

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

System Design and Verification of the Precession Electron Diffraction Technique

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Field of Materials Science and Engineering

By

Christopher Su-Yan Own

EVANSTON, ILLINOIS

December 2005

© Copyright by Christopher Su-Yan Own 2005
All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

System Design and Verification of the Precession Electron Diffraction Technique

Christopher Su-Yan Own

Bulk structural crystallography is generally a two-part process wherein a rough starting structure model is first derived, then later refined to give an accurate model of the structure. The critical step is the determination of the initial model. As materials problems decrease in length scale, the electron microscope has proven to be a versatile and effective tool for studying many problems. However, study of complex bulk structures by electron diffraction has been hindered by the problem of dynamical diffraction. This phenomenon makes bulk electron diffraction very sensitive to specimen thickness, and expensive equipment such as aberration-corrected scattering transmission microscopes or elaborate methodology such as high resolution imaging combined with diffraction and simulation are often required to generate good starting structures.

The precession electron diffraction technique (PED), which has the ability to significantly reduce dynamical effects in diffraction patterns, has shown promise as being a “philosopher’s stone” for bulk electron diffraction. However, a comprehensive understanding of its abilities and limitations is necessary before it can be put into widespread use as a standalone technique. This thesis aims to bridge the gaps in understanding and utilizing precession so that practical application might be realized.

Two new PED systems have been built, and optimal operating parameters have been elucidated. The role of lens aberrations is described in detail, and an alignment procedure is given that shows how to circumvent aberration in order to obtain high-quality patterns. Multislice simulation is used for investigating the errors inherent in precession, and is also used as a reference for comparison to simple models and to experimental PED data. General trends over a large sampling of parameter space are determined. In particular, we show that the primary reflection intensity errors occur near the transmitted beam condition and decay with increasing angle and decreasing specimen thickness. These errors, occurring at the lowest spatial frequencies, fortuitously coincide with reflections for which phases are easiest to determine via imaging methods. A general two-beam dynamical model based upon an existing approximate model is found to be fairly accurate across most experimental conditions, particularly where it is needed for providing a correction to distorted data. Finally, the practical structure solution procedure using PED is demonstrated for several model material systems.

Of the experiment parameters investigated, the cone semi-angle is found to be the most important (it should be as large as possible), followed closely by specimen thickness (thinner is better). Assuming good structure projection characteristics in the specimen, the thickness tractable by PED is extended to 40-50 nm without correction for complex oxides. With a forward calculation based upon the two-beam dynamical model (using known structure factors), usable specimen thickness can be extended past 150 nm. For *a priori* correction, using the squared amplitudes approximates the two-beam model for most thicknesses if the scattering from the structure adheres to psuedo-kinematical behavior. Practically, crystals up to 60 nm in thickness can now be processed by the precession methods developed in this thesis.

—

Approved by

Professor Laurence D. Marks
Department of Materials Science and Engineering
Northwestern University, Evanston, IL 60208, USA

To my wife Lindsey, for enriching my life throughout my years at
Northwestern and for many more to come.
You have our gratitude.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank my thesis adviser, Prof. L.D. Marks for the opportunity to work with him and for his guidance throughout my training. I am also indebted to Dr. Wharton Sinkler for his mentorship and for his willingness to work with me and share his resources throughout the duration of this work. He has acted quite like a second adviser and I thank him for his many suggestions, excellent feedback, and for his understanding.

Many other people have made this work possible. Thanks go to the members of the Marks research group, especially Arun Subramanian, who has always made himself available as a friend and teacher; my father, Dr. Shi-Hau Own for his continual encouragement; and Vasant Ramasubramanian, who taught me some fundamental electronics that I have found useful in many areas of my life. Winfried Hill of Rochester Polytechnic deserves special thanks for analysis of the electronics and circuit redesign suggestions for the first precession instrument I built. Wharton Sinkler from UOP LLC provided the GITO and MOR specimens and did considerable preliminary work with MOR that supported the results in section 5.4. Jim Ciston, from our group, contributed the background work on Andalusite in section 5.3. I also thank JEOL and Hitachi technical support, especially Ken Eberly and Jim Poulous at Hitachi, for constructive discussions, and Hitachi High Technologies for permission to publish microscope schematics included in this dissertation.

Funding for this project was provided by UOP LLC, STCS, the US Department of Energy (Grant no. DE-FG02-03ER 15457), and the Fannie and John Hertz Foundation. I am deeply indebted to the Fannie and John Hertz Foundation for funding my graduate studies; without the Foundation's singular vision and immense generosity, this work would not have been possible.

Contents

ABSTRACT	iii
Acknowledgements	vi
List of Tables	ix
List of Figures	x
Chapter 1. Introduction and Methods	1
1.1. The Electron Microscope in Crystallography	2
1.2. Direct Methods	4
1.3. The Problem of Multiple Scattering	12
1.4. Approaches for Pseudo-Kinematical Electron Diffraction	17
Chapter 2. Precession Instrumentation	28
2.1. Precession Geometry	29
2.2. Retrofit Requirements	35
2.3. Aberration Analysis	37
2.4. Review of Previous Instruments	43
2.5. Design Approach	44
Chapter 3. The GITO Model System	54
3.1. Rapid <i>a priori</i> Solution of a Metal Oxide	55
3.2. Precession Simulation	65
3.3. <i>R</i> -factor analysis	72
3.4. Summary	74
Chapter 4. Lorentz Correction Factors	77
4.1. Derivation of Correction Factors	78
4.2. Comparison between models	86
4.3. Discussion: Approach for Solving Novel Structures	100
Chapter 5. Precession Examples	103
5.1. $(\text{Ga,In})_2\text{SnO}_4$	103
5.2. $\text{La}_4\text{Cu}_3\text{MoO}_{12}$	106
5.3. Al_2SiO_5	111

5.4. Mordenite	113
5.5. Conclusion	117
Chapter 6. Conclusions and Future Work	119
6.1. Future Work	121
Appendix A. Electronics Background	123
A.1. Limited-bandwidth systems	123
A.2. Amplifier design	126
A.3. Simple Linear Power Supply Design	129
Appendix B. Implementation 1	132
B.1. Hitachi H-9000 retrofit	132
B.2. Performance and limitations	135
Appendix C. Implementation 2	139
C.1. JEOL 2000FX Retrofit	139
C.2. Performance and limitations	142
Appendix D. Implementation 3	145
D.1. JEOL 2100F	145
Appendix E. Alignment Procedure	149
Appendix F. Intensity Measurement	153
Appendix G. (Ga,In) ₂ SnO ₄ Dataset	157
Appendix. References	161

List of Tables

3.1	GITO atom positions from HREM, neutron diffraction (refined), and unrefined positions from precession. Atom positions from PED match very closely with the neutron-refined positions.	64
3.2	Terminology for thickness ranges.	67
4.1	Correction factors for correcting PED intensities. Note $C_{Blackman}$ has corrected integrand.	87
4.2	R_1 for the structure factors with noise added using equation 4.18.	98
4.3	R_1 for C_{2beam} -corrected intensities using noisy structure factors. Table values in percent.	99
G.1	Kinematical amplitudes and experimental amplitudes for the GITO precession experiment (normalized to strongest reflection). See figure 3.2 for experimental errors. Reflections excluded in direct methods are starred (*).	157

List of Figures

- 1.1 Demonstration of amplitude and phase errors in perbromo-phthalocyanine. The bottom row shows amplitude errors (a modified R_1 - see eqn 1.17) and the top shows phase errors (standard deviations, columns give comparable R-factor), both increasing to the right. Amplitude errors were generated using noise in steps of 8% of the strongest beam amplitude. Reproduced from Marks and Sinkler (2003). 5
- 1.2 Argand diagram illustrating Sayre's triplet relationship (equation 1.9). For strong amplitudes $|F_{\mathbf{g}}|$, $|F_{\mathbf{h}'}|$, and $|F_{\mathbf{g}-\mathbf{h}'}|$, the phase sum is approximately $2n\pi$. 8
- 1.3 Graphical representation of iterative projection onto sets described by equation 1.10. S_1 is the set of structure factors constrained by the observed experimental intensities $|U_g^{exp}|e^{i\phi_{\mathbf{g}}}$ and S_2 is the set of structure factors that satisfies the *a priori* constraints. The magnitude of P_n represents the calculated figure of merit (FOM); rapid convergence toward a feasible solution accompanies minimization of the FOM. 9
- 1.4 Three possible outcomes of the solution search between sets S_1 and S_2 using iterative projection. Case a), where a single unique solution is clearly defined, is rare. Case b) demonstrates considerable overlap of sets, a consequence of loose constraints where many solutions satisfy both constraint sets. c) shows a case where there is no overlap between sets. The algorithm will seek the solutions that minimize the distance between the sets. 10
- 1.5 Flowchart of the feasible sets '98 (fs98) direct methods algorithm. 11
- 1.6 Diffracted beams that meet the Bragg condition (equation 1.14) are necessarily in the same condition to be rediffracted back into the incident beam. Demonstrated here for two beams, this is the origin of dynamical diffraction. 13
- 1.7 Probability histogram of the product $F_{\mathbf{g}}F_{-\mathbf{g}}$ for (a) centrosymmetric and (b) noncentrosymmetric (random) models of $\text{C}_{32}\text{Cl}_{16}\text{CuN}_8$ crystal. (c) and (d) are similar centrosymmetric and noncentrosymmetric histograms for the triple product $F_{\mathbf{g}}F_{\mathbf{h}}F_{-\mathbf{g}-\mathbf{h}}$ for the same crystal. All structure factors calculated by multislice, $t = 5.264$ nm. Taken from Hu et al. (2000) and Chukhovskii et al. (2001). 17
- 1.8 Normalized dynamical moduli of $F_{\mathbf{g}}$ plotted against $F_{-\mathbf{g}}$ for the noncentrosymmetric structure in figure 1.7(b) and (d). Friedel's law is obeyed statistically for this thickness (5.264nm). 18

1.9	Plot of the $J_0(2A)$ and its integral. Values for the first local maximum and minimum are indicated.	20
1.10	The schematic diagram of precession electron diffraction (PED). The beam is tilted off zone by angle ϕ using the beam tilt coils and serially precessed through an angle $\theta = 2\pi$. A complementary de-tilt is provided below the specimen by de-scan coils to restore the zone axis pattern.	22
1.11	(a) Selected area DP of the [532] zone axis of magnesium orthovanadate ($\text{Mg}_3\text{V}_2\text{O}_8$). (b) Precessed SADP of the same orthovanadate using a moderate precession angle of 5.2 mrad to illustrate the effects. Several HOLZ annuli are apparent and non-systematic effects in the ZOLZ are averaged into a radially diminishing background. Note: Images (a) and (b) have identical exposure times, digitizing conditions, and have received the same digital image processing, so they can be directly compared.	23
2.1	Reciprocal space geometry in (a) $x - y$ plane and (b) $x - z$ plane. The beam precesses about the z -axis maintaining constant ϕ . In (b), the ZOLZ (bold dashed circle) precesses about the z -axis.	31
2.2	Center precession pattern (a) is an integration of the simulated tilt series (contrast inverted) that surrounds it forming an effective cone of illumination. (b) is the non-precessed pattern. $t = 41\text{nm}$, $\phi = 24\text{mrad}$, patterns represent structure factor amplitudes.	33
2.3	a) Precession geometry schematic showing the relationship between ZOLZ and FOLZ excitations. The distance z corresponds to the zero order zone radius; γ corresponds to the usable diffraction radius in mrad. b) Plot of unit cell dimension against usable diffraction radius γ for various cone semi-angles. The lines describe γ , which decreases with ϕ and specimen unit cell thickness.	34
2.4	Precession geometry in a modern condenser-objective TEM with double deflection coil system showing the path of the precessed transmitted beam. The objective prefield acts as an additional condenser lens. Circle I is generated by the beam tilt scan. De-scan collapses circle I down to point II.	38
2.5	Star of merced, formed by the unoptimized precession probe prior to full alignment. The three-fold astigmatism term is dominant. Each lobe is roughly 25 nm. The image was taken on a JEOL 2000FX retrofitted for precession.	39
2.6	The aberration function $\chi(\rho)$ describes the deviation from the ideal round lens along the projected direction of the aberrated ray. The aberrated ray deviates in angle from ideal by ρ ; in real space this corresponds to a deviation of probe location (the origin of probe ‘wandering’).	41

2.7	a) Two-fold (potato chip) and b) three-fold (monkey's saddle) aberration functions (arbitrary units). These are the primary aberrations that require compensation in conventional instruments.	41
2.8	An aberration function containing coefficients C_{10} , C_{12a} , C_{30} , and C_{45a} (mixed in a respective ratio of 1:2:3:3). The effective aberration surface has rough 5-fold symmetry. In the x - z section on the right, an odd-order function describes a region of flat phase extended in the $+x$ direction indicated by the arrows.	43
2.9	Overview diagram of the precession system.	45
2.10	Generic amplifier for driving an electromagnetic coil.	46
2.11	a) Simulated waveform for the H-9000 bipolar push-pull DS amplifier demonstrating crossover distortion. At each zero-crossing point, there is a plateau in the waveform. b) A precessed beam tilt pattern demonstrates how this distortion manifests in the pattern: since x and y coils are out of phase by 90 a pinwheel pattern is generated.	47
2.12	Mixer-buffer circuit used to add precession capabilities to a deflector amplifier. The first stage sums the normal microscope signal with the precession scan signal and is followed by an inverting buffer stage that corrects phase and isolates the mixer from downstream components. This circuit can be installed at point a in figure 2.10.	48
2.13	Precession software interface.	51
2.14	Precession patterns for 60 mrad cone semiangle (a) and 40 mrad cone semiangle (b). Spiral distortions in the projector lens alter the shape of the spots and shifts their position, preventing straightforward intensity measurement. Using a smaller cone semi-angle gives an improved and easier to measure spot pattern.	52
3.1	Structure of $(\text{Ga,In})_2\text{SnO}_4$ (GITO). In/Ga balls represent mixed occupancy sites.	54
3.2	Friedel errors (amplitudes). Most precession errors (circles) are less than 10% of the amplitude and decrease with increasing amplitude. Non-precessed Friedel errors have more scatter and often exceed 10% of the measured amplitude due to the asymmetric sampling of relrods.	56
3.3	(a) Kinematical amplitudes pattern (radius proportional to amplitude) and (b) experimental PED intensity pattern (radius proportional to intensity). The annulus describing the range 0.25 - 0.75 \AA^{-1} is bounded by the circles.	58
3.4	(a) Experimental precession amplitudes and (b) dynamical amplitudes plotted against kinematical amplitudes calculated from the known structure. Amplitudes shown are the square root of the measured intensity.	59
3.5	a) Four unique DM solutions generated from precession amplitudes. Reflections below $\mathbf{g} = 0.25 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$ were excluded. b) Topographical map of solution 4. Well-defined peaks above the noise floor correspond to atomic positions. c) DM solution from dynamical dataset. No high resolution phases were used to generate these maps.	61

3.6	DM solution from precession intensities (all reflections included).	63
3.7	Precession amplitudes (normalized) plotted against amplitudes calculated by precession multislice.	66
3.8	Montage of amplitude reference plots for GITO. In each plot, the abscissa represents kinematical amplitudes and calculated amplitudes are plotted along the ordinate. The plots are arranged in order of increasing thickness and angle as indicated.	68
3.9	3-D surface plots of absolute amplitude error ($F_{\mathbf{g}}^{exp} - F_{\mathbf{g}}^{kin}$) against $ \mathbf{g} $ and thickness. (a) Dynamical (non-precessed) dataset errors showing particularly large error spread within structure-defining reflections $g \subset [0.25, 1]$. (b)-(e) Precession dataset errors for $\phi = 10, 24, 50,$ and 75 mrad respectively. Experimental dataset parameters are indicated in plot (c). (f) Scatter plot for 24 mrad showing that for realistic specimen thicknesses (< 50 nm) almost all errors fall within the range $[-0.2, 0.4]$.	70
3.10	R_1 for the GITO experimental datasets. Precession datasets have a clear global minimum and indicating a nominal thickness of ≈ 40 nm.	73
3.11	3-D surface plots of absolute amplitude error ($F_{\mathbf{g}}^{exp} - F_{\mathbf{g}}^{kin}$) against $ \mathbf{g} $ for (a) dynamical and (b) precession data. The ranges of \mathbf{g} and t match experimental parameters from section 3.1. Errors are decreased from (a) to (b) and very little oscillation of intensity occurs with increasing thickness. Granularity of t is 3.17 \AA .	75
4.1	Reciprocal space geometry in (a) $x - y$ plane and (b) $x - z$ plane. The beam precesses about the z -axis maintaining constant ϕ . In (b), the ZOLZ (bold dashed circle) precesses about the z -axis.	80
4.2	Intensity collected ($I_{\mathbf{g}}$) and excitation error ($s_{\mathbf{g}}$) during the integration in the kinematical model, plotted against azimuthal angle for a low-index reflection ($ \mathbf{g} = 0.1R_0$, where $R_0 \approx \phi k = 0.96 \text{ \AA}$). Parallel illumination, with $t = 100 \text{ \AA}$, $\phi = 24$ mrad, 200 kV.	82
4.3	Scattered intensity ($I_{\mathbf{g}}$) v. excitation error ($s_{\mathbf{g}}$). Thickness $t = 500$. For the solid curve $\xi_{\mathbf{g}} = 1500 \text{ \AA}$ and for the dashed curve $\xi_{\mathbf{g}} = 500 \text{ \AA}$ (intensities not to scale). The binodal behavior occurs when $t > \xi_{\mathbf{g}}$.	83
4.4	Equation 4.17 plotted for the three strongest reflections in GITO. The oscillation periodicities are slightly different because the extinction distance $\xi_{\mathbf{g}}$ varies between reflections. The extinction distances are 580 \AA , 660 \AA , and 780 \AA for the $40\bar{1}$, 003 , and 206 reflections, respectively.	85
4.5	The squared sinc function (a) and the integral of the sinc function (b) plotted against excitation error for a crystal thickness of 500 \AA . The integral converges rapidly toward unity as indicated by the arrows: 98% of the intensity is sampled when 5 oscillation periods are integrated, and 99% of the intensity is sampled by 10 oscillation periods.	88

- 4.6 (a) The integration range $\Delta \mathbf{s}_{\mathbf{g}}$ for reflection \mathbf{g} located at $x = R_0$. Excitation error is positive in the $-z$ direction. (b) The scattered intensity over the range Δs from (a) for a crystal with $t = 200 \text{ \AA}$ and $\xi_{\mathbf{g}} = 250 \text{ \AA}$. 89
- 4.7 The kinematical correction factor C_{kin} for crystal thicknesses between 100 \AA and 600 \AA , for $\phi = 24 \text{ mrad}$. The correction factors behave nearly identically (with scaling) for $g < 1.8 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$, corresponding to about twice the radius of the zeroth order Laue zone ($2R_0$). Beyond $2R_0$, the correction factor is inversely proportional to the area within the tails of the relrod where there is very little scattered intensity, and the correction factor blows up. 90
- 4.8 Comparison of the full correction factors C_{2beam} and $C_{Blackman}$ from table 4.1 plotted against g . (a)-(c) Dynamical effects are small when t is small, therefore the full corrections converge to C_{kin} and C_{Gj} , respectively. The plots show that C_{Gj} does not match the C_{kin} well at small thickness. (c) For larger tilt angle, Gjønnes-Blackman correction matches for $g < R_0$. Small peaks begin to appear on top of the geometry term (whale-shaped curve) as thickness increases. (d) Correction $C_{Blackman}$ matches correction C_{2beam} for large thickness because the periodicity within the relrod is very small. The dynamical corrections (peaks) dominate the correction factor values. 92
- 4.9 Tableau of correction factor plots for the GITO system calculated for various cone semi-angles and specimen thickness. The constituent plots represent C_{2beam} v. g . The plots in the 10 mrad row have a cutoff of $g = 0.9 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$ because for small cone semi-angle the correction factor blows up at high spatial frequencies. 94
- 4.10 Multislice amplitudes with correction factor C_{kin} applied. 95
- 4.11 Plots of corrected amplitude v. kinematical amplitudes. Correction factors were applied to datasets simulated from multislice (200 kV). All plots use correction factor C_{2beam} except row 10*, which uses C_{Bk} (refer to table 4.1). 10 mrad corrected datasets include only $g < 0.8 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$ due to the ZOLZ limit $2R_0$. 96
- 4.12 Detail plot of simulated intensities for $t = 1268 \text{ \AA}$ corrected using C_{2beam} . The distribution of the intensities with g is indicated by symbol. Weak intensities from the entire range of g contribute to the spread at low amplitude, showing that dynamical effects are not strongly tied to spatial frequency (except in the continually multiply-excited condition near the transmitted beam). 97
- 4.13 Multislice datasets corrected with C_{2beam} using structure factors with 40% noise added. The abscissa within each plot represents the true kinematical structure factor. R-factors for these plots are given in table 4.3. 99
- 4.14 Flowchart for generating a starting structure model from a PED data set. 102
- 5.1 (a) C_{2beam} correction factors calculated for GITO using true structure factors and known experimental parameters $\phi = 24 \text{ mrad}$ and $t = 412 \text{ \AA}$. (b) The experimental amplitudes corrected by C_{2beam} v. true structure factor. (c) Intensities plotted

- against true structure factor for the GITO system. Black triangles correspond to low-index reflections with $g < 0.25 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$. The grey data points represent reflections in the range from $g = 0.25\text{-}1.4 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$. 104
- 5.2 (a) Direct methods potential map from amplitudes corrected for 2-beam effects (C_{2beam} correction factors, figure 5.1(b)). (b) Contour map of (a) with the atoms overlaid. 105
- 5.3 [001] projection of the $\text{La}_4\text{Cu}_3\text{MoO}_{12}$ structure model. In this model, the frustrated structure alternates Mo-rich columns along the b -axis to ensure stoichiometry, resulting in a doubling of the unit cell along a . 107
- 5.4 Experimental conditions for the $\text{La}_4\text{Cu}_3\text{MoO}_{12}$ precession diffraction experiment. The selected-area image (with precession off) is shown in (a). The specimen morphology was a spike shape with thin region masked using the selected-area aperture. The sample became very thick just outside of the masked region. With precession on, the probe, specimen, and aperture image wander because of optical aberrations and SA errors. Incomplete integration and/or thickness sampling variation along the circuit may result as shown in (b). 108
- 5.5 $\text{La}_4\text{Cu}_3\text{MoO}_{12}$ intensity diffraction patterns. (a) Kinematical pattern calculated from the structure in figure 5.3. (b) Conventional on-zone zone-axis pattern (dynamical dataset). The dataset had considerable tilt, so intensities are not symmetric. This was exacerbated by large specimen thickness. (c) Precession pattern from the same specimen region as (b) taken under the same specimen tilt conditions. Precession angle was 20 mrad. 109
- 5.6 Direct methods solutions from PED on $\text{La}_4\text{Cu}_3\text{MoO}_{12}$. The amplitude solution is shown in (a) and the intensity solution is shown in (b). The frustrated structure suggested in Griend et al. (1999) has been replaced with a disordered structure that includes. The cation positions are localized and show that the mixed Cu/Mo tetrahedra. 111
- 5.7 Amplitude diffraction patterns from Al_2SiO_5 . (a) Conventional DP and (b) precessed DP ($\phi = 36 \text{ mrad}$). The amplitude ordering in the precession pattern is more distinct. Additionally, the forbidden reflections (odd-order (001)-type reflections), which are very strong in the conventional pattern, are extinct in the precession pattern as indicated by the arrows. The ring overlay describes the spatial frequency $g = 0.25 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$. 112
- 5.8 Potential maps from direct methods for Andalusite. (a) Map from conventional amplitudes. (b) Map from high-pass filtered PED amplitudes. Contour plots are shown in (c)-(d) and the structure is overlaid for reference. Dark atoms are Si, light atoms are Al, and white atoms are O. The white atoms along at $\frac{1}{2}$ the vertical distance represent mixed Si/O columns. 113

5.9	(a) Kinematical diffraction pattern for Mordenite [001] zone axis. (b) The precession pattern for the same zone ($\phi = 40$ mrad). The spatial frequency $g = 0.25$ is indicated the ring overlay.	115
5.10	(a) Structure map from direct methods using kinematical amplitudes to 1 \AA^{-1} with no additional phases. The cation locations are pinpointed but the structure map has many spurious Gibbs oscillations due insufficient sampling of spatial frequencies. (b) Preliminary PED direct methods solution using amplitudes with direct methods (no filtering). Considerable intensity is put into the pore centers where no atoms should exist, and spurious oscillations occur throughout the denser regions of the structure. The true structure is overlaid on top of both solution maps for reference; light atoms represent Al/Si and dark atoms represent O.	116
5.11	Direct methods potential map of Mordenite generated using high-pass filtered intensities. Peaks occur near cation locations within the framework.	117
A.1	(a) The block diagram for the system described by equation A.1. The Bode plot for this system is shown in (b), and the scope output showing the response to a step input of 10 units is displayed in (c).	124
A.2	(a) The block diagram for the system described by equation A.2. The Bode plot for this system is shown in (b), and the scope output showing the step response (1 unit) is displayed in (c).	125
A.3	The ideal op-amp (from Mancini (2002)).	126
A.4	(a) LM741 op-amp, DIP8 package. (b) Noninverting, (c) inverting, and (d) mixer (inverting) operational amplifier circuit configurations.	128
A.5	Voltage divider.	129
A.6	(a) Full-wave 48V LC unregulated supply. (b) The current and through the inductor L1 and the voltage supplied to the load V(R1). The turn-on behavior results in a spike in current and a slow build-up of supply voltage with stabilization by about 300ms.	130
B.1	BD STB circuit, Hitachi H-9000. Courtesy of Hitachi High Technologies.	133
B.2	Image S. circuit, Hitachi H-9000. Courtesy of Hitachi High Technologies.	134
B.3	Revised coil driver circuit, based around the OPA544T power operational amplifier.	136
B.4	The hardware for the first-generation precession instrument installed on the Hitachi UHV H-9000. (a)-(b) BT and DS signal insertion modules. (c) Replacement DS coil driver of figure B.3.	137
C.1	The hardware for the second-generation precession instrument. Left: outboard power supply and signal distribution box. Right: Plug-in signal insertion modules.	140

C.2	DEF UNIT block diagram for the JEOL 2000FX. BTX, BTY, DSX, and DSY indicate the locations where the plug-in module should be inserted.	141
C.3	Schematics for the second generation precession system. The plug-in modules are shown in (a) and the outboard power supply, capable of powering up to four modules, is shown in (b).	142
C.4	(a) Montage of probe images during a precession revolution (close to aligned). 24 frames denote a full revolution; 8 of 24 are shown here. The center image shows the composite of all tilts. Both probe and specimen image wander for in the unaligned condition, contributing to a blurry composite image. The right image (b) shows a well-defined specimen image and excellent alignment of the cone pivot point after alignment. Probe size is ≈ 50 nm.	144
D.1	Power supply box schematics for the new PED system.	146
D.2	BT signal board schematics for the new PED system.	147
D.3	DS signal board schematics for the new PED system.	148
E.1	Alignment procedure for the PED systems described in appendices B-C.	150
E.2	Reciprocal space alignment on the JEOL 3000F systems described in appendix C. (a) shows the BT ring alignment and (b) shows the complementary descann alignment. The x and y descann coils do not have the same number of windings on this instrument. Consequently, the precision of the DACs is more limited in one axis, leading to a slight broadening of the ring indicated by the grey arrows.	151
F.1	Demonstration of the background subtraction technique for measuring peak intensity. The background is approximated by a line connecting points tangent to the probe tails. The background is subtracted and the area under the curve (shaded region) is integrated, or calculated from a spline approximation.	153
F.2	Measurement of an irregular peak shape. An irregular precession spot is shown in (a). The quantification procedure is demonstrated in (b): the spot is masked, the background is subtracted, and the remaining intensity integrated.	155
F.3	(a) Semper-measured Gaussian intensity profiles. The straight line corresponds to the true spot intensities. Lighter data points correspond to low-intensity spots and spots below the noise floor (the flattened region). (b) EDM-measured intensity profiles. The cutoff is just above the noise floor measured by Semper, with very good correspondence to the true intensity over 2.5 orders of magnitude.	156

References

- Avilov, A.S., A.K. Kuligin, U. Pietsch, J.C.H. Spence, V.G. Tsirelson, and J.M. Zuo. 1999. Scanning system for high-energy electron diffractometry. *J. Appl. Cryst.* 32:1033–1038.
- Bagdik'ianc, G.O., and A.G. Alexeev. 1959. *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Fiz.* 23:773–779.
- Batson, P.E., N. Dellby, and O.L. Krivanek. 2002. Sub-ångström resolution using aberration corrected electron optics. *Nature* 418:617–620.
- Berg, B.S., V. Hansen, P.A. Midgley, and J. Gjønnnes. 1998. Measurement of three-dimensional intensity data in electron diffraction by the precession technique. *Ultramic.* 74:147–157.
- Bethe, H.A. 1928. Theorie der beugung von elektronen an kristallen. *Ann. Phys. (Leipzig)* 87: 55–129.
- Blackman, M. 1939. On the intensities of electron diffraction rings. *Proc. Roy. Soc.* 173:68–82.
- Cheng, Y.F., W. Nuchter, J. Mayer, A. Weickenmeier, and J. Gjønnnes. 1996. Low-order structure-factor amplitude and sign determination of an unknown structure Al_mFe by quantitative convergent-beam electron diffraction. *Acta Cryst. A* 52:923–36.
- Chukhovskii, F.N., J.J. Hu, and L.D. Marks. 2001. Statistical dynamical direct methods ii: The three-phase structure invariant. *Acta Cryst. A* 57:231–239.
- Cochran, W. 1955. Relations between the phases of structure factors. *Acta Cryst.* 8:473–478.
- Combettes, P.L. 1996. Method of successive projections for finding a common point of sets in metric spaces. *Adv. Imag. Elec. Phys.* 95:155–261.
- Cowley, J.M., and A.F. Moodie. 1957. The scattering of electrons by atoms and crystals. i. a new theoretical approach. *Acta Cryst.* 10:609–619.
- Deng, B., and L.D. Marks. 2005 in preparation.
- Dorset, D.L. 1995. *Structural electron crystallography*. New York:Plenum Publishing Co.
- Dorset, D.L., S. Hovmoller, and X. Zou, eds. 1997. *Electron crystallography*. Dordrecht:Kluwer Academic.
- Edwards, D.D., T.O. Mason, W. Sinkler, L.D. Marks, K.R. Poeppelmeier, Z. Hu, and J.D. Jorgensen. 2000. Tunneled intergrowth structures in the $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3\text{-In}_2\text{O}_3\text{-SnO}_2$ system. *Journal of Solid State Chemistry* 150:294–304.
- Egerton, R.F. 1989. *Electron*. New York:Plenum Press.
- Franco, S. 2002. *Design with operational amplifiers and analog integrated circuits*. New York:McGraw-Hill.
- Gemmi, M. 2001. Precession technique. In *Electron crystallography and cryo-electron microscopy on inorganic materials and organic and biological molecules*, ed. J. Puiggali,

- A. Rodriguez-Galan, L. Franco, and M.T. Casas, L91–L97. Barcelona:Universitat Politecnica De Catalunya.
- Gemmi, M., X.D. Zou, S. Hovmoller, A. Migliori, M. Vennstrom, and Y. Andersson. 2003. Structure of ti_2p solved by three-dimensional electron diffraction data collected with the precession technique and high-resolution electron microscopy. *Acta Cryst. A* 59:117–126.
- Gjønnnes, J., V. Hansen, B.S. Berg, P. Runde, Y.F. Cheng, K. Gjnnnes, D.L. Dorset, and C.J. Gilmore. 1998a. Structure model for the phase al_mfe derived from three-dimensional electron diffraction intensity data collected by a precession technique. comparison with convergent-beam diffraction. *Acta Cryst. A* 54:306–319.
- Gjønnnes, J., and A.F. Moodie. 1965. Extinction conditions in dynamic theory of electron diffraction. *Acta Cryst.* 19:65–&.
- Gjønnnes, K. 1997. On the integration of electron diffraction intensities in the vincent-midgley precession technique. *Ultramicroscopy* 69:1–11.
- Gjønnnes, K., Y.F. Cheng, B.S. Berg, and V. Hansen. 1998b. Corrections for multiple scattering in integrated electron diffraction intensities. application to determination of structure factors in the 001 projection of al_mfe . *Acta Cryst. A* 54:102–119.
- Griend, D.A. Vander, S. Boudin, V. Caignaert, K.R. Poeppelmeier, Y.G. Wang, V.P. Dravid, M. Azuma, M. Takano, Z.B. Hu, and J.D. Jorgensen. 1999. $\text{La}_4\text{cu}_3\text{moo}_{12}$: A novel cuprate with unusual magnetism. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 121:4787.
- Haider, M., S. Uhlemann, and B. Kabius. 1999. Towards sub-ångström resolution by correction of spherical aberration. *Scanning* 21:89–90.
- Haider, M., S. Uhlemann, E. Schwan, H. Rose, B. Kabius, and K. Urban. 1998. Electron microscopy image enhanced. *Nature* 392:768–769.
- Harker, D., and J.S. Kasper. 1948. Phases of fourier coefficients directly from crystal diffraction data. *Acta Cryst.* 1:70–75.
- Hauptman, H.A. 1991. The phase problem of x-ray crystallography. *Rep. Prog. Phys.* 54: 1427–1454.
- Hirsch, P.B., A. Howie, R.B. Nicholson, and D.W. Pashley, eds. 1965. *Electron microscopy of thin crystals*. London:Spottiswoode, Ballantyne, & Co. Ltd.
- Horowitz, P., and W. Hill. 1989. *The art of electronics*. New York:Cambridge University Press.
- Hu, J.J., F.N. Chukhovskii, and L.D. Marks. 2000. Statistical dynamical direct methods. i. the effective kinematical approximation. *Acta Cryst. A* 56:458–469.
- Hwang, J.H., D.D. Edwards, D.R. Kammler, and T.O. Mason. 2000. Point defects and electrical properties of sn-doped in-based transparent conducting oxides. *Solid State Ionics* 129:135–144.
- Jansen, J., D. Tang, H.W. Zandbergen, and H. Schenk. 1998. MsIs and a least-squares procedure for accurate crystal structure refinement from dynamical electron diffraction patterns. *Acta Cryst. A* 54:91–101.
- Khattak, C.P., D.E. Cox, and F.F.Y. Wang. 1975. Magnetic ordering in $\text{ba}_2\text{mnreo}_6$. *J. Solid State Chem.* 13:77–83.

- Kilaas, R., L.D. Marks, and C.S. Own. 2005. Edm 1.0: Electron direct methods. *Ultramic.* 102:233–237.
- Krivanek, O.L., N. Dellby, and A.R. Lupini. 1999. Towards sub-Å electron beams. *Ultramic.* 78:1–11.
- Krivanek, O.L., and P.A. Stadelmann. 1995. Effect of three-fold astigmatism on high resolution electron micrographs. *Ultramic.* 60:103.
- Landree, E., C. Callazo-Davila, and L.D. Marks. 1997. Multi-solution genetic algorithm approach to surface structure determination using direct methods. *Acta Cryst. B* 53:916–922.
- Levi, A., and H. Stark. 1984. Image restoration by the method of generalized projections with application to restoration from magnitude. *J. Opt. Soc. Am. A* 1:932–943.
- Mancini, R. 2002. *Op amps for everyone*. Dallas:Texas Instruments, Inc.
- Marks, L.D., E. Bengu, C. Callazo-Davila, D. Grozea, E. Landree, C. Leslie, and W. Sinkler. 1998. Direct methods for surfaces. *Surf. Rev. Lett.* 5:1087–1106.
- Marks, L.D., and W. Sinkler. 2003. Sufficient conditions for direct methods with swift electrons. *Micros. and Microanal.* 9:399–410.
- Midgley, P.A., M.E. Sleight, M. Saunders, and R. Vincent. 1998. Measurement of debye-waller factors by electron precession. *Ultramic.* 75:61–67.
- Nellist, P.D., M.F. Chisholm, N. Dellby, O.L. Krivanek, M.F. Murfitt, Z.S. Szilagy, A.R. Lupini, A. Borisevich, W.H. Sides, and S.J. Pennycook. 2004. Direct sub-ångström imaging of a crystal lattice. *Science* 205:1741–1741.
- Newsam, J.M. 1988. Synthesis and structural characterization of a lithium gallosilicate with the zeolite abw framework. *J. Phys. Chem* 92:445–452.
- Nicolopoulos, S., J.M. Gonzalezcalbet, M. Valletregi, A. Corma, C. Corell, J.M. Guil, and J. Perezpariente. 1995. Direct phasing in electron crystallography — *ab-initio* determination of a new mcm-22 zeolite structure. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 117:8947–8956.
- O’Keefe, M.A., and R. Kilaas. 1988. Advances in high-resolution image simulation in image and signal processing in electron microscopy. In *Scanning microscopy supplement 2*, ed. P.W. Hawkes, F.P. Ottensmeyer, W.O. Saxton, and A. Rosenfeld, 225. AMF O’Hare, IL:SEM, Inc.
- Own, C.S., and L.D. Marks. 2004. Hollow-cone electron diffraction system. US Patent application no: 60/531,641.
- . 2005a. Prospects for aberration-corrected precession. *Micros. and Microanal.* submitted.
- . 2005b. Rapid structure determination of a metal oxide from pseudo-kinematical electron diffraction data. *Ultramic.* in press.
- Own, C.S., L.D. Marks, and W. Sinkler. 2005a. Electron precession: A guide for implementation. *Rev. Sci. Instr.* 76:Art. no. 033703.
- Own, C.S., W. Sinkler, and L.D. Marks. 2005b in preparation.
- Own, C.S., A.K. Subramanian, and L.D. Marks. 2004. Quantitative analyses of precession diffraction data for large cell oxides. *Micros. and Microanal.* 10:96–104.

- Sayre, D. 1952. The squaring method: a new method for phase determination. *Acta Cryst.* 5: 60–65.
- Scherzer, O. 1936. Über einige fehler von elektronenlinsen. *Zeit. Phys.* 101:593.
- Sinkler, W., W. Bengu, and L.D. Marks. 1998a. Application of direct methods to dynamical electron diffraction data solving bulk crystal structures. *Acta Cryst. A* 54:591–605.
- Sinkler, W., and L.D. Marks. 1999a. Dynamical direct methods for everyone. *Ultramic.* 75: 251–268.
- . 1999b. A simple channelling model for hrem contrast transfer under dynamical conditions. *J. Microscopy* 194:112–123.
- Sinkler, W., L.D. Marks, D.D. Edwards, T.O. Mason, K.R. Poepelmeier, Z. Hu, and J.D. Jorgensen. 1998b. Determination of oxygen atomic positions in a ga-in-sn-o ceramic using direct methods and electron diffraction. *Journal of Solid State Chemistry* 136:145–149.
- Spence, J.C.H. 2003. *High-resolution electron microscopy*. Oxford:Oxford Univ. Press.
- Spence, J.C.H., and J.M. Zuo. 1992. *Electron microdiffraction*. New York:Plenum Press.
- Suzuki, Y., A. Takeuchi, H. Takano, and H. Takenaka. 2005. Performance test of fresnel zone plate with 50 nm outermost zone width in hard x-ray region. *Jap. J. Appl. Phys.* 1 44: 1996–2000.
- Vainshtein, B.K. 1964. New York:Pergamon Press.
- Vainshtein, B.K., B.B. Zvyagin, and A.S. Avilov. 1992. Electron diffraction structure analysis. In *Electron diffraction techniques, vol.2*, ed. J.M. Cowley, 216–312. Oxford:Oxford University Press.
- Vincent, R., and D.M. Bird. 1986. Measurement of kinematic intensities from large-angle electron-diffraction patterns. *Phil. Mag. A* 53:L35–L40.
- Vincent, R., D.M. Bird, and J.W. Steeds. 1984. Structure of augeas determined by convergent-beam electron diffraction: 1. derivation of basic structure. *Phil. Mag. A* 50:745–763.
- Vincent, R., and P. Midgley. 1994. Double conical beam-rocking system for measurement of integrated electron-diffraction intensities. *Ultramic.* 53:271–282.
- Weirich, T.E. 2004. The crystal structure of Zr_2Se reinvestigated by electron crystallography and x-ray powder diffraction. *Cryst. Rep.* 49:379–389.
- Xu, P., G. Jayaram, and L.D. Marks. 1994. Cross-correlation method for intensity measurement of transmission electron diffraction patterns. *Ultramic.* 53:15–18.
- Youla, D.C. 1987. Mathematical theory of image restoration by the method of convex projections. In *Image recovery: theory and applications*, ed. H. Stark, L91–L97. Orlando:Academic press, Inc.
- Yu, B.Y., A. Abramov, V.G. Tsirelson, V.E. Zavodnik, S.A. Ivanov, and I.D. Brown. 1995. The chemical bond and atomic displacements in SrTiO_3 from x-ray diffraction analysis. *Acta Cryst. B* 51:942–951.
- Zukhlistov, A.P., M.S. Nickolsk, B.B. Zvyagin, A.S. Avilov, A.K. Kulygin, S. Nicolopoulos, and R. Ochs. 2004. Imaging plates - a new life for electron diffraction structure analysis. *Zeit. Krist.* 219:2004.