

 $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$

 $\sim 10^7$

 $\bar{\lambda}$

 $\ddot{}$

 $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$

 $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$

List of Tables

f.

Acknowledgements

It is a pleasure to express my gratitude to Professor Martin **J.** Buerger, who proposed this problem, supervised my work and contributed to it throughout with helpful suggestions and constructive criticism.

I am also indebted to the graduate students in the Department of Geology, particularly Mr. Donald Peacor and Mr. Bernhardt Wuensch for their constant interest in this problem and their useful suggestions; Mr. Charles T. Prewitt for his help in everything related to the use of computation programs which he had written, and for making special subroutines for the anomalous scattering correction of the Ti atoms; and Dr. Charles W. Burnham, now of the Geophysical Laboratory, Washington, **D. C. ,** for teaching me how to use his absorption correction program for a prismatic crystal, and for being ready at all times to solve my doubts at the results. Dr. Karl Fischer, of the University of Frankfurt on Main, Germany, also gave me many helpful suggestions. Mrs. Shirley Veale reviewed the manuscript and corrected my English; her help is gratefully acknowledged.

An important part of this work was carried out at the Computation Center of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

This work was done while the author held a scholarship given **by** the United States Department of State and the University of Chile.

 $\mathbf{1}$

Chapter **I**

Introduction

Potassium hexatitanate was synthesized for the first time in **1959 by** the Central Research Department of the Experimental Station of **E.** I. du Pont de Nemours and Company, **by** Berry et al. **,** who reported at the same time the x-ray powder data, the space group and the unit cell. A little later Anderson and Wadsley¹⁴ reported an unusual five-coordinated Ti in a compound of the same family, and this made the determination of the structure of potassium hexatitanate of great interest. Since it appeared to be of a reasonable complexity, it was thought that it could be solved **by** using vector methods such as 4 an implication diagram and minimum functions . It was found that, even though the interpretation of these turned out not to be so simple because of the strong substructure which made almost every peak multiple in the Patterson synthesis, these methods were still the most useful.

Recently Anderson and Wadsley¹⁶ published the structures of sodium and rubidium hexatitanate which are obviously isotypic with our potassium hexatitanate. **A** comparison between these structures is given at the end of this work.

Chapter II.

A. Unit cell and space group

Most of the crystals were prismatic with a good cleavage corresponding to **(100),** and elongated in the direction of the 2-fold axis. **A** thin prismatic crystal which gave a good extinction under the polarizing microscope was chosen and oriented in the optical goniometer.

Three Weissenberg photographs corresponding to the levels **0,** *1* and 2 with the 2-fold axis as the rotation axis were taken, and the intensity distribution was found to correspond to the monoclinic symmetries **C** 2/m, Cm or **C2.** For the first stages of this determination it was assumed to be **C** 2/m, **Fig.** *1.* This ambiguity is discussed further in the section on the refinement. Every reflection was indexed on the basis of a monoclinic cell of approximate dimensions $\underline{a} = 15.5 \text{ Å}, \underline{b} = 3.82 \text{ Å}, \underline{c} = 9.1 \text{ Å} \text{ and } \beta = 99^{\circ}5^{\circ}.$

More exact values of the a and c axes and the angle β were obtained from a precision back-reflection Weissenberg photograph using the technique described **by** Buerger . These results were adjusted **by** means of a least-squares calculation using a program *15a* written for the IBM **709** computer **by** Burnham

The value of the **b** axis was obtained **by** averaging the measurements of one rotation photograph and two precession photographs, which corresponded to the zero levels of the a and c axes.

3.

Space group **C** 2/m.

 $4.$

These results as well as those reported by Berry <u>et al</u>. ⁹ are listed in Table **1.**

B. Cell content

The volume of the unit cell is given **by**

 $V = a b c \sin \beta = 534.86 \text{ Å}^3$

The mass of one $K_2 Ti_6 O_{13}$ formula is

$$
M = 1.915 \times 10^{-21} \text{ gr.}
$$

and using the reported density, $\rho_o = 3.58 \text{ gm/cm}^3$, the number of formulae per cell is $\[\underline{n} = \frac{V\rho}{m}\] = 2.05 \approx 2.$ If $\underline{n} = 2$ is accepted, the value of the calculated density turns out to be $\rho_c = 3.581 \text{ gr/cc}$.

 $\sim 10^7$

Table *1*

Unit cell dimensions of potassium hexa-

titanate

Chapter III.

Intensity measurement

Selection of the sample. In choosing the crystal the primary consideration was the behavior of the crystal under the polarizing microscope. Since a new program for correcting absorption in prismatic crystals^{15b} is now available in this laboratory, it was not absolutely necessary to obtain an approximately cylindrically-shaped crystal, to simplify the absorption correction.

The dimensions of the crystal finally chosen were **0. 0923** X **0.0213** mm.,- and **0.2272** mm. The elongated direction corresponded to the 2-fold axis which was designated as the **b** axis. The crystal had two well developed **(100)** faces, and it was easily oriented optically. The orientation was corrected **by** means of precession photographs.

Intensity measurement. The collection of the intensities was made with a Buerger¹² single-crystal diffractometer operated with a Philips generator, using an argon-filled geiger counter as the detector. CuKa radiation **(Ni** filter) was used, and the generator was run uniformly at **35kV** and **15** ma. Six hundred reflections, corresponding to the levels **0, 1,** 2, **3** and 4 perpendicular to the **b** axis, were collected.

In order to keep the measurements within the linearity range of the counter, two aluminum foils of different thicknesses were used to cut down the strongest reflections. Rather than trying to calculate

7.

the absorption factor of each foil accurately, these were calculated roughly, and instead three different scale factors were used: scale factor 1 being used for all reflections without aluminum foil; scale factor **2** for all reflections measured with the less absorbent of the foils, and scale factor **3** for those measured with the thicker foil.

The ϕ and Υ values for all reflections were computed on the IBM 709 computer using a program written by Prewitt⁸ which also computes the Lorentz-polarization factor $1/\mu$.

The uniformity of the x-ray beam was checked according to the technique described by Burnham^{15d} and the white-radiation effect¹³ was found to be negligible.

The technique used was as follows: for each peak, the background was counted for a fixed point on each side of the peak; the counts per second were averaged and subtracted from the total number of counts per second for the scanned peak. Reflections where zero or a "negative" number of counts per second were found were set to a value equal to **1/ 3** times the value of the smallest non-zero reflection found $15c$. The integrated intensities were corrected for Lorentz-polarization factor and for absorption. The absorption correction for a prismatic crystal for which the equations of the crystal faces are known and which has no re-entrant angles has been described^{15b}. The approximate error when 64 integration points inside the crystal are used has been estimated at **3.8 %.**

It was relatively simple to establish these equations, since

this crystal had only six faces. On the other hand, **if** a cylindrical approximation for this particular crystal had been used, the error in the zero-level reflections could have been as large as **63% 15b,** due to the shape of the crystal and the high absorption coefficient, $\mu = 389.39 \text{cm}^{-1}$, which it has. That this absorption correction was accurate was proved **by** the fact that it was possible to use a single scale factor for the reflections of the different levels which were measured without aluminum foil.

The values of the integrated intensities, corrected as described above, were used as the $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{obs}}^{-2}$ coefficients for a twodimensional Patterson synthesis.

Chapter IV.

Structure determination

Four facts lead to the formulation of the trial model which proved to be the correct structure of potassium hexatitanate:

- **1.** The length of the **b** axis is just equal to the height of a titanium octahedron in the rutile structures;
- 2. Strong substructure reflections outline a sublattice repeating itself three times along the c axis **(Fig.** 2);
- **3.** The number of oxygens **(13** in the structural unit) drastically restricts the packing of the octahedra;
- 4. The large ionic radius of the K cations, together with the symmetry restrictions, sets up definitely the positions of the potassium atoms.

A two-dimensional Patterson synthesis, Fig. **3,** of the crystal showed a square arrangement of peaks which confirmed that the structure was based on Ti octahedra with their axes parallel to the **b** axis. Now, in the symmetry **C** 2/m, this fact- implies that the basic structure will have to be a sort of layer structure, with atoms only at the values zero and $\frac{1}{2}$ for the y coordinate. A three-dimensional Patterson synthesis proved that within the error limits there were peaks only in the $y = 0$ and $y = \frac{1}{2}$ sections. Both sections were identical but displaced $\frac{a}{2}$ in the <u>a</u> direction, as required for the facecentered cell. Therefore the three-dimensional work required in the

Zero-level precession photograph, a axis

(**c*** is vertical)

1999年

Patterson synthesis P(xz). (Contours at equal but arbitrary intervals)

12.

use of vector methods was reduced to the study of the section $P(x0z)$, Fig. 4.

Minimum functions based on different peaks of $P(x0z)$ were built up, and although these **did** not give an unambiguous result (because the peaks turned out to be multiple peaks) they all agreed in giving three strong peaks in a line which made a small angle with the c axis, Fig. **5.** These peaks were identified with the Ti atoms. Although not all the oxygens were obtained, there was sufficient evidence to prove that the basic unit was three octahedra sharing edges, as out lined in Fig. **5.** This choice agreed with the fact that the substructure reflections previously mentioned indicated a motif repeated three times along the c axis.

The number of oxygens, **26** in the complete cell, required that at least one should be placed at a symmetry center, and this was therefore placed at the origin. It was then found that the three octahedra sharing edges contained all the required information: the symmetry elements of the space group **C** 2/m produced the other three octahedra to complete a set having composition $K_2 Ti_6 O_{13}$. A picture of the idealized projection of the structure along the **b** axis is shown in Fig. **6. Fig. 7** is a clinographic projection of the structural unit.

The only thing necessary to complete the model now was to fix the position of the K ions. As a rough approximation the side of the square section of the Ti octahedra was **3** A; when four oxygens were placed one at each corner, a void was left of $3\sqrt{2}-2\times1.4$ =

Fig. 4.

Three dimensional Patterson synthesis section P(x0z). (Contours at equal but arbitrary intervals).

Fig. 5. Minimum function M (xOz), based on an **0-0** peak.

16.

 ω

 \hat{s}

Clinographic projection of the structural unit $^{\circ}$ ⁰¹ $^{\circ}$ $^{\circ}$

4.24 - 2.8 = 1.44 \AA diameter. The diameter of K^+ is 2.66 \AA , so that the only place where a K ion could **fit** in was one of the three cubic voids where the Ti octahedron chains were further apart, Fig. **7.** Since a symmetry center occurs in the central empty position, placing a potassium at this position would provide only two potassium atoms per unit cell instead of the necessary four. The final positions of the K ions are therefore those labeled I and **3** in Fig. **6.**

At this stage another minimum function $M_2(x^0z)$, based on the K-K peak, was made, and the result reproduced the proposed model structure (Fig. **8)** which proved that the model was correct.

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$

Fig. 8. Minimum function $M_2(x0z)$ based on the K peak.

Chapter V.

Refinement of the structure

The coordinates of the idealized model of **Fig. 6,** adjusted for the truevalues of the cell constants, were used as input for two cycles of least-squares refinement. The Busing and Levy crystallographic least-squares program was used, and the individual isotropic temperature factors and the three scale factors were allowed to vary, together with the coordinates. For the first cycle, all three scale factors were set at **1.0,** and the temperature factor was assumed to be 0.7 for all atoms. Atomic scattering curves^{7, 10, 5} for T^{+3} adjusted at low sin θ for T^{+4} , for O^{-2} and K^{+} were used. After two cycles which adjusted the scale factors, the discrepancy factor R was **39.1%** and the refinement stopped.

The R factor is defined as

$$
R = \frac{\Sigma ||F_0| - |F_c||}{\Sigma |F_0|}
$$

and the weighted R factor is defined as

$$
R' = \frac{\sum w \left|F_0\right| - \left|F_c\right| \left|^2}{\sum w \left|F_0\right|^2}
$$

all summations taken over all hkl. Busing and Levy^ts program minimizes R¹.

A Fourier refinement was next attempted¹². A threedimensional Fourier synthesis was calculated assigning to F_{obs} the signs of F_{cal} as obtained from the last least-squares cycle. The Fourier synthesis was calculated using the program MIFRI written **by** Sly and Shoemaker¹¹ for the IBM 704 computer. After the first Fourier synthesis and structure factor calculation, the R factor dropped to **32.6%** and after three more Fourier syntheses followed **by** structure factor calculations, an R factor of 24.2% was obtained.

At this point the displacement of all the atoms in the Fourier synthesis was very small, and a new least-squares refinement, again using Busing and Levy¹s program, was tried. After four cycles, the R factor was reduced to **16.0%** and the refinement stopped. In each cycle of refinement some negative temperature factors had been obtained, which was attributed to the anomalous scatterer character of Ti. The Ti atoms were corrected for anomalous scattering³ and values were assigned for Ti atomic scattering values after Dauben and Temple-2 ton

It was then decided that a new FORTRAN least-squares crystallographic program, **SFLSQZ,** written recently **by C.** T. Prewitt 1 7 of this laboratory, should be used for further refinement. It is very easy to make changes in this program, such as in the weighting scheme, in the space group, or in the number of atoms afftected **by** anomalous scattering, and it is also much faster than that of Busing and Levy.

The correction for anomalous scattering improved the

temperature factors, but **did** not appreciably improve the R factor. (An easy way to correct for anomalous scattering for the space groups **^C**2/m, Cm and **C2** is given in the Appendix.)

Since Prewitt¹s program also minimizes R^t , it was decided that a new weighting scheme should be tried. **Up** to this stage in the refinement, the weighting scheme proposed **by** Burnham15c had been used; this implied that small standard deviations in the F_{obs} will give higher weights to these reflections. But this meant that in practice the refinement was based on the highest F_{obs} , since these were the ones with the lowest standard deviation; and at this stage only the light atoms were changing their positions appreciably. Therefore a weighting scheme was tried as follows:

$$
\sqrt{\mathrm{w}}^{\mathsf{T}} = 1/\sigma
$$

as before, but now

if F_{obs} > $4 F_{obs min}$, $\sigma = 1/F_{\text{obs}};$

if F_{obs} < $4 F_{obs min}$, σ = 4 $F_{\text{obs min}}$.

This had the advantage of basing the refinement on the medium-strong F^ts, the higher and the lower F^ts being assigned a smaller weight.

Three more cycles of refinement resulted in a final R factor

of 12.4% for all reflections. Table **2** shows the values of the coordinates obtained from the first Fourier synthesis, and Table **3** shows the final coordinates of the structure.

At this stage an attempt was made to determine the true space group of potassium hexatitanate. The final atomic positions were submitted for refinement in the space groups **C2** and Cm. After two cycles in space group **C2** an R factor of 12.4% was obtained (the same as that for **C** 2/m) and the deviation of all **y** coordinates, but one, from the zero value, were smaller than the standard deviations. Space group Cm also permitted refinement up to 13.0%, but the standard deviations were very high and some of the temperature factors had very **high** values. Table 4 shows the coordinates of the atoms which were obtained for the space group **C2.** The space group problem is discussed further in the next chapter.

Finally, the coordinates given by Anderson¹⁶ for sodium hexatitanate were refined using K2 **^T 60 1 3** data. After two cycles, the discrepancy factor was 20. **6%** and the coordinates were beginning to converge to $K_2 Ti_6 O_{13}$ coordinates, as is shown in Table 5.

Table **6** lists the observed and calculated structure factors for potassium hexatitanate after the last cycle of refinement. Reflections 200, **110,** 220, **130** and 240 have been omitted on the basis of their **high** extinction, and the value of reflection **131** was found to be incorrect.

Table 2.

Potassium hexatitanate

Atomic coordinates in space group C 2/m, as

obtained from Fourier synthesis.

Potassium hexatitanate: Final atomic coordinates **in** space group **C2/m.** $\bar{\lambda}$

Atom	$\mathbf x$	$\sigma(\mathbf{x})$	y.	${\bf z}$	$\sigma(z)$	в
Ti(1)		0.1142 0.0001	0.0	0.0980	0.0002	0.47 ± 0.09
Ti(2)	0.1716 0.0001		0.0	0.4386 0.0002		0.60 ± 0.09
Ti(3)	0.2325 0.0001		0.0	-0.2238 0.0002		0.50 ± 0.09
K		0.4540 0.0002	0.0		0.2474 0.0003	1.11 ± 0.09
O(1)	$\mathbf{0}$.		0.	0.		0.6 ± 0.2
O(2)	0.2370 0.0006		0.0	0.237	0.001	0.6 ± 0.2
O(3)	0.0764 0.0006		0.0	0.291	0.001	0.6 ± 0.2
O(4)	0.2964 0.0006		0.0	-0.428	0.001	0.2 ± 0.2
O(5)	0.1330	0.0006	0.0	-0.384	0.001	0.4 ± 0.2
O(6)	0.3591 0.0006		0.0	-0.109	0.001	0.4 ± 0.2
O(7)	0.1677 0.0006		0.0	-0.083	0.001	0.6 ± 0.2

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$

 $\bar{}$

Potassium hexatitanate: Atomic coordinates in space group C2.

Table 4.

26.

Table **5.**

Results of refining potassium hexatitanate starting with Anderson^ts sodium hexatitanate as trial coordinates.

27.

Table 6.		
----------	--	--

Potassium hexatitanate: Observed and calculated structure factors.

 \sim \sim

 \mathcal{A}^{\prime}

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ $\frac{1}{2}$.

 $\frac{1}{2}$

 \mathcal{A}

 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ $\overline{}$

 $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$.

 \mathcal{L}_{max}

 \downarrow

 $\ddot{}$

30.

 $\overline{}$

 $\ddot{}$

 \mathcal{A}

 $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$

 $\frac{1}{2}$.

 $\label{eq:2.1} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}) \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$, where $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

 ~ 10

 $\sim 10^6$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

 $\frac{1}{2}$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$

 $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{A}}$

 \sim t .

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

 $\sim 10^{-10}$

 $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}$

 ~ 10

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ and $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

 $\frac{1}{2}$

 $\frac{1}{2}$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2}$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2}$

 $\label{eq:2} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ and $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

 \hat{a} , \hat{a}

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

 \sim

 \sim \sim

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$

35.

denter claims.

 $\frac{1}{2}$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1$

 $\mathcal{A}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

 $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\,d\mu_{\rm{eff}}\,d\mu_{\rm{eff}}$

 \sim

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$

 $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}$

 $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$,

 $\frac{1}{2}$

 \sim

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$

 ω

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$

Ŷ.

 $\frac{1}{2}$

41.

 $\ddot{}$

 \overline{a}

Chapter VI.

Description and discussion of the structure.

A projection on (010) of the final structure of $K_2Ti_6O_{13}$ is shown in **Fig. 9.** It consists basically of a unit of three Ti octahedra sharing edges in the square section, and this unit repeate itself in a zigzag way along the **b** axis. In this open frame there are no unshared corners, and the potassium ions are located in the tunnels between the structural units.

Table **7** shows the interatomic distances in the structural unit. Each Ti atom is surrounded **by** six oxygens in a distorted octahedron, and all are displaced from the center of the octahedron in the direction of the open sites where the K ions occur.

The potassium atoms are located at the center of a distorted cube defined **by** eight oxygen atoms. The potassium atoms are displaced from the center of the cube in the direction of the central void. Fig. **10** shows the environment of the different atoms in the structure. Assuming bond strength of 4/6 for Ti and **1/8** for K, it turns out that Pauling^ts electrostatic valence rule is not in general satisfied:

(a) The nearest neighbors of **0(1)** and **0(7)** are two Ti and four K atoms, so they have a net charge of $-2 + 2 \times \frac{4}{6} + 4 \times \frac{1}{8} = -\frac{1}{6}$

(b) O(2) and 0(4) have as nearest neighbors four Ti, so that their valence is oversaturated and they have a net charge of

Final structure of Potassium hexatitanate projected along the **b** axis. (Large circles represent K ions, medium size circles represent **⁰**atoms, little circles represent Ti atoms).

 \sim

 $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{A})$

Table 7. Interatomic distances in $K_2 Ti_6 O_{13}$.

 \sim

 $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$

O(1) and O(7)

0(2) and O(4)

0(3) and O(5)

 $-2+4 \times \frac{4}{6} = +\frac{4}{6}$

(c) **0(3)** and **0(5)** have as neighbors two Ti and two K, so they have a net charge of -2 + $2 \times \frac{4}{6}$ + $2 \times \frac{1}{8}$ = $-\frac{5}{12}$.

(d) 0(6) has as only nearest neighbors three Ti, and has a zero net charge, so is the one that satisfies Pauling's rules exactly.

Now, if it is assumed that the bond strength is inversely proportional to the bond distance, the acentric position of the Ti within the octahedra can be explained as being necessary to achieve the electrical neutrality. The effect, as shown in Table **7,** is that the distances from Ti(1) are as follows:

> $Ti(1) - O(1) = 1.86$ Å $Ti(1) - O(2) = 2.11$ $Ti(1) - O(3) = 1.96$,

therefore Ti(1) contributes more than $\frac{4}{6}$ to compensate the unsaturated oxygens **(1)** and **(3),** but less to the oversaturated 0(2). The same is true with respect to Ti(2):

> $Ti(2) - O(3) = 1.84$ Å $Ti(2) - O(2) = 2.28$ $Ti(2) - O(5) = 1.83$ $Ti(2) - O(4) = 2.11$.

Again Ti(2) is closer to the unsaturated atoms **0(3)** and **0(5)** than to the oversaturated atoms 0(2) and 0(4).

46.

Similarly, the acentric position of the potassium ion within the cube can be explained as an effort to compensate the less saturated atoms of the structure, namely **0(5)** and **0(3):**

$$
K - O(5) = 2.77 \text{ Å}
$$

$$
K - O(7) = 2.91 \text{ .}
$$

Again the ion is closer to the less saturated of the oxygens.

There is one problem left: why was it impossible to determine the true space group of the structure? This must be the subject of another investigation. Nevertheless, it is necessary to point out that this may be explained as the result of a certain amount of disorder in the crystal. In this particular case, since the structure is a layer structure, the problem could be merely one of stacking faults. This supposition is supported **by** the appearance of the final electron density map (Fig. **1i)** and the difference synthesis **(Fig.** 12).

In the electron-density map it is possible to observe some small additional peaks close to those belonging to the structure. The same peaks appear in the difference synthesis, Fig. 12. It is also possible to see that these additional peaks outline the same structural model as that for $K_2 Ti_6 O_{13}$, but are displaced along a vector approximately equal to half the Ti(1) **- 0(1)** vector. **If** it is tru that there are stacking fahlt problems, this would also explain why the \underline{R} factor of the refinement could not be reduced below 12.4% even though the intensity data were good.

Fig. i.

Electron density section $\int \rho(x0z)$

(Contours at equal but arbitrary intervals;each contour of a shaded peak correspond to five of the unshaded ones).

Appendix.

Structure factors for the space groups C 2/m, Cm and C2 corrected for anomalous scattering.

The general structure factor **F(hkl)** can be written in terms of its real and imaginary components as

$$
F(hkl) = A^t + iB^t, \text{ where}
$$

\n
$$
A^t = \Sigma \Sigma f_r \cos 2\pi (hx_r + ky_r + iz_r) e^{-\beta} r \frac{\sin^2 \theta}{\lambda^2}
$$

\n
$$
B^t = \Sigma \Sigma f_r \sin 2\pi (hx_r + ky_r + iz_r) e^{-\beta} r \frac{\sin^2 \theta}{\lambda^2}
$$

where the summations are taken over the different kinds of atoms in the unit cell and over all the different equivalent positions of those atoms.

$$
f_r
$$
 = atomic scattering factor for atom r
 β_r = temperature factor for atom r

When the atom is an anomalous scatterer,

$$
f_r = f_{or} + \Delta f_r^{\dagger} + i\Delta f'' , \qquad (1)
$$

and both At and B? become complex. Formula **(1)** cannot be used any longer in its original sense, and it is necessary to determine the new real and imaginary components of the structure factor. Call

$$
A_1 = \Sigma f \sin 2\pi (\hbar x + k y + l z) e^{-\beta \frac{\sin 2\theta}{\lambda^2}}
$$

$$
B_1 = \Sigma f \sin 2\pi (\hbar x + k y + l z) e^{-\beta \frac{\sin^2 \theta}{\lambda^2}}
$$

the summation extending over all equivalent positions in a unit cell.

For the space group **C** *2/n*

$$
A_1 = 8f \cos 2\pi (hx + Iz) \cos 2\pi ky e^{-\beta \frac{\sin 2\theta}{\lambda^2}}
$$

\n
$$
B_1 = 0
$$

\n
$$
A_1 = A_R + iA_I
$$

\n
$$
A_R = 8(f_0 + \Delta f^I) \cos 2\pi (hx + Iz) e^{-\beta \frac{\sin^2 \theta}{\lambda^2}}
$$

\n
$$
A_I = 8\Delta f'' \cos 2\pi (hx + Iz) \cos 2\pi ky e^{-\beta \frac{\sin^2 \theta}{\lambda^2}}
$$

It is also possible to express the structure factor as

$$
F(khl) = A + iB
$$

$$
A = \sum_{i} A_{R}^{i}
$$

$$
B = \sum_{i} A_{I}^{i}
$$

 $\bar{\sqrt{2}}$

where

the summation being taken over all atoms in the cell. Note that the centric space group becomes acentric.

For the space group Cm

$$
A_{1} = 4f \cos 2\pi (hx + Iz) \cos 2\pi ky e
$$

\n
$$
B_{1} = 4f \sin 2\pi (hx + Iz) \cos 2\pi ky e
$$

\n
$$
B_{1} = A_{R} + iA_{I}
$$

\n
$$
B_{1} = B_{r} + iB_{I}
$$

\n
$$
F(hkl) = \Sigma (A_{1} + iB_{1}) = \Sigma (A_{R} + A_{I} + iB_{R} - B_{I}).
$$

Therefore the real and imaginary parts of the stracture factor are

$$
A = \Sigma(A_R - B_I)
$$

$$
B = \Sigma(A_I + B_R)
$$

$$
F(hkl) = A + iB,
$$

where

$$
A_R = 4(f_0 + \Delta f^t) \cos 2\pi(hx + Iz) \cos 2\piky e^{-\beta \frac{\sin^2 \theta}{\lambda^2}}
$$

$$
A_{I} = 4\Delta f'' \cos 2\pi (hx + Iz) \cos 2\pi ky e
$$

- $\beta \frac{\sin^{2}\theta}{\lambda^{2}}$

$$
B_r = 4(f_0 + \Delta f^{\mathbf{i}}) \cos 2\pi (hx + Iz) \cos 2\pi ky e^{-\beta \frac{\sin^2 \theta}{\lambda^2}}
$$

$$
B_l = 4\Delta f^{\mathbf{i} \mathbf{i}} \sin 2\pi (hx + Iz) \cos 2\pi ky e^{-\beta \frac{\sin^2 \theta}{\lambda^2}}
$$

For the space group C2
\n
$$
A_1 = 4f \cos 2\pi (hx + 1z) \cos 2\pi ky e
$$
\n
$$
B_4 = 4f \cos 2\pi (hx + 1z) \sin 2\pi ky e
$$
\n
$$
B_4 = 4f \cos 2\pi (hx + 1z) \sin 2\pi ky e
$$

The same transformation formulae as for space group Cm are used:

$$
A = \Sigma(A_R - B_I)
$$

$$
B = \Sigma(A_I + B_R)
$$

$$
F = A + iB,
$$

with the summation taken over all atoms; but of course the form of

 B_R and B are different, according to the expression for B_I .

Bibliography

Buerger, M.J. X-ray crystallography. $1.$ (John Wiley an **d** Sons, New York, *1959)*

Dauben, **C.** H. and Templeton, D.H. **A** table of dispersion $2.$ corrections for x-ray scattering of atoms. Acta Cryst,. **8** *(1955)* 841-842.

- Templeton, **D.** X-ray dispersion effects in crystal structure $3.$ determination. Acta Cryst. **8 (1955),** 842.
- Buerger, **M.J** Vector Space **.** 4. (John Wiley an **d** Sons, New York, 1942)
- Freeman, **A. J** Atomic scattering factors for spherical and 5. asperical charge distributions. Acta Cryst. 12 **(1959) 261-271.**
- Busing, W.R., and Levy, **H.A.** Crystallographic least-6. squares refinement program for IBM 704. (Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, **1959)**
- Freeman, **A. J. ,** and Watson, R. **E.** Quarterly Progree 7. Report (October **15, 1959)** Solid State Molecular Structure Group, M. I. T. **p. 16.**
- Prewitt, C. T. The parameters Υ and ϕ for equi-inclination 8. with application to the single-crystal counter diffractometer. Z. Krist. 114 **(1960) 5-6.**
- Berry, K.L., Aftandilian, V.D., Gilbert, W.W., Meibohm, 9. **E.** P. H. and Young, H. **S.** Potassium tetra- and hexatitanates. **J.** Inorg. Nucl. Chem. 14 **(1960) 231-239.**
- **10.** Suzuki, T. Atomic scattering factor for **0-2** Acta Cryst. **13 (1960) 279.**
- **111. Sly,** W. **G.,** and Shoemaker, **D.P.** MIFRI: two and three dimensional crystallographic Fourier summation program for IBM 704 computer (program description and manual of operation). Technical report, Office of Ordnance Research contract DA-19-020-ORD-4696 **(1960).**
- 12. Buerger, **M.J.** Crystal structure analysis. (John Wiley and Sons, New York, **1960) 590.**
- **13.** Fischer, K., and Hahn, T. Background correction for singlecrystal diffractometers. *Z.Krist.* **116 (1961) 27-35.**
- 14. Anderson, **S.,** and Wadsley, **E. D.,** The crystal structure of-K₂Ti₂O₅. Acta Chem. Scand. 15 (1961) 663-669.
- **15.** Burnham, **C.** W. The structures and crystal chemistry of the aluminum-silicate minerals. Ph.D. Thesis, M. I. T., August, **1961.**

15a. pages **183-194**

15b. pages 240-259

15c. pages **273-284**

15d. page **213**

16. Andersson, **S.,** and Wadsley, **A.D.** The structures of $\text{Na}_2\text{Ti}_6\text{O}_4$ and $\text{Rb}_2\text{Ti}_6\text{O}_4$ and the alkali metal titanates. Acta Cryst. **15 (1962)** 194-201.

17. Prewitt, **C.** T. **(1962)** Personal communication.

54,